

**The Ohio State University
College of the Arts
Department of Industrial, Interior, and Visual Communication Design**



Appointments, Promotion and Tenure

Criteria and Procedures

January, 2008

**Dr. Wayne E. Carlson
Chair
Department of Industrial, Interior and Visual Communication Design
January 25, 2008**

Table of Contents

1. Preamble.....	3
2. Department Mission.....	4
3. Appointments.....	5
3.1 Criteria.....	5
3.1.1 Regular Tenure Track Faculty.....	6
3.1.2 Auxiliary Faculty.....	7
3.1.3 Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty.....	9
3.2 Procedures.....	9
3.2.1 Regular Tenure Track Faculty.....	10
3.2.2 Auxiliary Faculty.....	12
3.2.3 Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty.....	13
4. Annual Review Procedures.....	13
4.1 Probationary Tenure Track Faculty.....	14
4.1.1 Fourth Year Review.....	16
4.1.2 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Periods.....	16
4.2 Tenured Faculty.....	16
4.3 The Faculty Annual Report.....	17
4.3.1 Procedures for Preparing the Faculty Annual Report.....	17
4.3.2 Faculty on Leave.....	18
5. Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards.....	18
5.1 Criteria.....	18
5.2 Procedures.....	19
5.3 Documentation.....	19
5.3.1 Teaching.....	20
5.3.2 Research.....	20
5.3.3 Service.....	21
6. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews.....	21
6.1 Criteria.....	21
6.1.1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.....	22
6.1.1.1 Teaching.....	23
6.1.1.2 Research.....	24
6.1.1.3 Service.....	25
6.1.2 Promotion to Professor.....	22
6.2 Procedures.....	27
6.2.1 Candidate Responsibilities.....	27
6.2.2 Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities.....	28
6.2.3 Department Chair Responsibilities.....	30
6.2.4 External Evaluations.....	32
6.3 Documentation.....	35
6.3.1 Teaching.....	36
6.3.2 Research and Creative Activities.....	37
6.3.3 Service.....	39
7. Appeals.....	39
8. Seventh Year Reviews.....	40
9. Appendix.....	40

1. Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapter 6 of the Rules of the University Faculty (Additional Rules Concerning Tenure track Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure (<http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php>)); the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Chapter 7 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policy and Procedures Handbook (http://oaa.osu.edu/OAAP_PHandbook.php); and other policies and procedures of the College of the Arts and the university to which the department and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change the Department of Industrial, Interior and Visual Communication Design (referred to herein as the Department of Design or simply the department) will follow those new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the appropriate changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years on appointment or reappointment of the department chair.

The Dean of the College of the Arts and the Office of Academic Affairs must approve this document before it can be implemented. It sets forth the department's mission, and in the context of that mission and the missions of the College of the Arts and the university, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and reappointments, and its criteria and procedures for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards including salary increases. In approving this document the Dean and Provost accept the mission and criteria of the Department of Design and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating continuing faculty and candidates for positions in relation to this mission and criteria.

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

2. Department Mission

The Department of Design seeks to maintain a progressive and viable undergraduate and graduate curriculum directed toward the education of students in the professional practice of industrial, interior and visual communication design. The department also seeks to contribute to the furtherance of professional standards in cooperation with industry, government, and other societal institutions.

The department seeks to impart traditional design knowledge and skills as well as to provide an environment for the creation and exploration of new design knowledge through research and curriculum development.

The department promotes the development and application of progressive and innovative approaches to problem solving — a process that is understood as a value-laden activity directed towards the optimization of solutions by narrowing the gap between “the existing” and “the desired.”

The department utilizes the full resources of the university to provide a multi-disciplinary, interdisciplinary and liberal learning environment.

Within the undergraduate and graduate programs, a process-oriented approach to learning is encouraged. Such an approach provides the students with a continuous stream of learning experiences similar to those encountered in professional practice.

Within the undergraduate and graduate curricula, emphasis is placed on the development and refinement of fundamental principles and concepts that may serve as frameworks for further investigation and learning. “Learning to learn” is an implicit aim of the total educational unit.

The department recognizes the need for its students and faculty to continue to form and strengthen relationships with other faculty within this and other universities and schools of design. The department promotes national and international contact with professional organizations and societies, industry, governmental agencies, advocacy groups, through exchange agreements and involvement with the community-at-large in the pursuit of a more responsive educational program.

The department is committed to the attainment of all of the aforementioned goals, and expects its faculty to participate in this commitment. Furthermore, the department recognizes that the discipline of design, as well as the standards and expectations that define the discipline are always changing. In this regard, the department is

accordingly committed to improving itself in all aspects of its mission. This property of continuous improvement will drive all areas of recruitment, ongoing evaluation, promotion and tenure of the faculty.

Faculty/Department Citizenship

The mission of the department and the necessity for positive interactions within the community of scholars cannot be achieved without good faculty citizenship and collegiality being demonstrated by members of this scholarly community. Therefore, each faculty member is expected to carry her or his load with respect to academic service, contribute to and participate in her or his professional organization(s), and contribute to and participate in the academic life of the department (e.g., through attendance and participation in seminars, invited speaker programs, faculty meetings, social events, student organization activities where faculty participation is expected or invited, etc.)

