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This document is designed to provide an outline for implementing the promotion and tenure policy for Group I faculty and the promotion policy for Clinical Faculty set forth in the Ohio University Faculty Handbook. The policy is designed to ensure continuity of process and to guide Schools/Departments and faculty in their tenure and/or promotion deliberations. Nothing in this statement shall be construed to supersede the procedural guarantees provided by the Faculty Handbook. The criteria for the College’s constituent Schools/Departments serve to operationalize those criteria and policy specified in this document and the Faculty Handbook.

PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE
COMPOSITION AND PROCEDURES

COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

The College PTC shall comprise two tenured faculty members at the rank of full and/or associate professor (or one at either rank if there is just one tenured faculty member) from each School/Department within the College. School Directors/Department Chairs may not serve on the College PTC as the representative from their School/Department. A faculty member who may have a conflict of interest with a candidate should recuse himself/herself as a reviewer (see Faculty Handbook for details on matters of recusal). In cases of promotion, all PTC members will hold the same or higher academic rank than that being requested by the candidate. Whenever necessary, additional members, or Ohio University faculty members external to the College beyond the minimum two from each School/Department may be appointed to the PTC by the Dean for the review of a candidate. Any faculty member on the PTC going up for promotion will be prohibited from participating in the discussion of his/her own case. Schools/Departments should determine who will serve on the PTC no later than the first Monday in October of each academic year. The Dean serves as an ex officio member of the PTC and may be present at all meetings.

PROCEDURES

The Dean’s office will schedule the College PTC meetings. During its initial meeting in the fall term, the PTC shall elect a Chair. During the initial meeting, the PTC will also review the current College Promotion and Tenure Policy and all pertinent School/Department promotion and tenure guidelines in order to discuss and establish a common understanding about the guidelines and policies as well as the performance markers pertinent to the promotion and tenure review process. The Chair of the PTC has the responsibility of conducting all meetings, maintaining minutes, conducting the review and revision of the College Promotion and Tenure Policy, and providing the Dean a brief written summary report of promotion and tenure review recommendations.

The PTC functions in an advisory capacity to the Dean regarding the promotion and/or tenure decision for each candidate. This advice will be given following a comprehensive review of the dossier and supporting materials of each candidate being considered for promotion and/or tenure as forwarded by the Schools/Departments. During the promotion and tenure review meetings, a representative from the candidate’s School/Department will make a presentation on behalf of the candidate to the College PTC. The presenter must be a member of the School/Department’s PTC. The presenter should provide an
accurate and balanced summary of the candidate’s performance in each of the three areas. Following discussion among the PTC members, the committee will vote by secret ballot. For probationary candidates seeking both promotion and tenure, a single vote will be cast. The Chair of the PTC will provide the Dean a brief written summary and a recommendation regarding each candidate. The meeting devoted to candidate reviews will occur during the winter/spring term at a time that will allow completion of work at least two weeks prior to the Dean’s deadline for forwarding materials and recommendations to the Executive Vice-President and Provost.

In cases where the recommendation to the Dean is negative with respect to promotion and/or tenure, the candidate may initiate an appeal process (specific information about the process and timelines can be found in the Appeal Process appearing later in this document and in the Faculty Handbook).

REVIEW OF COLLEGE PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY

The PTC will conduct a review of the Promotion and Tenure Policy at least every five years. The review will include input and approval from Group I faculty members. The resulting summary and recommendations of these reviews will be forwarded to the Dean who will either accept revisions as offered or will recommend additional revisions for consideration. Changes are subject to a majority vote of the voting Group I faculty of the College. Approval of the revised Promotion and Tenure Policy will adhere to a timeline established by the PTC chair early spring semester that assures review and voting before the final day of classes of spring semester. If the Promotion and Tenure Policy is not approved by majority vote of the voting Group I faculty, the College PTC will work with the Dean to make appropriate revisions. Every effort will be made to vote on the revised Promotion and Tenure Policy before the end of spring term. If the vote does not occur, then it will be delayed until the following fall term and approved changes will not take effect until the subsequent academic year.

IMPORTANT TIMELINES AND DEADLINES

The College adheres to timelines and deadlines approved by the Faculty Senate. See ATTACHMENT G (copied from Faculty Handbook APPENDIX B).
PART I. GROUP I FACULTY

PRINCIPLES

The College of Health Sciences and Professions aims to become a national and international leader in transformative education and scholarly endeavors. In addition, the College strives to positively affect the health care environment of its community. Expectations for faculty members seeking promotion and/or tenure are that each faculty member will promote and advance the missions of the College.

Achievement of the missions of the College requires contributions by its Group I faculty in three broad areas:

1. **Teaching**, which encompasses activities that directly or indirectly prepare students for their role in their chosen discipline;
2. **Scholarly endeavors** (focused and thematic) that: (a) add to and integrate knowledge within a scientific discipline or that integrate theories and methods among scientific disciplines; (b) improve practice and/or instruction; (c) expand our understanding of the world; and/or (d) enhance the scholarship of teaching; and
3. **Service**, which addresses those activities, including professional, institutional, and administrative, that enhance the community and the public.

An overarching goal of the College of Health Sciences and Professions is to provide an environment in which Group I faculty can flourish from their pre-tenure years through their post-tenure years as senior professors. Key components of that environment are a belief in formal and informal mentoring of pre-tenure faculty, a collaborative approach to career goal setting, an emphasis on formative evaluation, and a commitment to working with faculty to secure resources necessary for faculty success. The College values an environment in which faculty members exhibit collegiality, University citizenship, and professionalism.

It is recognized that faculty performance is complex and dynamic; consequently, the assessment and evaluation of faculty work must reflect this complexity (refer to the College Workload Policy for details about faculty workload). Evaluation of any individual will be based on a combination of that individual’s expertise and performance, contribution to the respective School/Department, and effort directed toward the accomplishment of the missions of the College and University. The candidate will use the dossier to assemble evidence from various perspectives to form an integrated picture of the candidate’s areas of strengths, common themes of scholarly focus, as well as challenges. The candidate will document in the dossier his/her workload distribution during the pre-tenure period along with a specification of the resources the University/College/ School/Department has provided to the faculty member (e.g., start-up funds, summer research support, laboratory space and set-up, course reductions, etc.) to achieve work/career objectives. Additional information regarding the structure of the dossier can be found in Attachment A of this policy.

A promotion and tenure policy must address the complexity of faculty work and outline expectations while recognizing that there is no template of ideal and unchangeable
criteria or quality indicators in tenure and rank decisions. Assessment of a candidate’s performance will consider the: (a) quality, breadth, and depth of the body of work; (b) development of the work over the time in question; and (c) sustainability and thematic nature of the body of work. In addition, the body of work must relate to the institutional mission, disciplinary or interdisciplinary expectations, and the candidate’s personal career goals. The expectations of the College as outlined in this policy are based in several areas:

1. Faculty members must develop quality indicators of their work. Characteristics to be considered include: (a) discipline-based expertise expected; (b) originality; (c) innovation; (d) intellectual rigor; and (e) significance of the work.

2. Pre-tenure faculty members will receive an annual formative evaluation from the School/Department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) and School Director/Department Chair. This evaluation will provide the faculty member with specific input to improve his/her progress toward tenure and promotion. The written plan for annual objectives/goals will serve as a mechanism for discussion with the candidate, the relevant School/Department committee and the School Director/Department Chair. Senior faculty members are encouraged to guide and shape the professional career development of any faculty member as part of the mentoring process.

The College criteria are designed to provide a framework for the Schools/Departments and to serve as a policy for members of the College of Health Sciences and Professions’ Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) as they review candidates in preparation for their recommendations to the Dean. Each School/Department is responsible for developing specific criteria and a set of guidelines for promotion and tenure that reflect its mission and simultaneously meet College criteria. Although Schools/Departments may have criteria that exceed those of the College, they cannot have standards that are lower than, or conflict with, those specified in the College document or that conflict with the University guidelines found in the Faculty Handbook.

Both formative and summative evaluations of the faculty member's efforts are essential to judging individual performance in moving through the promotion and/or tenure process. These evaluations occur through the following separate but complementary processes at the School/Department level: (a) annual oral and written reviews of progress toward promotion and/or tenure completed by the School/Department’s PTC and Director/Chair; (b) annual merit reviews occurring pre- and post-tenure; and (c) pre-tenure third year review. If a faculty member has a situation that falls outside of the College Promotion and Tenure policy (e.g., illness), he/she must make the School Director/Department Chair aware of the situation. The School Director/Department Chair consults with the School/Department’s PTC to determine the appropriate course of action (e.g., extension) in accordance with the Faculty Handbook.

**TENURE**

Tenure is the most important decision that an institution makes regarding an individual faculty member. Tenure is awarded to those individuals whose records indicate that they are likely to continue to make significant positive contributions to the academic life of the University throughout their professional careers. A tenure decision is also a statement of an individual’s accomplishments across the three areas of teaching, scholarly endeavors,
and service have added to the value of the School/Department, College, and University and that future contributions to the institution are expected to do the same. Tenure is only granted to individuals who meet expectations in teaching, scholarly endeavors, and service activities, including professionally related services. While respecting values of academic freedom, University citizenship and collegiality are also factors to consider in a tenure decision.

Faculty members who are appointed as assistant professors with a doctorate or equivalent professional experience are expected to achieve both promotion and tenure to associate professor by the end of the probationary period. Expectations that differ will be detailed in the letter of appointment from the Dean.

“Promotion and tenure committees customarily cast a single combined vote on both tenure and promotion for probationary faculty, on the grounds that promotion signals the reasons for the institution’s investment in a candidate. It is unlikely that tenure will be awarded to a candidate who has not also been recommended for promotion. This does not apply to candidates who are already Associate or Full Professors.”

A recommendation for early promotion and tenure is possible but requires that a case be made for exceptionality. Faculty members who choose to apply for early promotion and tenure and are not successful may reapply up to or during the penultimate year of the probationary period.

PROMOTION

Promotion through the ranks from assistant professor to full professor is in recognition of the accomplishments of the faculty member being considered. All faculty members in the College of Health Sciences and Professions are encouraged to move through the academic ranks to achieve the status of full professor. Although typical time periods in a given rank are usually expected (e.g., 6 years in the rank of assistant and 5 years in the rank of associate), demonstrated merit, not years of service, shall be the guiding factor for promotion. A recommendation for early promotion is possible but requires that a case for exceptionality be made (e.g., significant research productivity that is focused and thematic; significant grant activity—including grant funding; significant extra-professional service and activity). Promotion shall not be automatic nor will it be regarded as guaranteed upon completion of a typical term of service.

REVIEW OF PRE-TENURE (PROBATIONARY) FACULTY

Each pre-tenured Group I faculty member will undergo a third year review to evaluate his/her progress toward promotion and/or tenure. In the fall of his/her fourth year, the faculty member will submit a promotion and tenure dossier to the Chair of his/her School/Department’s PTC by the second Monday of September. Faculty hired with service credit toward tenure will be reviewed at the mid-point of their pre-tenure period in consultation with their School Director/Department Chair. The dossier will contain:

- Narrative statement discussing the three areas of teaching, scholarly endeavors, and service and the candidate’s strengths and areas of growth in each area;
Summary statement discussing utilization of start-up investment;
Original letter of offer;
Current curriculum vitae;
Teaching portfolio;
Copies or reprints of publications/scholarly endeavors.