Furthermore, each faculty member is expected to demonstrate respect and responsible behavior toward peers, staff and students. While one can and must hold to their beliefs, values and opinions, regardless of whether they coincide with the majority or administration's position, each of us has the responsibility to articulate our positions and opinions responsibly and tactfully so as not to be disruptive to the functioning of the department and/or irresponsible within the expected norms of civility. This statement of citizenship is in keeping with the concept of academic freedom, which the department supports, and is consistent with the "Statement on Professional Ethics," endorsed by the 73rd Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors. The expectation of quality citizenship is important in the overall assessment of the faculty member, but is not to be considered as a 4th criterion for favorable promotion and tenure review.

3. Appointments

The vision for The Ohio State University is described in the Academic Plan, which can be accessed online at <http://www.osu.edu/academicplan/preface.php>

Appointment as a tenure track faculty member in the Department of Industrial, Interior and Visual Communication Design is consistent with the Academic Plan, the criteria described in University Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, and the stated mission of the department.

3.1 Criteria

The department is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the department. Important considerations include the individual's record to date in teaching, research and service; the potential for professional

growth in each of these areas; and the potential for interacting with colleagues and students in a way that will enhance their academic work and attract other outstanding faculty and students to the department. No offer will be extended in the event that the search process does not yield one or more candidates who would enhance the quality of the department. The search is either cancelled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

3.1.1 Regular Tenure Track Faculty

Instructor:

Appointments may be made at the level of Instructor when the offered appointment is that of Assistant Professor, but the candidate has not completed the requisite degree or experience requirements as defined in the next section at the time of the appointment. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the Instructor level is limited to three years. When an Instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment.

Assistant Professor:

The Assistant Professor rank is normally the rank at which a tenure track faculty appointment is made in the Department of Design. Appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Promotion and Tenure Committee determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted. The expectation is that the faculty member has sufficient formal education (a PhD or terminal Masters degree or equivalent advanced degree in a design-related discipline), or has attained significant equivalent experience. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the department and the profession is highly desirable. Potential for the realization of tenure according to the tenure criteria defined in Section 6 is essential.

Associate Professor and Professor:

The intent of hiring personnel at the advanced rank of Associate Professor or Professor is to bring highly qualified educators into the department who have established a proven record in teaching, research and professional activity. An advanced degree or equivalent, and experience are required, consistent with the requirements for promotion

and tenure to that rank. Hiring of expertise at an advanced rank is entertained when there is a perception among the faculty that the available individual is a resource critical to the continued strength in the department programs. A probationary appointment at senior rank is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a senior rank and approved for tenure, if appropriate, but the university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency.

3.1.2 Auxiliary Faculty

Consistent with Section 3335-5-19 in the Rules of the University Faculty, The Department of Design will make auxiliary faculty appointments subject to instructional needs within the department, and consistent with the missions of the department and the university. These appointments are made quarterly or annually. Auxiliary faculty are not eligible for tenure, may not vote at any level of governance, and may not participate in matters of promotion and tenure. Persons who are appointed at a rank greater than Instructor must have credentials comparable to regular faculty at the same rank within the department. Procedures for promotion of compensated auxiliary faculty, with the exception of Lecturers, are the same as those for regular faculty, including formal annual review.

Uncompensated Auxiliary Faculty:

Appointments are made in this category for Adjunct Instructor, Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, and Adjunct Professor. Persons appointed at this level are expected to participate in teaching, advising and/or research activities in the department. They may serve as committee members for graduate student projects or theses, but may not serve as chair of such a committee. They may serve as co-investigator on research projects, but not as principal investigator. They may serve as the primary instructor in one or more courses in the department.

Adjunct appointments are made for the period in which the uncompensated service is provided, not to exceed one year. Adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of regular tenure track faculty. Renewal is contingent upon significant contributions to the academic program of the department. Criteria for

promotion of Adjunct faculty are the same as that of regular faculty. In the event that the department wishes to compensate an adjunct faculty member for work other than the voluntary service for which the adjunct title is provided, a concurrent appointment of limited duration (eg, Lecturer) may be added for that purpose.

Compensated Auxiliary Faculty:

Appointments are made in this category for Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, and Visiting Professor, or regular titles at 49% FTE or lower.

Lecturer:

Appointment as Lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a Master's degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is desirable. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. Persons appointed at the rank of Lecturer are only permitted to engage in instructional activities. Appointments are made at this level only when other titles are not appropriate, and require sufficient experience in a design-related field to adequately participate in the instructional process. Lecturer appointments may be renewed indefinitely according to university rules.

Senior Lecturer:

Persons appointed at the rank of Senior Lecturer must have sufficient formal education (a Masters degree or equivalent advanced degree in a design-related discipline), or have attained significant equivalent experience, and show evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction. Senior Lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. Senior Lecturer appointments may be renewed indefinitely according to university rules. The department may limit terms of some Senior Lecturers for programmatic reasons.

Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%:

Appointment at auxiliary regular titles is for individuals at 49% FTE or below, either compensated or uncompensated. The rank of auxiliary faculty with regular titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of regular tenure track faculty. Auxiliary faculty members with regular titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of regular tenure track faculty.

Visiting Faculty:

Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from a regular academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non regular faculty)

individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of regular tenure track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. They may not be reappointed for more than three consecutive years at 100% FTE. Persons appointed at the level of visiting faculty are expected to participate in teaching, advising and/or research activities in the department. They may serve as committee members for graduate student projects or theses, but may not serve as chair of such a committee. They may serve as co-investigator on research projects, but not as principal investigator. They may serve as the primary instructor in one or more courses in the department. Visiting faculty may obtain Category M status, and may qualify for Category P status with the permission of the Graduate School.

Emeritus Faculty:

Appointments are made in this category for faculty who have retired from the university. The department chair recommends a retired faculty member according to the procedures described below. These appointments are consistent with faculty rule 3335-5-19 (http://oaa.osu.edu/OAAP_PHandbook.php).

3.1.3 Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty

Courtesy appointments represent no-salary (0% FTE) joint appointments for regular faculty from other Ohio State University units, and are made with the faculty member's regular title. Courtesy appointments are made in the department in order to identify an appointee's substantial involvement in some activity in the department in the areas of research and/or teaching. Any department faculty member may propose a courtesy appointment for a regular faculty member by completing a proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service; the proposal is considered at a regular faculty meeting, and the chair makes the appointment upon approval of the proposal. Courtesy-appointed faculty are not voting members of the department, and there are no procedures for promotion of courtesy-appointed faculty. They require no formal annual review, but must be re-appointed annually.

3.2 Procedures

See Chapter 2 in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook

(http://oaa.osu.edu/OAAP_PHandbook.php) on the following topics:

- recruitment of regular tenure track, clinical track and research track faculty
- appointments at senior rank or with prior service credit
- hiring faculty from other institutions after April 30

- appointment of foreign nationals
- letters of offer

3.2.1 Regular Tenure Track Faculty

A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be requested from the Office of Academic Affairs. Search procedures must be consistent with the university policies set forth in the most recent update of the publication *A Guide to Effective Searches* (<http://www.hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf>).

Searches for tenure track faculty proceed as follows:

The dean of the college provides approval for the department to commence a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise. As outlined in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01, peer review provides the foundation for decisions regarding faculty appointments in the Department of Industrial, Interior and Visual Communication Design. The department chair is ultimately responsible for the selection process and hiring of new or replacement faculty, based on recommendations of the faculty and an appropriate search committee. Searches will assure wide, diverse and equal accessibility to these positions. The following specific procedures are used when a search is initiated:

- When the department is authorized by the Dean to recruit for a position in a specified area of expertise, the department chair will appoint a search committee that is comprised of members of the faculty, with possible external members. A chair for this committee will also be appointed at this time. Tenure track position search committees are composed of a minimum of three faculty members. At least two of the three faculty members are from the area of expertise in which the search takes place, if possible. If fewer than two faculty members represent an area in which a search is taking place, the department chair will appoint additional faculty members to bring the membership up to the minimum of three.
- The search committee chair shall appoint a Diversity Advocate who is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants.
- The search committee, in consultation with the department chair, will finalize a position description (approved by the Dean's

Advisory Committee in the College of the Arts). They will also develop a search announcement for internal posting in the university Personnel Postings (formerly known as the "green sheet") through the Office of Human Resources Employment Services (<http://www.hr.osu.edu/>) and external advertising, subject to the department chair's approval. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, or salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.

- The search committee develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must assure that at least one print (as opposed to on-line) advertisement appears in a location likely to be read by qualified potential applicants. The university cannot legally grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency ("green card"), and strict U. S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their appointment to a tenure track position included an advertisement in a field-specific nationally circulated print journal.
- The search committee will receive and evaluate applications and will recommend to the full faculty three to five candidates to be interviewed on campus.
- On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee; graduate students; the department chair; and the dean or designee. In addition, all candidates make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their research, and teach a class. The latter could be an actual class or a mock instructional situation. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format.
- After each interview the search committee will seek opinions from all members of the faculty and the students who have interacted with the candidate. The faculty will vote on each candidate (at least two thirds of the faculty must cast a vote.) The committee then will make its recommendation to the department chair, who will then make a recommendation to the Dean of the College of the Arts.

- If there is no clear agreement on a candidate on the part of the faculty, the search committee, and/or the department chair, the search may be closed and later reopened at the discretion of the department chair after consultation with the full faculty.
- All offers at the Associate Professor and Professor rank, with or without tenure and all offers of prior service credit require a faculty vote regarding the appropriateness of the rank, and also the prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Offers to foreign nationals who lack permanent residency require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.
- In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the department chair decides which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the department chair.

3.2.2 Auxiliary Faculty

The appointment, review, and reappointment of all compensated auxiliary faculty is decided by the department chair in consultation with the faculty.

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

Auxiliary appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter period is appropriate to the circumstances. All auxiliary appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Adjunct appointments may be renewed only when the uncompensated academic service for which the appointment was made continues. Visiting appointments are limited to three consecutive years at 100% FTE. Lecturer appointments are usually made on a quarter by quarter basis.

Auxiliary faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for regular faculty (see Section 3.1 above), with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is negative, and does not proceed to the university level if the dean's recommendation is negative.

Emeritus Faculty:

Appointments are made in this category for faculty who have retired from regular service. The department chair recommends a retired faculty member after a majority vote of the eligible faculty. Approval of the Dean of the College of the Arts and the Office of Academic Affairs is required for appointment.

3.2.3 Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a regular faculty member from another Ohio State department. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the faculty, the department chair extends an offer of appointment. The department chair reviews all courtesy appointments annually to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

4. Annual Review Procedures

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in Chapter 6 in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (http://oaa.osu.edu/OAAP_PHandbook.php).

The annual reviews of every faculty member are based on expected performance in teaching, research, and service as set forth in the department's policy on faculty duties and responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.

The documentation required for the annual performance review of every faculty member is described under Section 5 below. This material must be submitted to the department chair no later than the final day of autumn quarter classes.