The School/Department PTC and School Director/Department Chair will review the materials by the end of the first week of winter/spring term. The School/Department PTC and School Director/Department Chair will meet with the Dean to provide him/her with an overview of the candidate’s progress toward promotion and/or tenure. This meeting will occur by the end of the third week of the winter/spring term. The candidate will receive a letter from the School Director/Department Chair that integrates all feedback about his/her progress toward promotion and/or tenure. The letter will include suggestions regarding which area(s) the candidate may need to strengthen and improve. The School Director/Department Chair will issue the letter no later than February 15.

**Assistant Professor to Associate Professor**

Promotion from the rank of assistant professor to associate professor requires:

1. Achievement of the terminal degree or its equivalent in that discipline;
2. A demonstrated record of effectiveness as a teacher;
3. A record of peer-reviewed scholarly activity that contributes to a focus within the candidate’s discipline or field of study and demonstrates the candidate’s intellectual development, scholarly independence, and potential to sustain a thematic/focused research program;
4. A record of service including administration to the discipline, the academic unit and, where possible, the School/Department, College, and/or University, to the public as well as profession at large.

**Associate Professor to Professor**

Promotion to the highest rank requires academic achievements and a professional reputation that is recognized as outstanding. In many instances, these achievements will have resulted in national and international recognition across various aspects of the candidate’s scholarly, teaching, and service activities.

The following attributes will be considered when deciding if a faculty member will earn the rank of professor:

1. Demonstrated continued growth and cumulative record of teaching effectiveness;
2. Substantial record of peer-reviewed scholarly activity that contributes to a focus within the candidate’s discipline or field of study and demonstrates the candidate’s intellectual development, scholarly independence, and ability to sustain a thematic/focused research program, and continued grant activity;
3. Demonstrated leadership in service to the University (School/Department, College, University), to the public, and to the profession at large.

Continued growth is expected from the time of appointment to associate professor in the areas of teaching, scholarly activity, and service/leadership. If significant but
unrecognized administrative duties prohibit continued growth in any of the areas, the PTC may consider the circumstances.

EXPECTATIONS IN AREAS OF FACULTY ACTIVITY

Expectations in Teaching

While teaching is only one component of a faculty member’s responsibilities, it is an important area of expectation at Ohio University. Faculty members promoted and/or tenured within the College of Health Sciences and Professions will demonstrate high quality teaching effectiveness. Teaching effectiveness is viewed as a measure of quality, not quantity, and is expected of all candidates, whether the teaching load consists of one or multiple courses.

An excellent teacher maintains a high level of knowledge and expertise in his/her respective discipline or area of specialization. An excellent teacher exhibits the knowledge, skills, and commitment necessary to assist students as they develop a growing understanding of the subject matter, the practices, and the competencies pertinent to their disciplines. An excellent teacher is committed to the guidance of students with varying strengths, needs, and capabilities to attain the necessary understanding of their discipline. An excellent teacher collaborates with others in the development and delivery of discipline-specific or interdisciplinary courses and is active in creating, revising, and reviewing curricula. An excellent teacher exhibits the following characteristics of effective teaching: (a) a commitment to students; (b) an ongoing interest in the craft of teaching; and (c) recognition that advising is an important, albeit less formal, aspect of the faculty-student relationship. Candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure will strive to balance time and effort in addressing these three areas so that professional growth is demonstrated over time.

An excellent teacher demonstrates a continuing concern for instructional effectiveness through the collection and utilization of feedback from students, colleagues, and others regarding presentation strategies and evaluation of learning. It is expected that faculty members will provide substantive evidence about their skill and effectiveness in teaching. It is the candidate’s responsibility to present evidence of a consistent pattern of high quality and effective teaching. Evaluations based on a wide variety of instruments might be one form of documenting such a pattern. Strategies for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness may include, but are not limited to: self-evaluations, classroom visitations, student evaluations of teaching, School Director/Department Chair evaluations, peer evaluations, external review, and evaluations of the academic advising of students.

Teaching portfolios are a meaningful way for candidates to demonstrate their teaching effectiveness. Candidates must have a teaching portfolio for the mid-probationary tenure review which can be added to and revised in preparation for the full promotion and/or tenure review. The basic framework for the teaching portfolio can be found in Attachment C. Candidates must include relevant teaching benchmarks (see Attachment B) in their portfolio.

In all review cases, the weight given teaching must be considered in light of other demands made on the faculty member by hiring agreements or activities necessary to fulfill the School/Department’s mission. For example, a candidate may have been hired
with the understanding that workload would include administrative responsibilities or may have received resources for scholarly activities that include a reduced teaching workload. Specific teaching responsibilities will occur through dialogue between the faculty member, the School Director/Department Chair, and the Chair of the School/Department's PTC (other committee members also may be involved) and will reflect the goals and needs of the program (including interdisciplinary teaching, if applicable) and the professional goals of the individual faculty member. The candidate shall provide a written record of decisions that may later affect promotion and/or tenure decisions to the faculty member and copies retained in his/her permanent file. To this end, the candidate must maintain accurate documentation (e.g., summary notes of conversations with the director/chair, email correspondences) of any changes in workload and expectations that may occur during the pre-tenure period. These documents may be used in the evaluative materials submitted by the candidate at the time of review.

The responsibility of the College PTC is to address the following questions: Is there clear and sufficient evidence to support the candidate’s effectiveness as a teacher? Have the College of Health Sciences and Professions’ expectations for effective teaching been met?

**Expectations in Scholarly Endeavors**

Scholarship refers “. . . to a variety of creative work carried on in a variety of places [with] its integrity . . . measured by the ability to think, communicate, and learn” (Boyer, 1990, p. 15). Group I faculty members in the College of Health Sciences and Professions are expected to contribute to the understanding and/or improvement of the world in which we live. Scholarly activities are the mechanisms for accomplishing this component of faculty responsibility. Scholarship includes original research from a focused program of study that expands and challenges knowledge. Scholarship includes innovative, creative thinking processes that result in new insights and perspectives integrated into expansive intellectual patterns that may be discipline specific or interdisciplinary in nature. Given that the College includes many disciplines with diverse perspectives, the substance and nature of contributions in this area will reflect this diversity.

Strong scholarship includes a number of important characteristics. The following characteristics will be considered:

1. Scholarship that builds on, relates to, and enhances an existing body of knowledge in a specific discipline or across disciplines;
2. Scholarship that is grounded in scientifically appropriate quantitative or qualitative research methods and;
3. Scholarship that provides opportunities for the scholar to disseminate research, theory or practice through a variety of methods such as publication or presentations.

Although a given faculty member may choose to express scholarly endeavors differently at various stages of his/her professional lifetime, it is anticipated that there will be a clear...
programmatic line of study that connects these activities.

Quantity is neither the primary nor the driving factor in assessing scholarly/creative activity. Schools and departments may choose to identify various quantitative markers, and it is a combination of quantity and quality of scholarship that is ultimately assessed in evaluating the candidate. The quality of the work, influence the work produces, and the level of contribution to a particular body of knowledge are the substantive issues that will be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure. Markers of quality of publications may include impact factors of journals, number of citations of published work, and audience of journal. Quality of grantsmanship is indexed by such things as positive comments from review panels and success in securing grant funding.

Evaluation of scholarly endeavors must go beyond those performed by colleagues at Ohio University. Scholarly endeavors will be reviewed and evaluated by relevant peers outside of Ohio University. Criteria used to evaluate activities of the various disciplines represented within the College of Health Sciences and Professions may vary and an external review of scholarly materials by expert peers beyond the University allows an opportunity to obtain insight from the discipline with which the candidate identifies with most closely. The discipline-based variations found within the respective Schools/Departments of the College provide each School/Department with opportunities to establish its own values and culture.

Peer review implies that experts within a particular discipline or field of study have had the opportunity to review the work and been involved in deciding its merit in contributing to a body of knowledge. Peer review occurs in the submission and acceptance for dissemination of and funding for scholarly work. The use of external reviewers is another form of peer review and is a mechanism used in the College of Health Sciences and Professions promotion and/or tenure decisions. External reviewers from within the academe must be at a rank equal to or higher than the rank for which the candidate is being considered. Copies of the external reviews become part of the candidate’s dossier. Suggested guidelines for external reviewers for promotion and/or tenure are included in Attachment D.

Excellence is highly valued in the promotion and tenure decision. In the area of scholarly endeavors, excellence is defined as a record of sustained and quality performance in discipline-specific activities that meet the characteristics of scholarship identified in this document. Scholarship may also include interdisciplinary activities that augment and complement a candidate’s discipline-specific activities. Suggested benchmarks of scholarly endeavors can be found in Attachment E of this document.

Expectations in Service

Service is broadly defined as a contribution to a larger group and extends beyond mere membership. It is expected that faculty members seeking promotion and/or tenure will have a record of service linked to citizenship within the University, College, and/or School/Department. Valued contributions should also include service to the faculty member’s discipline or profession and the larger community that enfolds the University. Service benchmarks suggestions are located in Attachment F.

Faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure will have performed service that is documented
and evaluated across the following categories:

1. Institutional service that contributes to the growth and ongoing work and development of the School/Department/College/University (e.g., committee work at all levels, membership on external committees/task forces, activities that contribute to achievement of specific goals). These activities may reflect both discipline-specific and interdisciplinary involvement.

2. Disciplinary or interdisciplinary professional contributions that assist professional, scholarly, or disciplinary/interdisciplinary associations and organizations in accomplishing their work (e.g., serve as an accreditation visitor, serve as an officer or assume a leadership role in a relevant organization, serve as a policy advisor).

3. Private or community contributions that call upon the knowledge and expertise of the faculty member involved (e.g., serve on a board of directors of relevant agencies; teach a class in a public [K-12] school; engage in professional practice).

Given the large number of disciplines within the College that include a practice component, there is the strong possibility that faculty members will be active practitioners within their specific discipline(s).

Practice that generates knowledge and meets the following criteria will more likely be considered scholarly:

1. The practice activity has a demonstrated and substantive link to a societal problem, issue, or concern with activities being designed for the purpose of providing for the public/common good.

2. The practice requires utilization and application of discipline-specific or interdisciplinary knowledge to the identified societal problem, issue, or concern.

3. Peers external to the School/Department have judged the activity as exemplary and leading to the improvement of practice.