The department chair is required (per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35 (<http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php>)) to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04 (<http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php>)) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

These annual reviews form the basis for the development of a written assessment by the department chair of the performance of the faculty

member. In the case of a probationary faculty member, the review will be conducted in a meeting between the department chair and the faculty member and will be based on an annual report in the format of the Office of Academic Affairs Core Dossier and input from the department P&T Committee. The written assessment will usually accompany notification of merit increases and will become part of the personnel record of the faculty member. Supplementary information may be offered by the faculty member, or may be requested by the department chair. The purpose of these reviews is to:

- provide the opportunity for the department chair to assess faculty accomplishments in teaching, research and service, as well as evidence of continuing development.
- provide the faculty the opportunity to comment on overall administration of the department, guidance they receive related to their academic careers, and to establish goals and report progress toward accomplishments in teaching, research, and service.

The annual review process will be accepted by all parties as professional, candid, and constructive. Criticisms should be viewed as opportunities for individuals to correct deficiencies and to take advantage of new directions. The department is committed to use the review process as a means to be supportive and helpful to all faculty members.

An untenured faculty member at the rank of Assistant Professor serves a six-year probationary period. In each of those years, with the exception of years four and six, a decision is made by the department chair with input from the department Promotion and Tenure Committee as described in Section 4.1 to renew or not renew the appointment of the Assistant Professor.

In the case of the fourth year review, renewal of the appointment of a probationary Assistant Professor for the fifth year requires a review by the full eligible faculty and approval of the Dean, and also provides for a comments process following the comments procedures outlined in Section 6. In the case of a non-renewal determination, the process and procedures used in the fourth year review will be followed. In the case of the sixth year review, the procedures described in Section 6 are followed.

4.1 Probationary Tenure Track Faculty

Annual review of an untenured faculty member is designed to ascertain progress in rank for promotion and tenure in the areas of teaching, research and service. The result of the annual review is to provide the

faculty member a clear assessment of his or her progress and to clearly communicate aspects of performance that need improvement if the candidate is to make acceptable progress in the tenure track.

If the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6- 04 (<http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php>)) is invoked. This process is also described in Section 6 of this document. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

The department chair, using the following procedures, conducts the annual reviews of untenured or probationary faculty members during spring quarter:

- The chair is provided a copy of the Faculty Annual Report (see Section 4.3 below) by an untenured faculty member.
- The department chair solicits input from the Promotion and Tenure Committee (who meets with the candidate and reviews all evidence of performance, including peer reviews and student evaluations, publications and evidence of creative contributions, and any other relevant information) regarding performance of the candidate. On completion of the review, the faculty votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment. In order for the vote to be valid, at least two-thirds of all faculty members eligible to vote must vote either yes or no. Abstentions are not votes. In order for the recommendation to be considered positive, a simple majority of the yes or no votes must be positive.
- The Promotion and Tenure Committee forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department chair. The department chair conducts an independent assessment of performance; meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and, as appropriate, future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.
- The department chair informs the untenured faculty member of a specific date for a review of this P&T input, and provides an independent assessment of the progress in teaching, research and service and a recommendation regarding renewal.
- If the recommendation of the department chair is to renew the

appointment, the decision is final. In the event the recommendation is for non-renewal, the full eligible faculty will review the probationary faculty member and vote on whether the appointment should be renewed. In this case the procedures described in the fourth year review process will take place and all materials will be forwarded to the dean for resolution. In all cases, the department chair provides a written assessment of the faculty member, which becomes part of the personnel file.

4.1.1 Fourth Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluation letters will not typically be solicited, and the dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. Since the department follows fourth-year review procedures for all annual reviews of probationary tenure track faculty, no modifications are required for the fourth-year. However, at the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php>)) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

The fourth year review is normally conducted early in the winter quarter of the candidate's fourth year of service.

4.1.2 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Periods

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) (<http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php>) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period. Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (http://oaa.osu.edu/OAAP_PHandbook.php). While individuals may apply for consideration of an exclusion at any time within the limits of the rule, the department may wish to consider during the annual review process whether to recommend for application for an exclusion. However, the department may not require a faculty member to apply for excluded time. In the event the faculty member applies for the exclusion, the annual review will still be conducted, unless absence from campus makes this impractical.

4.2 Tenured Faculty

The department chair is required to provide written feedback to a tenured faculty member, which reflects the chair's evaluation of that faculty member based on the content of the Faculty Annual Report (see

Section 4.3). This evaluation provides feedback as needed regarding the performance in the areas of teaching, research and service.

Associate Professors are reviewed annually by the full Professors on the Promotion and Tenure Committee, who submit a written performance review to the department chair along with comments on the faculty member's progress toward promotion. The department chair conducts an independent assessment; meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair. The review process includes a meeting if either the department chair or faculty member requests a meeting. On completion of the review, the department chair prepares a written assessment on the faculty member's performance and future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

4.3 The Faculty Annual Report

The submission of the Faculty Annual Report prior to annual review is essential so that adequate dialogue can take place. This Faculty Annual Report is designed to:

- act as a means by which the accomplishments of the faculty can be used for annual reporting to the university and/or to the College of the Arts, developing publications for the department, and as a reference to respond to requests for information about faculty.
- provide the department chair with a basis for annual assessment of the untenured faculty. This assessment of the annual report is part of the determination of distribution of merit increases and to evaluate continuing faculty development.