**Tenure Clock Extensions**

Extensions to the tenure clock can be granted for a variety of reasons. These extensions are typically made for only one year and must be sought prior to the penultimate year. For details see the Faculty Handbook.3

**Transfer from Tenure Track to Clinical Faculty Track**

As per the Faculty Handbook, “Tenure Track faculty are permitted to petition for a one time transfer to a Clinical Track position no later than the end of their third year. In order to make a transfer, interested faculty need to demonstrate that they are good candidates for a Clinical Faculty position. A petition to transfer must originate with the faculty member and be approved by the Department Chair, the Dean, the Provost, and the

---

3 Faculty Handbook (September, 2012): Sick Leave Policy (II.H., pp. 41 ff.; Leaves of Absence (II.I.); Procedural Error (II.D.2.e.) or Reduced Capacity (II.D.2.e.), and II.H.6.). The faculty member may appeal denial using the grievance procedure relating to promotion and tenure recommendations (see Section II.F.).
Department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee. In the event of a non-approval, a faculty member has a right to appeal. The appeal process parallels the process for grievance appeal as outlined in II.G of the Faculty Handbook. Once a transfer is completed, the faculty member is not eligible to transfer back to a Tenure Track position.4

**Appeal Process**5

In the case of a negative recommendation for promotion and/or tenure, the candidate may begin an appeal process. At this point, the original dossier is kept in a secure location by the academic unit considering the appeal. The candidate has direct supervised access to the document. The initial letter of appeal must be filed by the candidate within 45 days of written receipt of the negative recommendation (as stated in the Faculty Handbook). For further details about “Time Limits” regarding appeal of nonreappointment or denial of tenure or promotion, see ATTACHMENT G (excerpted from Faculty Handbook APPENDIX B, Section B.)

Grounds for an appeal may be based on one or more of the following conditions:
1. inadequate consideration;
2. denial of due process – a procedural error; or,
3. denial of academic freedom.

The appeal process starts at the level where the negative recommendation was received. If that is the level of the School/Department PTC, then the candidate directs the letter of appeal to the School/Department PTC through the School Director/Department Chair. The School/Department PTC will reconvene to review the issues of appeal based on the original dossier. The School/Department PTC must complete its review of the appeal and submit a written response to the candidate within 30 days. If the committee’s review upholds the appeal (agrees with the candidate), then the candidate’s original dossier is sent to the School Director/Department Chair for review and the standard reviewing process occurs but on a modified time-line.

If the committee rejects the candidate’s appeal, then the candidate has 30 days to submit a letter of appeal to the Dean. During these 30 days, the original dossier will be forwarded to the Dean for secure keeping. Upon receipt of a letter of appeal, the Dean may convene the College PTC to assist in the review process. The Dean’s decision on the appeal must be completed and a written decision submitted to the candidate within 30 days of receipt of the letter of appeal.

If the Dean upholds the original PTC decision (appeal is rejected), then the candidate has the right to appeal to the next level (Executive Vice-President and Provost). The candidate has the right to appeal through all levels up to the Faculty Senate (see Faculty Handbook for details). The Faculty Senate vote on the appeal is binding and completes the appeal process within the University. The steps in the appeal process are:

---

4 Faculty Senate Resolution to Establish a Clinical Faculty Track to Include the College of Health Sciences and Professions passed September 10, 2012 and signed by the Provost September 24, 2012; see also Faculty Handbook II.C.3.e.11. (September, 2012).

5 See Faculty Handbook (September, 2012), Section II. F. Grievance Procedures for Non-reappointment and for Denial of Promotion and/or Tenure.
If the Dean supports the appeal, then the dossier is reconsidered by the School/Department’s PTC. At each step of a positive appeal, the dossier is returned to the School/Department’s PTC for further consideration and a vote. The candidate will have the original dossier returned to him/her at the completion of the appeal process.

Reference List

PART II. CLINICAL FACULTY

GOVERNING CONCEPTS

Per the Faculty Handbook, “Clinical Faculty Track consists of faculty in the College of Health Sciences and Professions (CHSP) whose work is primarily teaching in a clinical setting and as appropriate to their individual disciplines.”

1. In CHSP, the Clinical Faculty track consists of faculty members who hold clinical licenses/credentials and who may practice as clinicians in their disciplines. They are primarily hired to mentor/teach students in clinical disciplines and/or in clinical settings.

2. Clinical Faculty may hold the rank
   a. Assistant Clinical Professor
   b. Associate Clinical Professor
   c. Clinical Professor

Faculty in the Clinical Faculty track will normally be hired at a rank of Assistant Clinical Professor, but rank may be negotiated at the time of hire depending on qualifications and experience.

3. Normally, the initial contract for Clinical Faculty will be a 12-month, renewable contract for a term of one year. After an initial three years of satisfactory service, he/she will receive a contract for a term of three years, with subsequent contracts to be renewable for 5-year terms based on successful evaluations and continued need of the department or college. However, the length of the initial and subsequent contracts can be negotiated based on qualifications, experience and need of the faculty member and department or college.

4. Clinical Faculty must be evaluated annually by the department Chair based on department guidelines with more extensive reviews performed in the last year of multi-year contracts. Extensive reviews will be completed by a departmental committee with input from Chairs, and then sent on to the Dean for action of renewal or non-renewal.

6. Clinical Faculty may be promoted (without tenure) to Assistant Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor, and Clinical Professor as appropriate.
   a. An individual is usually expected to spend a minimum of six years in the rank of Assistant Professor before being considered for promotion to Associate.
   b. An individual is usually expected to spend a minimum of five years in the rank of Associate Professor before being considered for promotion to Professor.

---

6 Items 1-11 under Governing Concepts verbatim from the Faculty Handbook (September 2012).
7 Faculty Senate Resolution to Establish a Clinical Faculty Track to Include the College of Health Sciences and Professions passed September 10, 2012 and signed by the Provost September 24, 2012; see also Faculty Handbook II.C.3.e.1-11 (September, 2012).
7. Clinical Faculty members may be employed on the basis of full-time or part-time appointments.

8. Clinical Faculty members may negotiate a shift from a full-time to a part-time appointment, or from a part-time to a full-time appointment without loss of rank.

9. Percentage distribution of scholarship, teaching, and service responsibilities are negotiated with the department chair at the time of hire in the letter of offer and annually as appropriate to meet the needs of department or college.

10. Faculty holding a Clinical Track position are eligible to apply for tenure track positions when they become available. The criteria for rank determination in the Clinical Track and the Tenure Track differ. Hence, a faculty member’s rank in the Clinical Track is not necessarily transferable to the Tenure Track.

11. Tenure Track faculty are permitted to petition for a one time transfer to a Clinical Track position no later than the end of their third year. In order to make a transfer, interested faculty need to demonstrate that they are good candidates for a Clinical Faculty position. A petition to transfer must originate with the faculty member and be approved by the Department Chair, the Dean, the Provost, and the Department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee. In the event of a non-approval, a faculty member has a right to appeal. The appeal process parallels the process for grievance appeal as outlined in II.G of the Faculty Handbook. Once a transfer is completed, the faculty member is not eligible to transfer back to a Tenure Track position.

PRINCIPLES

The College of Health Sciences and Professions aims to become a national and international leader in transformative clinical education and scholarly endeavors. In addition, the College strives to positively affect the health care environment of its community. Expectations for faculty members seeking promotion are that each faculty member will promote and advance the missions of the College.

Depending on the terms of hire and the standards of the academic unit, the performance expectations of Clinical Faculty will encompass one or more of the following areas:

1. Teaching, which encompasses activities that directly or indirectly prepare students for their role in their chosen discipline;
2. Scholarly endeavors that: (a) add to and integrate knowledge within a scientific discipline or that integrate theories and methods among scientific disciplines; (b) improve practice and/or instruction; (c) expand our understanding of the world; and/or (d) enhance the scholarship of teaching; and
3. Service, which addresses those activities, including professional, institutional, and administrative, that enhance the community and the public.

An overarching goal of the College of Health Sciences and Professions is to provide an environment in which Clinical Faculty can flourish. Key components of that environment are a belief in formal and informal mentoring of faculty, a collaborative approach to career goal setting, an emphasis on formative evaluation, and a commitment to working with
faculty to secure resources necessary for faculty success. The College values an environment in which faculty members exhibit collegiality, University citizenship, and professionalism.

It is recognized that faculty performance is complex and dynamic: consequently, the assessment and evaluation of faculty work must reflect this complexity (refer to the College Workload Policy for details about faculty workload). Evaluation of any individual will be based on a combination of that individual’s expertise and performance, contribution to the respective School/Department, and effort directed toward the accomplishment of the missions of the College and University. The candidate will use the dossier to assemble evidence from various perspectives to form an integrated picture of the candidate’s areas of strengths, common themes of scholarly focus, as well as challenges. The candidate will document in the dossier his/her workload distribution during the evaluation period along with a specification of the resources the University/College/ School/Department has provided to the faculty member to achieve work/career objectives. Additional information regarding the structure of the dossier can be found in Attachment A of this policy.

A promotion policy must address the complexity of faculty work and outline expectations while recognizing that there is no template of ideal and unchangeable criteria or quality indicators regarding promotion decisions. Assessment of a candidate’s performance will consider the: (a) quality, breadth, and depth of the clinical teaching, scholarship and service, and (b) a strong relationship to the institutional mission, professional or interprofessional expectations, and the candidate’s personal career goals. The expectations of the College as outlined in this policy are based in several areas:

1. Faculty members must develop quality indicators of their work. Characteristics to be considered include: (a) discipline-based expertise expected; (b) originality; (c) innovation; (d) intellectual rigor; and (e) significance of the work.

2. Clinical Faculty members will receive an annual formative evaluation from the School/Department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) and School Director/ Department Chair. This evaluation will provide the faculty member with specific input to improve his/her progress toward promotion. The written plan for annual objectives/goals will serve as a mechanism for discussion with the candidate, the relevant School/Department committee and the School Director/Department Chair. Senior faculty members are encouraged to guide and shape the professional career development of any faculty member as part of the mentoring process.

The College criteria are designed to provide a framework for the Schools/Departments and to serve as a policy for members of the College of Health Sciences and Professions’ Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) as they review candidates in preparation for their recommendations to the Dean. Each School/Department is responsible for developing specific criteria and a set of guidelines for promotion and tenure that reflect its mission and simultaneously meet College criteria. Although Schools/Departments may have criteria that exceed those of the College, they cannot have standards that are lower than, or conflict with, those specified in the College document or that conflict with the University guidelines found in the Faculty Handbook.

Both formative and summative evaluations of the faculty member’s efforts are essential to
judging individual performance in moving through the promotion process. These evaluations occur through the following separate but complementary processes at the School/Department level: (a) annual oral and written reviews of progress toward promotion completed by the School/Department’s PTC and Director/Chair; (b) annual merit reviews; and (c) a more extensive review performed in the last year of a multi-year contract. If a faculty member has a situation that falls outside of the College Promotion and Tenure policy (e.g., illness), he/she must make the School Director/Department Chair aware of the situation. The School Director/Department Chair consults with the School/Department’s PTC to determine the appropriate course of action (e.g., extension) in accordance with the Faculty Handbook.

PROMOTION

Promotion through the ranks from assistant professor to full professor is in recognition of the accomplishments of the faculty member being considered. All faculty members in the College of Health Sciences and Professions are encouraged to move through the academic ranks to achieve the status of full professor. Although typical time periods in a given rank are usually expected (e.g., 6 years in the rank of assistant and 5 years in the rank of associate), demonstrated merit, not years of service, shall be the guiding factor for promotion. Promotion shall not be automatic nor will it be regarded as guaranteed upon completion of a typical term of service.

Assistant Clinical Professor to Associate Clinical Professor

Depending on the terms of hire and the standards of the academic unit, promotion from the rank of assistant professor to associate professor will be based on one or more of the following:

1. A demonstrated record of effectiveness as a teacher/mentor;
2. A record of peer-reviewed scholarly activity that contributes to a focus within the candidate’s discipline or field of study and demonstrates the candidate’s intellectual development, scholarly independence, and potential to sustain a thematic/focused research program;
3. A record of service including administration to the discipline, the academic unit and, where possible, the School/Department, College, and/or University, to the public as well as profession at large.

Associate Clinical Professor to Clinical Professor

Depending on the terms of hire and the standards of the academic unit, promotion to the highest rank requires academic achievements and a professional reputation that is recognized as outstanding.

One or more of the following attributes will be considered when deciding if a faculty member will earn the rank of Clinical Professor:

1. Demonstrated continued growth and cumulative record of mentoring/teaching effectiveness;
2. Substantial record of peer-reviewed scholarly activity that contributes to the candidate’s discipline or field of study;
3. Demonstrated leadership in service to the University (School/Department, College, University), to the public, and to the profession at large.

Continued growth is expected from the time of appointment to Clinical Associate professor.

EXPECTATIONS IN AREAS OF CLINICAL FACULTY ACTIVITY

Expectations in Teaching

Clinical Faculty members promoted within the College of Health Sciences and Professions will demonstrate high quality mentoring/teaching effectiveness. Teaching effectiveness is viewed as a measure of quality, not quantity, and is expected of all candidates, whether the teaching load consists of one or multiple courses.

An excellent teacher maintains a high level of knowledge and expertise in his/her respective discipline or area of specialization. An excellent teacher exhibits the knowledge, skills, and commitment necessary to assist students as they develop a growing understanding of the subject matter, the practices, and the competencies pertinent to their disciplines. An excellent teacher is committed to the guidance of students with varying strengths, needs, and capabilities to attain the necessary understanding of their discipline. An excellent teacher collaborates with others in the development and delivery of discipline-specific or interdisciplinary courses and is active in creating, revising, and reviewing curricula. An excellent teacher exhibits the following characteristics of effective teaching: (a) a commitment to students; (b) an ongoing interest in the craft of teaching; and (c) recognition that advising is an important, albeit less formal, aspect of the faculty-student relationship. Candidates seeking promotion will strive to balance time and effort in addressing these three areas so that professional growth is demonstrated over time.

An excellent teacher demonstrates a continuing concern for instructional effectiveness through the collection and utilization of feedback from students, colleagues, and others regarding presentation strategies and evaluation of learning. It is expected that faculty members will provide substantive evidence about their skill and effectiveness in teaching. It is the candidate’s responsibility to present evidence of a consistent pattern of high quality and effective teaching. Evaluations based on a wide variety of instruments might be one form of documenting such a pattern. Strategies for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness may include, but are not limited to: self-evaluations, classroom visitations, student evaluations of teaching, School Director/Department Chair evaluations, peer evaluations, external review, and evaluations of the academic advising of students.

Teaching portfolios are a meaningful way for candidates to demonstrate their teaching effectiveness. Candidates must have a teaching portfolio for promotion review which can be added to and revised in preparation for the full promotion review. The basic framework for the teaching portfolio can be found in Attachment C. Candidates must include relevant teaching benchmarks (see Attachment B) in their portfolio.

In all review cases, the weight given teaching must be considered in light of other demands made on the faculty member by hiring agreements or activities necessary to fulfill the School/Department’s mission. For example, a candidate may have been hired
with the understanding that workload would include administrative responsibilities or may have received resources for scholarly activities that include a reduced teaching workload. Specific teaching responsibilities will occur through dialogue between the faculty member, the School Director/Department Chair, and the Chair of the School/Department's PTC (other committee members also may be involved) and will reflect the goals and needs of the program (including interdisciplinary teaching, if applicable) and the professional goals of the individual faculty member. The candidate shall provide a written record of decisions that may later affect promotion decisions to the faculty member and copies retained in his/her permanent file. To this end, the candidate must maintain accurate documentation (e.g., summary notes of conversations with the director/chair, email correspondences) of any changes in workload and expectations that may occur during the pre-tenure period. These documents may be used in the evaluative materials submitted by the candidate at the time of review.

The responsibility of the College PTC is to address the following questions: Is there clear and sufficient evidence to support the candidate’s effectiveness as a teacher? Have the College of Health Sciences and Professions’ expectations for effective teaching been met?

**Expectations in Scholarly Endeavors**

Scholarship refers “. . . to a variety of creative work carried on in a variety of places [with] its integrity . . . measured by the ability to think, communicate, and learn” (Boyer, 1990, p. 15). Depending on the terms of hire and the standards of the academic unit, Clinical Faculty members in the College of Health Sciences and Professions may be expected to contribute to the understanding and/or improvement of the world in which we live. Scholarly activities are the mechanisms for accomplishing this component of faculty responsibility. Scholarship includes original research from a focused\(^8\) program of study that expands and challenges knowledge. Scholarship includes innovative, creative thinking processes that result in new insights and perspectives integrated into expansive intellectual patterns that may be discipline specific or interdisciplinary in nature. Given that the College includes many disciplines with diverse perspectives, the substance and nature of contributions in this area will reflect this diversity.

Strong scholarship includes a number of important characteristics. The following characteristics will be considered:

1. Scholarship that builds on, relates to, and enhances an existing body of knowledge in a specific discipline or across disciplines;
2. Scholarship that is grounded in scientifically appropriate quantitative or qualitative research methods and
3. Scholarship that provides opportunities for the scholar to disseminate research, theory or practice through a variety of methods such as publication or presentations.

Quantity is neither the primary nor the driving factor in assessing scholarly/creative

\(^8\) Focus is the accumulation of a body of unitary or integrated work that contributes to a thematic area. Focus can be narrowly or broadly defined but is normally not defined as a set of unrelated works
activity. Schools and departments may choose to identify various quantitative markers, and it is a combination of quantity and quality of scholarship that is ultimately assessed in evaluating the candidate. The quality of the work, influence the work produces, and the level of contribution to a particular body of knowledge are the substantive issues that will be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure. Markers of quality of publications may include impact factors of journals, number of citations of published work, and audience of journal. Quality of grantsmanship is indexed by such things as positive comments from review panels and success in securing grant funding.

Evaluation of scholarly endeavors must go beyond those performed by colleagues at Ohio University. Scholarly endeavors will be reviewed and evaluated by relevant peers outside of Ohio University. Criteria used to evaluate activities of the various disciplines represented within the College of Health Sciences and Professions may vary and an external review of scholarly materials by expert peers beyond the University allows an opportunity to obtain insight from the discipline with which the candidate identifies with most closely. The discipline-based variations found within the respective Schools/Departments of the College provide each School/Department with opportunities to establish its own values and culture.

Peer review implies that experts within a particular discipline or field of study have had the opportunity to review the work and been involved in deciding its merit in contributing to a body of knowledge. Peer review occurs in the submission and acceptance for dissemination of and funding for scholarly work. The use of external reviewers is another form of peer review and is a mechanism that may be used in the College of Health Sciences and Professions promotion decisions. Copies of the external reviews become part of the candidate’s promotion dossier. (Suggested guidelines for external reviewers for promotion are included in Attachment D).

Excellence is highly valued in the promotion decision. In the area of scholarly endeavors, excellence is defined as a record of sustained and quality performance in discipline-specific activities that meet the characteristics of scholarship identified in this document. Scholarship may also include interdisciplinary activities that augment and complement a candidate’s discipline-specific activities. Suggested benchmarks of scholarly endeavors can be found in Attachment E of this document.

Expectations in Service

Service is broadly defined as a contribution to a larger group and extends beyond mere membership. Depending on the terms of hire and the standards of the academic unit, Clinical Faculty may be expected to have a record of service linked to citizenship within the University, College, and/or School/Department. Valued contributions should also include service to the faculty member's discipline or profession and the larger community that enfolds the University. Service benchmarks suggestions are located in Attachment F.

Faculty seeking promotion may have performed service that is documented and evaluated across the following categories:

1. Institutional service that contributes to the growth and ongoing work and development of the School/Department/College/University (e.g., committee work
at all levels, membership on external committees/task forces, activities that contribute to achievement of specific goals). These activities may reflect both discipline-specific and interdisciplinary involvement.

2. Disciplinary or interdisciplinary professional contributions that assist professional, scholarly, or disciplinary/interdisciplinary associations and organizations in accomplishing their work (e.g., serve as an accreditation visitor, serve as an officer or assume a leadership role in a relevant organization, serve as a policy advisor).

3. Private or community contributions that call upon the knowledge and expertise of the faculty member involved (e.g., serve on a board of directors of relevant agencies, teach a class in a public [K-12] school, involvement with professional practice).

Given the large number of disciplines within the College that include a practice component, there is the strong possibility that faculty members will be active practitioners within their specific discipline(s).

Practice that generates knowledge and meets the following criteria will more likely be considered scholarly:

1. The practice activity has a demonstrated and substantive link to a societal problem, issue, or concern with activities being designed for the purpose of providing for the public/common good.
2. The practice requires utilization and application of discipline-specific or interdisciplinary knowledge to the identified societal problem, issue or concern.
3. Peers external to the School/Department have judged the activity as exemplary and leading to the improvement of practice.

Appeal Process

In the case of a negative recommendation for promotion, the candidate may begin an appeal process. At this point, the original dossier is kept in a secure location by the academic unit considering the appeal. The candidate has direct supervised access to the document. The initial letter of appeal must be filed by the candidate within 45 days of written receipt of the negative recommendation (as stated in the Faculty Handbook). For further details about “Time Limits” regarding appeal of nonreappointment or denial of promotion, see ATTACHMENT G (excerpted from Faculty Handbook APPENDIX B, Section B.)

Grounds for an appeal may be based on one or more of the following conditions:
1. inadequate consideration;
2. denial of due process – a procedural error; or
3. denial of academic freedom.

The appeal process starts at the level where the negative recommendation was received. If that is the level of the School/Department PTC, then the candidate directs the letter of appeal to the School/Department PTC through the School Director/Department Chair. The School/Department PTC will reconvene to review the issues of appeal based on the original dossier. The School/Department PTC must complete its review of the appeal and submit a written response to the candidate within 30 days. If the committee’s review
upholds the appeal (agrees with the candidate), then the candidate’s original dossier is sent to the School Director/Department Chair for review and the standard reviewing process occurs but on a modified time-line.

If the committee rejects the candidate’s appeal, then the candidate has 30 days to submit a letter of appeal to the Dean. During these 30 days, the original dossier will be forwarded to the Dean for secure keeping. Upon receipt of a letter of appeal, the Dean may convene the College PTC to assist in the review process. The Dean’s decision on the appeal must be completed and a written decision submitted to the candidate within 30 days of receipt of the letter of appeal.