4.3.1 Procedures for Preparing the Faculty Annual Report

Probationary faculty are required to use the Office of Academic Affairs Core Dossier form for annual review preparation. It is recommended that tenured faculty structure their annual review materials so that the content format is also consistent with the Core Dossier format.

These materials and updated curriculum vitae will be provided to the department chair no later than the sixth week of spring quarter of each academic year. The accomplishments to be listed shall include information about those endeavors that have been realized or completed within the preceding twelve months. Work in progress or under review should be listed as such.

4.3.2 Faculty on Leave

Any faculty member absent from the department for an approved leave will be evaluated following the same guidelines as the faculty on duty with the following exceptions:

- A notice to submit the faculty annual report shall be sent to the faculty on leave during winter quarter. It shall be due at the same time as all other reports from the faculty.
- Absent faculty shall have the opportunity to supplement their report with work in progress, especially materials or evidence of the work in progress related to their leave.
- The department chair shall respond in writing with an assessment of all materials submitted and inform the faculty member of the review results.
- Faculty on leave shall have the opportunity, if so desired, to participate in the annual review by returning to campus for a meeting with the department chair.

5. Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards

5.1 Criteria

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

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

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

Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation for an annual review at the required time will receive no salary increase in the year for

which documentation was not provided, except in extenuating circumstances, and may not expect to recoup the foregone raise at a later time.

The following considerations apply:

- Excellence in teaching – Teaching activities of faculty in the department are extremely diverse with many highly individual approaches. This diversity is taken into account in assessing individual performance. Specific performance factors related to teaching are outlined in Section 6.3 below.
- Excellence in research and creative activities – As in many areas of the arts, research is defined to not only include theoretical research, as documented in scholarly publications, but also encompasses many diverse creative activities. This diversity is taken into account in assessing individual performance. Specific performance factors related to research and creative activities are outlined in Section 6.3 below.
- Excellence in service – We recognize service as an individual and variable activity. Service to the department, the university, the community, and the professional field are all considered in the assessment of individual performance. Specific performance factors related to service activities are outlined in Section 6.3 below.

5.2 Procedures

The department chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the dean, who may modify these recommendations. Salary increases are formulated in dollar amounts rather than percentage increases, with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the department chair divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) and considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate.

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

5.3 Documentation

The annual performance review of every faculty member requires that all documentation described below, including the two summary documents, be submitted to the department chair no later than the final

day of autumn quarter classes.

- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place
- updated Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, Chapter 7 (http://oaa.osu.edu/OAAP_PHandbook.php)

Any published materials presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or other final form that documents actual publication. An author's manuscript does not document publication.

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

The time period covered by the documentation described below is the previous 12 months.

5.3.1 Teaching

- Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the university Registrar) for every class taught.
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in the Appendix to this document).
- Copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed. An accepted but unpublished work submitted for consideration in a given annual review may not be resubmitted after publication for consideration in a future annual review.
- Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.

5.3.2 Research

- Copies of all scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that

the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed. In the case of joint publications, the candidate must provide a percentage of contribution.

- Documentation of grants and contracts received, including documentation of funding amounts and percentages associated with the candidate, in the case of jointly funded projects, and adequate documentation of value for in-kind contributions or software or equipment grants.
- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted).

5.3.3 Service

- Any available documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier.

6. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

6.1 Criteria

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02

(<http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php>) provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

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

The Office of Academic Affairs annually issues guidelines and procedures for the submission of documentation (a dossier) for

promotion and tenure. The department utilizes the OAA format and general procedures employed by the university and college as a whole.

A principle guiding the review for promotion and tenure is peer evaluation. Individual faculty members are reviewed by the full eligible faculty, assisted by a committee of senior faculty peers that comprise a Promotion and Tenure Committee, which is responsible for annual and preliminary promotion and tenure reviews. Of importance to the review process is excellence in teaching that can only be evaluated internally. Students' evaluation of teaching is mandatory in the review process. Also of importance are external reviews of the faculty research agenda by peers at other institutions.

6.1.1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02

(<http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php>) provides the following general

criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure:

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

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

The award of tenure is a commitment of lifetime employment. It is therefore essential to evaluate and judge the probability that faculty, once tenured, will continue to develop professionally and contribute to the department's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university.

Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Accepting weakness in any aspect of performance in making a tenure decision is tantamount to deliberately handicapping the department's ability to perform and to progress academically. Above all, candidates are held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. If a candidate's primary teaching role is and will continue to be undergraduate teaching, then excellence in undergraduate teaching is required. A mediocre performance in this area would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another aspect of teaching that is a significantly smaller part of the

individual's responsibilities. Excellence in teaching, research, and service are moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics (<http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/Rbethics.htm>).

The Department of Design subscribes to the content of these statements and has set its promotion and tenure criteria to be consistent with them. The department recognizes that duties and responsibilities assigned to individuals may vary and that various criteria are of different relative importance in individual cases.

In regard to research, the department recognizes that quality research can manifest itself in a wide and diverse variety of ways, such as creative activities and theoretical research that can also vary with the area of expertise.

In regard to teaching, the department recognizes that the faculty are faced with a wide range of teaching opportunities and challenges, which include a diversity of teaching models, from foundation to major, from studio courses to lecture courses, from very large classes to relatively small classes, and from production content courses to technology courses to research oriented courses.