If the Dean upholds the original PTC decision (appeal is rejected), then the candidate has the right to appeal to the next level (Executive Vice-President and Provost). The candidate has the right to appeal through all levels up to the Faculty Senate (see Faculty Handbook for details).

The Faculty Senate vote on the appeal is binding and completes the appeal process within the University. The steps in the appeal process are:

- School/Department PTC
- College PTC
- Executive Vice-President and Provost
- Faculty Senate PTC
- Formal Proceeding
- President

If the Dean supports the appeal, then the dossier is reconsidered by the School/Department’s PTC. At each step of a positive appeal, the dossier is returned to the School/Department’s PTC for further consideration and a vote. The candidate will have the original dossier returned to him/her at the completion of the appeal process.
PART III. INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY

Governing Concepts

1. Group II consist of experienced persons holding part-time or full-time appointments, who are primarily considered instructional personnel and may also have service responsibilities, related to the teaching mission of the department, college or university but no expectation for research or creative activity (i.e. TRS distributions ranging from 100:0:0 to 80:0:20). They possess qualifications which enable them to teach their assigned classes at a satisfactory level. Persons who have taught at Ohio University for four consecutive semesters on part-time appointments within the same department or regional campus with an average teaching load equivalent to 0.5 FTE or above shall be placed in the Group II classification unless previously included in Group I or serving under a clinical faculty contract or a Group IV contract. Other persons not included in Group I and holding part-time teaching appointments may be placed in Group II at the recommendation of their departments or regional campuses. Faculty members in Group II are expected to perform those faculty activities agreed to in negotiations with their departments or regional campuses at the time of hire and/or reappointment and shall enjoy the following rights and benefits.

i. The workload (percentage distribution of teaching and service responsibilities) for each group II faculty member is negotiated, as appropriate for the academic unit, with the department chair or, dean of the regional campus, or planning unit head at the time of hire. The letter of offer will contain the specific workload percentages for teaching and service as negotiated for the individual. Workload percentages may be subsequently renegotiated on an annual basis but all workload percentages must be contained in the faculty member’s letter of reappointment.

ii. Salaries will be negotiated at the time of hire at the departmental or regional campus level, taking into account factors such as qualifications, years of experience, rank and salaries of existing Group II faculty with similar workload assignments in the given department or on the given regional campus. However, the resulting amount must be commensurate to a proportion of the salary that a similarly qualified full-time person would receive in the given department or on the given regional campus with similar workload assignments. One base for negotiations will be an annual schedule of minimum per-course rates of compensation and guidelines provided by the Provost. Salary increments for Group II shall be negotiated in accordance with University policies and shall take into account rank, performance and length and quality of service.

9 All material under Governing Concepts verbatim from the Faculty Senate resolution passed April 8, 2013; Faculty Handbook Section II.C.3.b. to be amended. Errata: section iv para 3, >0.5 changed to “0.5 FTE or greater”; section v, annual evaluation deadline of February 15 changed to February 1.
iii. Usually, the contracts for Group II will be a nine-month, renewable contract for a term of one-year for the initial 5 years of service in all instances where a department's or regional campus' experience, or other factors, indicates that a faculty member will be employed for the whole of the ensuing nine-month academic year. Afterward, Group II should be offered 5-year contracts to be renewable based on as warranted by the performance of the faculty member, desire of the faculty member, and continued need of the department or regional campus. However, the length of the initial and subsequent contracts (either one-year or five-year) can be renegotiated based on qualifications, experience and need of the faculty member and department regional campus.

iv. Group II Faculty are categorized into four ranks. The rank of Assistant Lecturer should be given to all part-time faculty (<0.5 FTE). For Group II Faculty serving at 0.5 FTE or greater, the initial rank is Lecturer, the intermediate rank is Associate Lecturer, and the highest rank is Senior Lecturer. Individuals hired as Group II faculty in or prior to AY2012-2013 and who held the rank of Assistant Professor are permitted to use the courtesy title of Assistant Professor; those who held the rank of Assistant Professor or Associate Professor and who hold the Associate Lecturer rank are permitted to use the courtesy title of Associate Professor; and, those who held the rank of Assistant Professor and who hold the Senior Lecturer rank are permitted to use the courtesy title of Professor. Group II faculty will normally be hired at the rank of Lecturer depending on qualifications and departmental norms. The rank of Lecturer should be given to those who will teach 0.5 FTE or greater and have the appropriate degree or equivalent professional experience, as evaluated by the academic unit, and demonstrated potential for effective teaching.

v. Group II Faculty must be evaluated annually by the chair or director according to departmental or regional campus guidelines, with a comprehensive review in the last year of a multi-year contract or upon application for promotion. A written evaluation of the faculty member will be forwarded to him/her by February 1 on an annual basis by his/her director, chair, or division coordinator. The director, chair, or division coordinator shall employ a departmental committee or committees in the evaluation process, which shall conform to the department's written procedures and demonstrate peer review as a part of the merit process.

vi. Group II Faculty may be promoted (without tenure). Minimum criteria for consideration for promotion are outlined in II.C.3.b.vi.a-c; these are minimum criteria for consideration for promotion; Departments, Schools, and Regional Campuses may establish more stringent criteria for promotion.

   a. A faculty member hired as an Assistant Lecturer may be eligible for promotion of Lecturer at such time as their qualifications and performance meet the department's or division's normative criteria for Lecturer, as appropriate for their teaching/service distribution.
b. An individual is expected to spend a minimum of five years in the rank of Lecturer before being considered for promotion to Associate Lecturer and have qualifications of the previous title, as appropriate for their teaching/service distribution. Service as a Group II faculty member at any rank during and prior to AY2012-2013 shall be included in the minimum years of service required for consideration for promotion.

c. An individual is expected to spend a minimum of five years in the rank of Associate Lecturer before being considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer and have qualifications of the previous title, as appropriate to their teaching/service distribution. Service as a Group II faculty member at any rank during or prior to AY2012-2013 shall be included in the minimum years of service required for consideration for promotion.

vii. In the event that promotion is denied, a faculty member has a right to appeal. The appeal process is outlined in section II.F of the Faculty Handbook.

viii. Group II Faculty may negotiate a shift from a full-time to a part-time appointment, or from a part-time to a full-time appointment without loss of rank.

ix. Part-time faculty in Group II who are on nine-month contracts shall be eligible for retirement according to the State Teachers Retirement System (or in some circumstances the Alternative Retirement Plan—see (Section III.L), Group Life Insurance, Major Medical Insurance, Dental Insurance, Travel Accident Insurance, membership in the Ohio University Employee Credit Union, ax- Deferred Annuities, Twelve-Month Pay Option, and parking privileges. Group II Faculty, who have a FTE of 0.67, or greater, on an academic year basis, shall be considered full-time for the purpose of being eligible to participate in alternative retirement plans.

x. Group II faculty have the right to stand for election and to vote to elect two Group II faculty to the Faculty Senate.

xi. Group II faculty are encouraged to participate in activities to promote professional development directly related to their responsibilities. Departments and regional campuses should support professional development activities directly related to a faculty member’s responsibilities these activities as they do for other faculty. They These faculty are eligible for the Group II Outstanding Faculty Award and program grants, development awards and funds, with the exception of Faculty Fellowship leaves, University Professor awards, Presidential Research Scholar Awards, and Presidential Teacher Awards.

2. Be it further resolved that promotion in rank shall be considered in determining the salaries of faculty members appointed in Group II. Be it further resolved that
departments, schools and divisions shall establish written criteria to be used to make decision on promotion of Group II Faculty in consultation with the dean of the college or regional campus, that these criteria be approved by a majority of the voting Group I Faculty and a majority of the combined voting Group I and voting Group II Faculty of the department/school/division, and that these criteria be made public to Group II Faculty no later than October 15, 2013. In the event of an impasse between the department/school/division and the dean, the standing Committee on Promotion and Tenure of the Faculty Senate shall assist by providing examples of best practices from other institutions. Should the impasse continue, the Committee on Promotion and Tenure of the Faculty Senate shall offer to mediate. Should the mediation not resolve the impasse, the Provost shall act as arbiter.

PRINCIPLES

The College of Health Sciences and Professions aims to become a national and international leader in transformative education and scholarly endeavors. In addition, the College strives to positively affect the health care environment of its community. Expectations for faculty members seeking promotion are that each faculty member will promote and advance the missions of the College.

*Depending on the terms of hire and the standards of the academic unit,* the performance expectations of Instructional Faculty will encompass one or more of the following areas:

1. **Teaching,** which encompasses activities that directly or indirectly prepare students for their role in their chosen discipline;

2. **Service,** which addresses those activities, including professional, institutional, and administrative, that enhance the community and the public.

An overarching goal of the College of Health Sciences and Professions is to provide an environment in which Instructional Faculty can flourish. Key components of that environment are a belief in formal and informal mentoring of faculty, a collaborative approach to career goal setting, an emphasis on formative evaluation, and a commitment to working with faculty to secure resources necessary for faculty success. The College values an environment in which faculty members exhibit collegiality, University citizenship, and professionalism.

It is recognized that faculty performance is complex and dynamic: consequently, the assessment and evaluation of faculty work must reflect this complexity (refer to the College Workload Policy for details about faculty workload). Evaluation of any individual will be based on a combination of that individual's expertise and performance, contribution to the respective School/Department, and effort directed toward the accomplishment of the missions of the College and University. The candidate will use the dossier to assemble evidence from various perspectives to form an integrated picture of the candidate's areas of strengths, common themes of scholarly focus, as well as challenges. The candidate will document in the dossier his/her workload distribution during the evaluation period along with a specification of the resources the University/College/ School/Department has provided to the faculty member to achieve work/career objectives. Additional information regarding
the structure of the dossier can be found in *Attachment A* of this policy.

A promotion policy must address the complexity of faculty work and outline expectations while recognizing that there is no template of ideal and unchangeable criteria or quality indicators regarding promotion decisions. Assessment of a candidate’s performance will consider the: (a) quality, breadth, and depth of the Instructional teaching, scholarship and service and (b) a strong relationship to the institutional mission, professional or interprofessional expectations, and the candidate’s personal career goals. The expectations of the College as outlined in this policy are based in several areas:

1. Faculty members must develop quality indicators of their work. Characteristics to be considered include: (a) discipline-based expertise expected; (b) originality; (c) innovation; (d) intellectual rigor; and (e) significance of the work.

2. Instructional Faculty members will receive an annual formative evaluation from the School/Department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) and School Director/Department Chair. This evaluation will provide the faculty member with specific input to improve his/her progress toward promotion. The written plan for annual objectives/goals will serve as a mechanism for discussion with the candidate, the relevant School/Department committee and the School Director/Department Chair. Senior faculty members are encouraged to guide and shape the professional career development of any faculty member as part of the mentoring process.

The College criteria are designed to provide a framework for the Schools/Departments and to serve as a policy for members of the College of Health Sciences and Professions’ Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) as they review candidates in preparation for their recommendations to the Dean. Each School/Department is responsible for developing specific criteria and a set of guidelines for promotion and tenure that reflect its mission and simultaneously meet College criteria. Although Schools/Departments may have criteria that exceed those of the College, they cannot have standards that are lower than, or conflict with, those specified in the College document or that conflict with the University guidelines found in the *Faculty Handbook*.

Both formative and summative evaluations of the faculty member’s efforts are essential to judging individual performance in moving through the promotion process. These evaluations occur through the following separate but complementary processes at the School/Department level: (a) annual oral and written reviews of progress toward promotion completed by the School/Department’s PTC and Director/Chair; (b) annual merit reviews; and (c) a more extensive review performed in the last year of a multi-year contract. If a faculty member has a situation that falls outside of the College Promotion and Tenure policy (e.g., illness), he/she must make the School Director/Department Chair aware of the situation. The School Director/Department Chair consults with the School/Department’s PTC to determine the appropriate course of action (e.g., extension) in accordance with the Faculty Handbook.

**PROMOTION**

Promotion through the ranks from assistant lecturer to senior lecturer is in recognition of the accomplishments of the faculty member being considered. All instructional faculty in the College of Health Sciences and Professions are encouraged to move through the
academic ranks to achieve the status of senior lecturer. Although typical time periods in a given rank are usually expected (e.g., 5 years in the rank of assistant and 5 years in the rank of associate), demonstrated merit, not years of service, shall be the guiding factor for promotion. Promotion shall not be automatic nor will it be regarded as guaranteed upon completion of a typical term of service.

**Lecturer or Assistant Lecturer to Associate Lecturer**

*Depending on the terms of hire and the standards of the academic unit,* promotion from the rank of lecturer (<0.5 FTE) or assistant lecturer (>= 0.5 FTE) to associate lecturer will be based on one or both of the following:

1. A demonstrated record of effectiveness as a teacher/mentor;
2. A record of service including administration to the discipline, the academic unit and, where possible, the School/Department, College, and/or University, to the public as well as profession at large.

**Associate Lecturer to Senior Lecturer**

*Depending on the terms of hire and the standards of the academic unit,* promotion to the highest rank requires academic achievements and a professional reputation that is recognized as outstanding.

One or more of the following attributes will be considered when deciding if a faculty member will earn the rank of senior lecturer:

1. Demonstrated continued growth and cumulative record of mentoring/teaching effectiveness;
2. Demonstrated leadership in service to the University (School/Department, College, University), to the public, and to the profession at large.

Continued growth is expected from the time of appointment to Senior Lecturer.

**EXPECTATIONS FOR INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY ACTIVITY**

**Expectations in Teaching**

Instructional faculty members promoted within the College of Health Sciences and Professions will demonstrate high quality mentoring/teaching effectiveness. Teaching effectiveness is viewed as a measure of quality, not quantity, and is expected of all candidates, whether the teaching load consists of one or multiple courses.

An excellent teacher maintains a high level of knowledge and expertise in his/her respective discipline or area of specialization. An excellent teacher exhibits the knowledge, skills, and commitment necessary to assist students as they develop a growing understanding of the subject matter, the practices, and the competencies pertinent to their disciplines. An excellent teacher is committed to the guidance of students with varying strengths, needs, and capabilities to attain the necessary understanding of their discipline. An excellent teacher collaborates with others in the development and delivery of discipline-specific or interdisciplinary courses and is active in
creating, revising, and reviewing curricula. An excellent teacher exhibits the following characteristics of effective teaching: (a) a commitment to students; (b) an ongoing interest in the craft of teaching; and (c) recognition that advising is an important, albeit less formal, aspect of the faculty-student relationship. Candidates seeking promotion will strive to balance time and effort in addressing these three areas so that professional growth is demonstrated over time.

An excellent teacher demonstrates a continuing concern for instructional effectiveness through the collection and utilization of feedback from students, colleagues, and others regarding presentation strategies and evaluation of learning. It is expected that faculty members will provide substantive evidence about their skill and effectiveness in teaching. It is the candidate’s responsibility to present evidence of a consistent pattern of high quality and effective teaching. Evaluations based on a wide variety of instruments might be one form of documenting such a pattern. Strategies for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness may include, but are not limited to: self-evaluations, classroom visitations, student evaluations of teaching, School Director/Department Chair evaluations, peer evaluations, external review, and evaluations of the academic advising of students.

Teaching portfolios are a meaningful way for candidates to demonstrate their teaching effectiveness. Candidates must have a teaching portfolio for promotion review which can be added to and revised in preparation for the full promotion review. The basic framework for the teaching portfolio can be found in Attachment C. Candidates must include relevant teaching benchmarks (see Attachment B) in their portfolio.

In all review cases, the weight given teaching must be considered in light of other demands made on the faculty member by hiring agreements or activities necessary to fulfill the School/Department’s mission. For example, a candidate may have been hired with the understanding that workload would include administrative responsibilities or may have received resources for scholarly activities that include a reduced teaching workload. Specific teaching responsibilities will occur through dialogue between the faculty member, the School Director/Department Chair, and the Chair of the School/Department’s PTC (other committee members also may be involved) and will reflect the goals and needs of the program (including interdisciplinary teaching, if applicable) and the professional goals of the individual faculty member. The candidate shall provide a written record of decisions that may later affect promotion decisions to the faculty member and copies retained in his/her permanent file. To this end, the candidate must maintain accurate documentation (e.g., summary notes of conversations with the director/chair, email correspondences) of any changes in workload and expectations that may occur during the pre-tenure period. These documents may be used in the evaluative materials submitted by the candidate at the time of review.

The responsibility of the College PTC is to address the following questions: Is there clear and sufficient evidence to support the candidate’s effectiveness as a teacher? Have the College of Health Sciences and Professions’ expectations for effective teaching been met?

**Expectations in Service**

Service is broadly defined as a contribution to a larger group and extends beyond mere membership. Depending on the terms of hire and the standards of the academic unit,
Instructional Faculty may be expected to have a record of service linked to citizenship within the University, College, and/or School/Department. Valued contributions should also include service to the faculty member's discipline or profession and the larger community that enfolds the University. Service benchmarks suggestions are located in Attachment F.

Faculty seeking promotion may have performed service that is documented and evaluated across the following categories:

1. Institutional service that contributes to the growth and ongoing work and development of the School/Department/College/University (e.g., committee work at all levels, membership on external committees/task forces, activities that contribute to achievement of specific goals). These activities may reflect both discipline-specific and interdisciplinary involvement.

2. Disciplinary or interdisciplinary professional contributions that assist professional, scholarly, or disciplinary/interdisciplinary associations and organizations in accomplishing their work (e.g., serve as an accreditation visitor, serve as an officer or assume a leadership role in a relevant organization, serve as a policy advisor).

3. Private or community contributions that call upon the knowledge and expertise of the faculty member involved (e.g., serve on a board of directors of relevant agencies, teach a class in a public [K-12] school, involvement with professional practice).

**Appeal Process**

In the case of a negative recommendation for promotion, the candidate may begin an appeal process. At this point, the original dossier is kept in a secure location by the academic unit considering the appeal. The candidate has direct supervised access to the document. The initial letter of appeal must be filed by the candidate within 45 days of written receipt of the negative recommendation (as stated in the Faculty Handbook). For further details about “Time Limits” regarding appeal of nonreappointment or denial of promotion, see ATTACHMENT G (excerpted from Faculty Handbook APPENDIX B, Section B.)

Grounds for an appeal may be based on one or more of the following conditions:

1. inadequate consideration;
2. denial of due process – a procedural error; or,
3. denial of academic freedom.

The appeal process starts at the level where the negative recommendation was received. If that is the level of the School/Department PTC, then the candidate directs the letter of appeal to the School/Department PTC through the School Director/Department Chair. The School/Department PTC will reconvene to review the issues of appeal based on the original dossier. The School/Department PTC must complete its review of the appeal and submit a written response to the candidate within 30 days. If the committee’s review upholds the appeal (agrees with the candidate), then the candidate’s original dossier is sent to the School Director/Department Chair for review and the standard reviewing process occurs but on a modified time-line.
If the committee rejects the candidate’s appeal, then the candidate has 30 days to submit a letter of appeal to the Dean. During these 30 days, the original dossier will be forwarded to the Dean for secure keeping. Upon receipt of a letter of appeal, the Dean may convene the College PTC to assist in the review process. The Dean’s decision on the appeal must be completed and a written decision submitted to the candidate within 30 days of receipt of the letter of appeal.

If the Dean upholds the original PTC decision (appeal is rejected), then the candidate has the right to appeal to the next level (Executive Vice-President and Provost). The candidate has the right to appeal through all levels up to the Faculty Senate (see Faculty Handbook for details).

The Faculty Senate vote on the appeal is binding and completes the appeal process within the University. The steps in the appeal process are:

- School/Department PTC
- College PTC
- Executive Vice-President and Provost
- Faculty Senate PTC
- Formal Proceeding
- President

If the Dean supports the appeal, then the dossier is reconsidered by the School/Department’s PTC. At each step of a positive appeal, the dossier is returned to the School/Department’s PTC for further consideration and a vote. The candidate will have the original dossier returned to him/her at the completion of the appeal process.
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ATTACHMENT A-1
Promotion and Tenure Documents Submission Guidelines
for Executive VP & Provost and President Review

Only the P&T documents listed below should be submitted to the executive vice president & provost and the president for review. These documents should be removed from the P&T packet and assembled in the order indicated. For ease of review, it is best to remove the documents from binders, plastic sheet protectors, or other extemporaneous materials and fasten them with a large binder clip. Submit all P&T documents, from each college or regional campus, at the same time to: [Cutler Hall 310].

Section One – Introductory Documents

1) Review form for promotion and/or tenure (signature sheet)
2) Letter from college dean or executive dean of regional campus regarding merit of the P&T proposal
3) College promotion and tenure committee letter (if applicable)
4) Chair/Director letter
5) Department/School promotion and tenure committee letter
6) Chair/Director's annual evaluation letters and any promotion and tenure progress letters
7) Copy of the faculty member’s Group I offer/appointment letter (most recent if it was ever modified)

Section Two – Promotion/Tenure Summary Documents

1) Table of Contents
2) Academic Preparation
3) Professional Experience
4) Instruction and Advising
   a. Teaching Load - Courses taught over the past 3 years. Any changes in teaching assignments
   b. Teaching Effectiveness - Evidence of course organization, presentation and requirements. Student evaluation information. Teaching awards and recognition. Selection for teaching in special programs. Participation as a student in teaching enhancement programs. Other evidence of teaching effectiveness (Example: supporting letters from faculty peers.)
   c. Interdisciplinary Teaching
   d. Advising and Supervision
5) Research and Scholarly Accomplishments
   a. Articles in professional journals
   b. Other publications and presentations
   c. Books or portions of books
   d. Sponsored research projects and grants
   e. Theses and dissertations directed
   f. Proposals

11 These submission guidelines are promulgated by the office of the Executive Vice President and Provost.
g. Other
6) Professional Associations
7) Committees and Service
8) Interdisciplinary Contributions
9) Other Factors

Section Three – External Review

1) External Review Process - Why were these particular external reviewers chosen? How were they contacted? What were they sent to review?
2) External reviewers' letters
3) Short biographical summary for each reviewer. Do NOT include their curriculum vitae.