The accomplishments listed below in the areas of teaching, research, and service are expected of faculty for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. In the evaluation of untenured Associate Professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

6.1.1.1 Teaching

Regardless of the type of course or the subject matter, the quality of results that students produce is an essential ingredient in the judgment of the success of teaching. Faculty must show evidence of their ability to elicit excellent results from students, encourage development, and demonstrate an understanding of the processes and methodologies of design.

The department considers student and peer evaluations to be an extremely important part of the promotion and tenure process. The goals and procedures for evaluation and teaching improvement are designed in a way that allows teaching improvement to be measured over time by collecting data and opinions from multiple sources and points of view. Actions taken toward developing new teaching techniques and material are as important as correcting deficiencies discovered through this

evaluation of teaching. It is a process of gathering formative information to establish individual benchmarks which an instructor can then use for corrective action, identification of teaching opportunities (e.g., integration of technology, interdisciplinary teaching activities, industry collaborations) and/or teaching improvement and development.

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

- provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge
- demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm
- demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment
- engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity and appreciation of the knowledge creation process
- provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process
- treated students with respect and courtesy
- improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs
- served as advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the department's graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise
- engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching

Teaching effectiveness is measured primarily by peer review and through the analysis of standardized instruments of evaluation completed by students for each scheduled course, as described in Section 9.

6.1.1.2 Research

The growth of the design field and the sustenance of the educational program are directly dependent upon the creation of new knowledge for

and about design. It is likely that most research within the design context will be in the category of applied research, however theoretical research can be an important component of a faculty member's dossier. It is critical that faculty contribute to an ever-growing state of knowledge that explores relationships of design to the world. Contributions to a body of creative and research work for a faculty member in design may include:

- Design consulting and professional practice — consulting for the design industry, corporations or public service clients. The stature of the client and/or recognition of the importance of the work are essential for establishing the level of merit.
- Independent design work — free-lance, creative works done without a client. Outside and peer evaluation is essential for establishing the level of merit.
- Design research — generation of new information or ways of using new information for designers and/or their clients; investigation aimed at the discovery and interpretation of facts, revision of accepted theories or newer revised theories or concepts of design. The stature of a presentation event and/or publication of the research results, the rigor of the peer review process, and an assessment of the influence of the work on other research activities are essential for establishing the level of merit.
- Grants and funded projects – pursuit and success with internal and external funding opportunities. External funding, due to the peer review process involved in grant evaluation, is an important measure of research quality.

While collaborative and/or interdisciplinary work is encouraged, and indeed is essential to some types of design inquiry, the candidate's individual intellectual contributions to collaborative work and grant support must be clearly and fairly described to permit accurate assessment.

6.1.1.3 Service

The department is dependent upon its faculty for promotion of the department program, recruitment of students and faculty, laboratory coordination and maintenance, and a variety of other administrative functions. Without the support of the faculty in accomplishing these tasks, the department could not function. Therefore, an important criterion in consideration of service is that service be devoted to operations of the department and the development of programs in the department.

In some instances, service assignments are a major portion of the percentage of time assessed by the department chair and delegated to faculty (eg, in the case of the foundations director). This weighs heavily in merit consideration and is of significance in the development of an overall record for promotion and tenure candidacy.

Also of importance are those roles played by faculty in elected or designated service assignments external to the department. These include college and university service assignments as well as local community activities. Participation in national design activities and organizations is seen as having direct benefit to the department and is expected and strongly encouraged.

6.1.2 Promotion to Professor

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02

(<http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php>) establishes the following general criteria for promotion to the rank of Professor:

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

The rank of Professor is reserved for those senior faculty who exhibit exceptional and outstanding performance as both a contributor to the design discipline through research and creative activities, and as an exceptional contributor to the education of students as a design teacher.

For promotion to Professor, a faculty member is expected to be a role model for junior and senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. Assessment takes place in relation to specific assigned responsibilities, with exceptional performance in these required responsibilities required.

The specific criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to Professor are similar to those for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, with the added expectation of:

- sustained accomplishment
- increasing quality of contributions
- a record of continuing professional growth
- evidence of established national and international reputation in the field

A distinguished record that warrants such a promotion would be defined as a record of ongoing outstanding achievement influential in determining the course of design education and the design profession in general.

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

6.2 Procedures

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

During the spring quarter, the department chair will notify each faculty member who will be reviewed the following autumn quarter. The chair will appoint a Promotion and Tenure Committee to review and assist in the process. In the case of review of a probationary faculty member for promotion and tenure, this committee will consist of at least three tenured faculty members. In the case of a review for promotion to full Professor, this committee will consist of at least three full Professors. For any review, an OSU faculty member at the rank of Professor from an arts or design-related discipline outside the department may be appointed to the committee if the department chair feels it necessary and desirable, or if three such persons are not available within the department. One committee member will be named as the Procedures Oversight Designee, who will be responsible for assuring that the review process is conducted according to department, college and university policies and procedures.

6.2.1 Candidate responsibilities

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

If external evaluations are required, the candidate can review, upon request by the department chair, the list of potential external evaluators

developed by the department chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The department chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see 6.2.4 below.)

6.2.2 Promotion and tenure committee responsibilities

The department has a Promotion and Tenure Committee, the membership and chair of which are appointed by the department chair. The term of service is three years, with reappointment possible. The department chair, college dean, college associate and assistant deans, vice provosts, provost, and president may not be members of the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee. The department chair may attend meetings at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and may respond to questions, but may not vote.