Section Four – Curriculum Vitae and Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

1) Attach a current, comprehensive, curriculum vitae.
2) Department/School/Campus promotion and tenure guidelines.
3) College/RHE promotion and tenure guidelines.
ATTACHMENT A-2

Group II Promotion Documents Submission Guidelines
for Executive VP & Provost and President Review

Only the promotion documents listed below should be submitted to the executive vice president & provost and the president for review. These documents should be removed from the promotion packet and assembled in the order indicated. For ease of review, it is best to remove the documents from binders, plastic sheet protectors, or other extemporaneous materials and fasten them with a large binder clip. Submit all documents from each college at the same time to: [Cutler Hall 310].

Section One – Introductory Documents
1) Review form for promotion (signature sheet)
2) Letter from college dean or executive dean of regional campus regarding merit of the promotion proposal
3) College promotion committee letter (if applicable)
4) Chair/Director letter
5) Department/School promotion committee letter
6) Chair/Director's annual evaluation letters and any promotion progress letters
7) Copy of the faculty member's Group II offer/appointment letter (most recent if it was ever modified)

Section Two – Promotion/Tenure Summary Documents
1) Table of Contents
2) Academic Preparation
3) Professional Experience
4) Instruction and Advising
a. Teaching Load - Courses taught over the past 3 years. Any changes in teaching assignments
b. Teaching Effectiveness - Evidence of course organization, presentation and requirements. Student evaluation information. Teaching awards and recognition. Selection for teaching in special programs. Participation as a student in teaching enhancement programs. Other evidence of teaching effectiveness (Example: supporting letters from faculty peers.)
c. Interdisciplinary Teaching
d. Advising and Supervision
5) Professional Associations
6) Committees and Service
7) Interdisciplinary Contributions
8) Other Factors

Section Three – Curriculum Vitae and Promotion Guidelines
1) Attach a current, comprehensive, curriculum vitae.
2) Department/School/Campus promotion guidelines.
3) College/RHE promotion guidelines.

---

12 These submission guidelines are promulgated by the office of the Executive Vice President and Provost.
ATTACHMENT B
Teaching Benchmarks

The following information is provided as a guide to specific items that are included in the description of an individual who demonstrates high quality and effective teaching skills. There is no expectation that an individual will need to document effectiveness in every single item on this list but the candidate’s materials should address the major areas. Documentation should be sufficient to support the narrative and to establish a pattern of teaching that fits within these parameters whether that teaching is in a traditional classroom setting or through other formats, e.g., distance learning, seminars.

I. Shows commitment to students
   A. Meets classes regularly;
   B. Returns graded/evaluated material promptly;
   C. Holds office hours to promote student learning;
   D. When field liaison is part of the faculty member’s teaching load, is readily available to field supervisors and students in field placements and keeps careful records regarding liaison contacts;
   F. Provides a syllabus which furnishes students with: instructor’s name, call number, descriptive title, catalog number, basis for grading in the course, attendance policy, penalty for academic dishonesty, and explanation of policy relative to absences consistent with the policy as described in the Faculty Handbook (IV.A.3.);
   G. Practices good teaching methods through the performance of activities such as:
      1. Delivering course content in a clear and organized way;
      2. Demonstrating respect for students in the learning environment and fosters open communication with students around the subject matter;
      3. Demonstrating flexibility in one’s approach to course material and the methods used in presenting material;
      4. Developing original teaching materials (assignments, handouts, slides, videotapes) to stimulate student enthusiasm and interest/engagement in subject matter;
      5. Emphasizing ways of solving problems rather than providing solutions;
      6. Directing successful individual student work, e.g., independent studies, theses, or dissertations

II. Shows evidence of strong interest in the teaching process
   A. Prepares for teaching through activities such as:
      1. Remaining up-to-date with one’s discipline through journals, professional conferences, and collegial interaction;
      2. Maintaining professional competency in area of expertise or specialization;
      3. Presenting evidence of a sense of responsibility to teaching by demonstrating an ever increasing knowledge of the content area being taught;
      4. Participating in faculty/collegial activities that strengthen teaching abilities.
B. Promotes improved teaching by:
   1. Seeking advice from others about the courses being taught;
   2. Providing documentation of actions taken to improve teaching;
   3. Discussing teaching in general with colleagues;
   4. Developing, disseminating, analyzing, and acting upon data collected on one’s own teaching effectiveness;
   5. Developing innovative courses, teaching materials, or instructional techniques;
   6. Demonstrating currency in pedagogical techniques (e.g., use of technology in design and/or delivery of teaching).

III. Recognizes that advising is a less formal aspect of teaching; consequently, an excellent teacher/advisor:
   A. Remains current in information regarding University policies regarding graduation requirements, general education requirements, and requirements of the student’s chosen major.
   B. Seeks information from the Assistant Dean for Student Services in the College of Health Sciences and Professions when in need of clarification.
   C. Is accessible to students.
   D. Follows University, College, and School/Department policy for advising availability.
   E. Collects evaluation of advising according to School/Department procedures and acts on that feedback when appropriate.
   F. Gives accurate information when advising.
“What is a teaching portfolio?
A teaching portfolio is used to describe, document, and reflect upon an individual’s accomplishments as a teacher. It is a means to expose an audience (be that audience prospective employers, current colleagues, or PTCs) to the depth, breadth, and style of an individual’s accomplishments in teaching.

There are two important components to the teaching portfolio: (a) evidence of one’s teaching skill and (b) reflection upon that evidence. Common components in a teaching portfolio are:

- Philosophy of teaching.
- Teaching responsibilities, e.g., list of courses and information about those courses, selective syllabi.
- Evaluation of instruction.
- Activities to improve teaching effectiveness.
- Analysis of and reflection upon specific components of teaching, e.g., organizing, summarizing, and evaluating the set of teaching evaluations.

“There is no single correct recipe for preparing a teaching portfolio. Since it is a highly personalized product, like a fingerprint, no two are exactly alike. But as Shore and others (1986) point out, a good portfolio for promotion and/or tenure would normally contain items from three broad areas: the products of good teaching; material from oneself; and information from others” (Seldin, 1993).

“In compiling information in all three areas, the professor interested in improvement will scrutinize the connections among philosophy, methods, course materials, student feedback, peer reviews, and outcomes of learning. Using the portfolio to collect such details and recognizing the importance of coherence among the various dimensions of the instrument, the instructor becomes thoughtful and intentional in examining products and materials generated by self and others to verify the extent of actual student learning” (Zubizarreta, 1995, p. 15).

Possible items for inclusion in the teaching portfolio are listed in the three areas below:

I. The products of good teaching:
   A. Student scores on pre- and post-course examinations.
   B. Student essays, fieldwork reports, laboratory workbooks or logs.
   C. Examples of graded student essays showing excellent, average, and poor work.
   D. A record of students who succeed in advanced study in the field or are successful in the profession.
   E. Testimonials from employers or students about the professor’s influence on career choice.

II. Material from oneself:
   A. A reflective statement of the professor’s contribution to the teaching mission of the School/Department, institution, and/or discipline.
   B. Representative course syllabi which detail course content and objectives, teaching methods, readings, homework assignments and a reflective
statement as to why the class was so constructed. This section will include any courses that have been developed by the candidate.

C. A personal statement by the professor describing teaching goals for the next five years.

D. Description of steps taken to improve teaching including changes resulting from self-evaluation, time spent reading journals on improving teaching, participating in seminars and workshops on sharpening instructional skill including the use of technology in teaching and the incorporation of the concepts of service learning.

E. Summary of steps taken to identify students with special problems and to design teaching and assessment procedures, which facilitate their learning.

III. Material from others:

A. Student course and teaching evaluation data, which suggest improvements or produce an overall rating of effectiveness or satisfaction.

B. Statements from colleagues who have systematically reviewed the professor’s classroom materials, the course syllabi, assignments, testing and grading practices, and reading lists.

C. Invitations to teach from outside agencies, present a paper at a conference on teaching one’s discipline or on teaching in general.

D. Statements from colleagues who have observed the professor in the classroom as members of a teaching team or independent observers.

E. Documentation of teaching/development activity through the Center for Teaching and Learning on campus.

F. Statements from colleagues at other institutions on such matters as how well students have been prepared for graduate studies.
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ATTACHMENT D
Policy for Seeking External Reviewers for Promotion and Tenure

Colleges and universities throughout the country commonly solicit external letters of review for faculty members seeking promotion and/or tenure. Such letters are intended to certify the quality and quantity of the professional work by the candidate. In addition, they insure that College standards are consistent with like institutions. Outside letters help the School and the College to know that its expectations for promotion and tenure do not exceed or fall below the general standards in academe. It is a validation of School/Department, and College criteria. With this rationale in mind, it is suggested that reviewer letters adhere to the following guidelines:

1. The letter from an external reviewer should focus on the quality of the candidate’s scholarship in relation to the field of study.

2. Academic reviewers should be from institutions of the quality of Ohio University, and from programs similar to the candidate’s. For example, if there is a strong graduate program in the candidate’s school, this may be a consideration in selecting the institution of the external reviewers. Similarly, since Ohio University is a Carnegie Doctoral Research University (high research activity), external letters would not normally be sought from institutions that grant only baccalaureate degrees. This may require modification for faculty in baccalaureate-only programs.

3. Academic reviewers should be from university faculty members holding the rank to which the candidate aspires or higher. Letters from faculty members in lower ranks would require the writer to comment on criteria they had not met. Reviewers normally should not be asked to judge promotion standards until they have reached that level themselves. Only then can the reviewer have a full understanding of the quality or merit of the record expected.

4. Letters may be solicited from individuals who are not university faculty if they are judiciously selected and not greater in number than those from the professoriate. Letters from those outside academe should be from professionals who have prominence in the discipline.

5. In consultation with the School Director/Department Chair, the Chair of the PTC and PTC will consult with the candidate the appropriate profile of potential reviewers before the list is assembled. If necessary, the Chair of the PTC and/or PTC will discuss with the candidate any potential external reviewers who may need to be avoided because of a potential conflict. External reviewers should be objective and knowledgeable about the candidate’s area of research and thus qualified to evaluate his/her scholarly achievements. These individuals should not be former graduate school professors, co-authors, etc. The candidate will not contact the external reviewers at any time during this process. In addition, the candidate will not solicit additional support letters.

6. Candidates are to submit a list of five reviewers to the Chair of the PTC. The list should include the reviewers’ name, title, institution, phone number, email
address. In some instances School/Department guidelines require additional names.

7. The chair of the PTC, in consultation with the School Director/Department Chair, may seek review letters from individuals not included on the list provided by the candidate. This will vary relative to the Chair of the PTC and School Director/Department Chair’s concurrence with the candidate on the qualifications and objectivity of the reviewers. Prior to the Chair of the PTC or member(s) of the PTC soliciting the letters, the Chair of the PTC should notify the candidate as to the persons to be contacted and the letter to be used. If a candidate is being considered for full professor, most colleagues in their field should know their work. Reviewers, therefore, do not need to know the candidate personally.