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

- to review the AP&T document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- to review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the faculty meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- to attend all Promotion and Tenure Committee meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote. A minimum of two-thirds of the members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee must be present and vote yes or no on a case for the vote to be valid. Abstentions are not votes. Two-thirds of yes and no votes must be yes for a vote to be considered positive. Absentee voting is not permitted.
- to consider annually, in spring quarter, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only Professors on the subcommittee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of Professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.

- The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (eg, student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a nonmandatory review.
- A tenured faculty member who requests and is denied a promotion review for three consecutive years must be granted the review in the fourth year per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php>). If the three denials are based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the fourth year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
- Consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policy, only faculty who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non-mandatory tenure review. The committee must confirm with the department chair that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident (has a "green card"). Faculty not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by the Department of Design.
- A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn quarter, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
 - Late spring: Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.

- Late spring: Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair.
- Early autumn: Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
- Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- Revise the draft analysis of each case following the faculty meeting, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
- Provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure initiating unit is another department. The Promotion and Tenure Committee does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

6.2.3 Department chair responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- where relevant, to verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure may not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are

moreover not considered for promotion by the department.

- Late spring quarter: to solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the chair and the candidate. (Also see Section 6.4 below.)
- to make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the Promotion and Tenure Committee at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- to remove any member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review. A conflict of interest exists when a Promotion and Tenure Committee member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some way on the candidate's services, has a close professional relationship with the candidate (dissertation advisor), or has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an objective review of the candidate's work is not possible. Generally, faculty members who have collaborated with a candidate on at least 50% of the candidate's published work since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of the candidate.
- Mid-autumn quarter: to provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the Promotion and Tenure Committee's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- to meet with the Promotion and Tenure Committee to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- to inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
 - of the recommendations by the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

- of the recommendations by the department chair.
 - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and department chair.
 - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letters from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letters are accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- to provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant a response for inclusion in the dossier.
 - to forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline, except in the case of auxiliary faculty for whom the department chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases.
 - to receive the Promotion and Tenure Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the department chair of the other tenure initiating unit by the date requested.

6.2.4 External Evaluations

An important component of the review process is the external review of a candidate by outstanding academic and professional people either from the same field as the candidate or who have knowledge of the candidate's contribution to his or her field.

External evaluations are restricted to evaluations of research and scholarly activity, and must be obtained for all promotion reviews in which research must be assessed. These include all tenure track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews and all adjunct faculty promotion reviews. External evaluations are optional in other reviews and will be obtained as needed.

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

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

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

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule 3335-6-04

(<http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php>) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor the department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format, provided at (http://oaa.osu.edu/OAAP_PHandbook.php), for letters requesting external evaluations.

External reviewers must have the following qualifications:

- They must be able to review the work of the candidate beyond that of graduate study and graduate education.

- They must not have a familial or comparable relationship with the candidate, nor have a professional relationship that could give rise to a conflict of interest.
- If the reviewer is not familiar with the candidate or his/her work, the reviewer must have expertise that will permit a knowledgeable review and relevant judgments of the candidate's contributions.
- The reviewer must be willing to provide considerate analysis and judgment of specific materials. This aspect of the process should be established prior to the reviewer receiving the dossier of selected materials.
- More than half of the external reviewers will be drawn from the list generated by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The remaining letters in the dossier will be from a list of potential reviewers generated by the department chair after consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate shall be informed as to the list of reviewers, but will have no right of approval.

When commitments from reviewers to participate have been established, a dossier of selected materials is sent to the reviewer along with complete instructions regarding the required assessment. This assessment has the following components:

- The letter of external review is not a letter of recommendation. The Promotion and Tenure Committee requires an objective assessment that may be either positive or negative or contain elements of both. The assessment should be supported by logical and considerate analysis of the materials sent for review. Comparisons with contributions made by others in the same field are valid to demonstrate relative merit.
- The letter of external review is restricted to scholarly, professional, research, and external service contributions.
- The reviewer(s) should substantiate the contribution of the candidate to his/her field, deliberating whether or not it represents current directions in design.
- The reviewer(s) should establish that the work either has become or has the potential to become a body of knowledge that will advance the state of the art within a field of activity in design.

- The reviewer(s) should establish the ways in which the work of the candidate will be a contribution to the field and provide an assessment of the meaningfulness of his/her contributions.
- The reviewer(s) should assess the relative stature of the candidate within the design field on a national/international basis.

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

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

6.3 Documentation

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

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

- Any published materials presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or other final form that documents actual publication. An author's manuscript does not document publication.

- Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

In addition, as outlined in Section 5.3, candidates must provide other material (that isn't already included in the core dossier) related to teaching, research and service for review in this process. Examples of this material include but are not limited to:

- visual materials that are of a quality sufficient enough for comprehensive evaluation
- samples or other appropriate evidence of student work
- teaching evaluations
- course outlines and syllabi
- assessments of success of former graduate students
- extent to which pedagogical materials developed by the candidate are being used here and elsewhere
- copies of relevant publications and papers
- reviews conducted by the candidate
- successful grant proposals
- awards and recognition
- examples of related creative materials, such as computer programs, CD-ROMs, brochures, posters, videos, documentation of creative works, etc., developed as part of the candidate's academic activities
- self-evaluations

Documentation of activities and performance in the three categories of teaching, research and service should be compiled considering the following performance factors:

6.3.1 Teaching

For the time period since the last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, the candidate must provide

- cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction

computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class

- peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in the Appendix to this document)
- copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.