It must be understood that when external letters are sought, the University is not abdicating its responsibility for independent judgment. Faculty members may be recommended or not recommended for promotion and/or tenure regardless of the opinions of the reviewers. The external letters are simply one part of the dossier and, if the candidate merits promotion and/or tenure, such letters should be approached with confidence. External letters should be seen not as an obstacle, but as an opportunity to show further evidence that promotion and/or tenure is deserved. If not, there may be good reason for waiting until the case is stronger.
ATTACHMENT E
Scholarly Benchmarks

This attachment includes a list of the types of activities that are often considered as scholarly and creative contributions and is not intended to be all-inclusive. Other items may be considered. Inclusion of any item rests with the ability of the candidate and the School/Department PTC to explain how a specific contribution meets scholarly/creative expectations. The basic notion underlying scholarly work is that it adds to the world of knowledge; therefore, work in this area requires: (a) a strong intellectual base that demonstrates a high level of discipline-related expertise, (b) a high level of originality, and (c) significance or impact for the relevant audiences. Peers within and beyond Ohio University will have reviewed any work included in this area and evidence of this peer review should be provided in the dossier.

Some Schools/Departments may have specified quantity expectations in the scholarly area. While quantity may be a necessary condition it will not, in and of itself, be sufficient. If quantity were sufficient the individual who wrote the defining text for an area would be automatically equivalent to the individual who had published one article in a journal. While each had a single publication, the two products may or may not be equivalent in scholarly contributions. A definitive text could easily be equivalent to a definitive theoretical/empirical article in a journal, but few would consider a textbook and an article of opinion to be equivalent. At the same time, various dissemination outlets (journals, professional meetings) vary in prestige, selectivity, review rigor, and acceptance rates. It is important to consider these issues when making qualitative judgments.

Work associated with publications and comparable material:\(^{13}\):

A. Authoring of:
   1. Article in a refereed journal;
   2. Books;
   3. Manuals, workbooks, monographs, exhibit catalogs;
   5. Developer of software/systems package;
   6. Letters, abstracts, editorials, book reviews, technical reports;
   7. Working paper that has been submitted for review by a scholarly panel;
   8. Article in a non-refereed journal.

B. Reviewer in which the faculty member is listed as the editor, associate editor, or editorial consultant. (It is possible that work in this area would be considered service rather than scholarly. The candidate and the School/Department committee will need to explain the fit in the chosen category.)
   1. Journal within the discipline;
   2. Guest editor of manuscripts or specific/special issues of a journal (usually the issue is devoted to the expertise of the guest editor);
   3. Books;

\(^{13}\) This list is not in order of significance, but merely is a listing of possible scholarly activities.
C. Reviewer in which the faculty member is a member of an editorial review board. (It is possible that work in this area would be considered service rather than scholarly. The candidate and the School/Department committee will need to explain the fit in the chosen category.)
   1. Editor, associate editor, or editorial consultant of a journal;
   2. Editor of professional association newsletter.

D. Other review work (again work in this area may be more suitable to the service area and the fit between work and category needs to be clear):
   1. Book reviewer with the review to be published usually in discipline-related journal;
   2. Book review as requested by prospective publisher;
   3. Software material;
   4. Grant reviewer.

F. Professional presentations and posters
   1. Refereed presentations at professional meetings;
   2. Refereed papers which are included in the proceedings of a conference (if the paper was not a presentation);
   3. Refereed posters at professional meetings;
   4. Non-refereed papers and posters (usually most appropriate for an individual who is beginning activity in the scholarly area).

G. Funded grants and/or contracts
   1. Projects that are funded by sources external to Ohio University;
   2. Projects that are funded through a source internal to Ohio University, e.g., College of Health Sciences and Professions Scholarly Activity Award, 1804 Fund;
   3. Submitted, but not funded grants.

H. Invited presentations, panel participation, or other activities in which the individual is being invited for work that has contributed to the growth of the discipline.

I. Education and professional enhancement activities that have led to a product or some activity that has enhanced the knowledge within the discipline.

J. Some peer review activities that are not included in items above.
ATTACHMENT F
Service Benchmarks

The activities included in the service category are those that require faculty members to use the expertise gained through professional preparation. Service includes work done for the University, for the discipline, and for consumers related to the specific discipline. Service within a specific discipline often has a tradition for this work to be viewed by others as a contribution (e.g., the faculty member receives little, if any, financial recompense for the activity).

Scholarly activities require the faculty member to be focused on the development of knowledge, while service activities entail the faculty member's abilities to focus the contribution through the use of knowledge previously attained. Service as part of the faculty member's role must be distinguished from service activities that are done as a member or citizen of a given community. Contributions to the various communities that are part of our lives are important, but these contributions may not be related to special expertise, knowledge and/or skills and may not be viewed as professional service.

Dossier material should include a description of service activities, the faculty member's specific contributions to that activity, and an explanation as to how this activity utilized the expertise of the faculty member. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide evidence about his/her participation and contributions for each specific activity listed (e.g., a few samples of submitted manuscript reviews, committee meeting notes). A mere listing of activities is insufficient. The following activities are examples of those things that could fit in this area.

1. School/Department, College, and University committee work in standing, ad-hoc, or other committees;
2. Consultancy to committees within the University community;
3. Leadership within the School/Department, College, and/or University;
4. Student organization advising;
5. Advisory committee membership;
6. Administrative responsibilities (e.g., School Director/Department Chair, coordinator of a program within a School/Department).

Examples of professional service:

1. Professional service may include things such as: editor or associate editor of various journals and newsletters; editorial consultant of a journal or newsletter; organizer of conferences/ symposia; leadership roles in professional organizations; and serving on accreditation teams. Candidates should explain whether these activities should be viewed as scholarly activities or service by providing evidence that supports how criteria are interpreted.

2. Teaching workshops are part of professional development of others (e.g., workshops that are completed as part of an agreement for fieldwork sites that require faculty member's expertise and considerable prior preparation).

3. Participation on a particular project as an invited authority within the region or nation (e.g., special meetings to help the Ohio Department of Health develop
4. Community outreach projects developed through the University.
5. Grant reviewer (federal, state, foundation).
6. Invited reviews of courses, curricula, or programs at universities for specific purposes, e.g., those needed by the Board of Regents within the new program approval process.
7. Consulting with the media, textbook publishers, education groups, and/or electronic based development groups.
8. Engaging in any in-house professional consultation with requires considerable effort and expertise from the faculty member.
9. Development and maintenance of external organizational contracts for the purposes of student experiences or other academic/professional interactions.
10. Development and maintenance of alumni and student recruitment programs on a continuing basis. Service credit not granted for such activities if the faculty member has received release time for their completion.
11. Media appearance if they contribute to the accomplishment of the School/Department’s mission.
12. Holding office or chairing various committees within a relevant professional organization.
13. Attendance at state, regional, national, or international conventions or appropriate professional associations if such attendance includes participation in the work of a relevant committee or active participation as a delegate or comparable activity.
14. Other activities may be included with appropriate explanation.
This appendix contains a summary of critical dates and deadlines from selected sections of the Faculty Handbook. Material is collected here only as a convenience to faculty; the referenced sections, not this appendix, are part of the faculty contract with the University.

### A. Notification Deadlines

1. **Nonrenewal of Probationary Appointments (Section II.D.3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 1</td>
<td>Nonrenewal notification <em>during the first year of service</em> for contracts expiring at the end of the academic year (or no later than 3 months before expiration for other contracts).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15</td>
<td>Nonrenewal notification <em>during the second year of service</em> for contracts expiring at the end of the academic year (or no later than 6 months before expiration for other contracts).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 30</td>
<td>Nonrenewal notification <em>after two or more years of service</em> for contracts expiring at the end of the academic year (or no later than 12 months before expiration for other contracts).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Promotion and Tenure (Sections II.D.1, II.E.2, II.E.7, II.E.8, and II.E.10)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 15</td>
<td>Tenured faculty eligible for promotion request letter of evaluation from chairperson if desired. (Probationary faculty receive evaluation letter annually without requesting one.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1</td>
<td>Chairperson provides probationary faculty with annual letter of evaluation regarding progress toward tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Day of Fall Semester Exams</td>
<td>Chairperson notifies faculty member in writing of departmental recommendation for promotion and/or tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>Dean notifies chairperson and candidate in writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

14 Timelines and deadlines excerpted from Faculty Handbook (September 2013).
### 3. Evaluation and Contracts of Continuing Faculty (Sections II.D.1, II.D.3, and II.E)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 1</td>
<td>Chairperson provides faculty member with written statement of annual departmental evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>Faculty member receives formal notice of reappointment for next year. Continuing faculty, excluding those undergoing active consideration for promotion/tenure are sent contracts, if feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 15</td>
<td>Contracts sent to all continuing faculty members unless deadline extended by Faculty Senate. Second-year contract for probationary faculty includes written form verifying tenure dates and deadlines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Resignations (Section II.K)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>Faculty member gives notice of resignation in writing to dean (or no later than 30 days after receiving written notification of terms of employment for the following year).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. University Faculty Fellowships (Sections V.A.11 and V.A.12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First day of Spring semester.</td>
<td>Written application from faculty member to department chairperson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>Written notification of President's approval or disapproval to faculty member.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Time Limits

1. **Appeal of Nonreappointment or Denial of Tenure or Promotion (Section II.F)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Limit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45 days</td>
<td>For faculty member's initial appeal (time counted from date of notification of denial, excluding intersessions and summer terms).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>For appeal by the faculty member to each higher administrative level (time counted from date of last notification of denial, excluding intersessions and summer terms).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>For each administrative level (department chairperson, dean, and Provost) to rule on the grievance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>For appeal by faculty member to Promotion and Tenure Committee of Faculty Senate (time counted from date of notification of denial by Provost, excluding intersessions and summer terms).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 days</td>
<td>For petition to Promotion and Tenure Committee, after it issues its report, to recommend a formal proceeding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Grievances other than Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (Section II.G)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>For each administrative level to render a decision in writing (time counted from date of receipt of grievance).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Minimum Period for Retention of Student Records (Section IV.A7)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One semester</td>
<td>For retention of all material used to determine a student's grade, unless returned to student or alternate policy provided at beginning of semester. Spring-semester material must be kept on file through Fall semester.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Record of changes to this document:**

- Original document by P & T Committee May 20, 2002.
- Revision approved by the majority vote of the voting faculty October, 2011.
- Administrative revision, approved by College P & T Committee, to incorporate Faculty of Senate semester dates, June 6, 2012.
- Administrative revision to incorporate Faculty Senate Resolution on Linking Tenure and Promotion, signed February 12, 2013.
- Substantive revision (minor restructuring of document and addition of Part II. Clinical Faculty).
- Substantive revision (addition of Part III, Instructional Faculty).
- Changes approved by the majority of Group I and Group II faculty voting May 1, 2013.
- *Document Submission Guidelines*, former Attachment A replaced with Attachments A-2 and A-3 (disseminated by the office of the Executive Vice President and Provost); administrative change only; May 1, 2014.
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