Other teaching documentation that will be considered in the review includes:

- performance in the classroom and studio as manifested by such things as:
 - student performance
 - student feedback and evaluations
 - original and creative instructional methods
 - former students' contributions to the discipline
- program and course development
- related activities outside the classroom, such as
 - advising
 - symposia
 - workshops
 - field trips
- degrees or honors theses advised to completion
- out-of-department teaching activities
- publications and other resources for the purpose of teaching

6.3.2 Research and creative activities

For the time period since the last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, the candidate must provide

- copies of all scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form,

with no further revisions needed.

- documentation of grants and contracts received, including documentation of funding amounts and candidate percentages.
- other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted).

Other research documentation that will be considered in the review includes:

- creation of significant works of design or art
- design exhibitions and/or exhibition catalogues
- outstanding design or research consulting activities
- successful grant writing and award activities
- design commissions
- publications in scholarly journals or proceedings
- presentations at conferences
- fellowships
- citations for research work
- reviews conducted by the candidate
- computer software development that benefits the discipline
- publications as the author, co-author, or editor of catalogs, books, articles, reviews, monographs, and visual materials, and reviews of these types of publications
- significant reviews of candidate work or exhibitions
- winning of prizes, awards, fellowships, or other recognition of research quality

6.3.3 Service

For the time period since the last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, the candidate must provide

- any available documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier

Other service documentation that will be considered in the review includes:

- committee work
- unusual or difficult service assignments
- participation as a juror or curator of exhibitions or competitions
- participation in an editorial capacity
- participation on advisory or other committees or governing boards
- organization of conferences, workshops, symposia, exhibitions or competitions
- appearance as a critic, guest artist or designer, panelist, or as a director of a workshop or institute
- involvement in arranging co-ops and/or internships for students
- special department, college or university assignments
- consulting to or on behalf of educational institutions, associations, or government agencies when it is an honor to have been selected.

7. Appeals

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05

(<http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php>) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05 (<http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php>).

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

8. Seventh Year Reviews

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05

(<http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php>) sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a Seventh Year Review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year (mandatory tenure) review.

9. Appendix: procedures for student and peer evaluation of teaching

9.1 Student evaluation of teaching

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

9.2 Peer evaluation of teaching

The department chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process, and the Promotion and Tenure Committee is charged with conducting the peer evaluation of teaching. The responsibilities of the Committee are as follows:

- to review the teaching of probationary tenure track at least once per quarter during the first two years of service, and at least twice per year during the remainder of the probationary period, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned in the course of each probationary year.
- to review the teaching of tenured Associate Professors at least once per year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a three year period.

- to review the teaching of tenured Professors at least once every four years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review.
- to review, upon the department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.
- to review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. In a case such as this the department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the Office of Faculty and TA Development (<http://www.ftad.osu.edu>).

Reviews conducted upon the request of the department chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the chair or faculty member.

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluation (the first three situations listed above) is comprehensive and includes, in addition to classroom visitation, review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and exams. Classroom visitation or critique attendance is conducted by a member of the committee and is unannounced. However, at the beginning of the quarter, the committee will request from the faculty member a list of dates on which visitation would be inappropriate because exams are being given, guest speakers are scheduled, etc.

The peer review includes:

- A self-evaluation of teaching
- a qualitative evaluation of student work
- observation of the instructor's ability to create an effective teaching and learning environment
- an analysis of course materials generated by the instructor

- studio and/or critique visitation
- review of student evaluation of teaching materials
- review of teaching goals and plans

The opportunity to review student design work provides an effective method of evaluation in a small program of professional education where faculty interact on a regular basis.

Peer review focuses particularly on aspects of teaching that students are less qualified than faculty to evaluate, such as appropriateness of curricular choices given the goals of the course (survey as opposed to required major course), implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and appropriateness of approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. As part of its evaluation the committee examines copies of the faculty member's SEI summaries from recent years, and where student opinion is mixed to negative, the committee attempts to ascertain the reasons. In so doing, members are to bear in mind that they have observed only one or a few classes out of the quarter, and moreover have a very different level of knowledge compared to students. Consequently their assessment may differ considerably from that of the majority of students.

Specific goals of peer evaluation of teaching are:

- to provide the individual instructor with information and opportunities for teaching development
- to provide the department, college, and university with a basis for determining merit, promotion, tenure, teaching assignments, and/or developing individual program(s) for improvement of teaching effectiveness
- to provide information, which would determine if a teaching mentor should be assigned, or other action be taken for an individual's teaching development
- to create dialogue among faculty colleagues and administrators concerning teaching issues
- to provide information to plan and revise departmental curriculum

At the conclusion of the review, the committee submits a written evaluation (a copy of the evaluation checklist is included in this appendix) to the department chair, copied to the faculty member. The faculty member may provide written comments on this report and the committee may respond in writing to those comments if it chooses to do so. All such comments are appended to the report for inclusion in the faculty member's promotion and tenure dossier, unless the faculty member requests that the comments be excluded.

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

9.2.1 Peer evaluation of teaching checklist
(following page)

Peer Evaluation of Teaching Check Sheet

CONFIDENTIAL

Department of Industrial Interior & Visual Communication Design

Prepared by a member of the Department's P&T Committee with the faculty member

Faculty _____

Peer reviewer _____

Date(s) of review _____

- Review of "Self-Evaluation"
- Discussion of "Self-Evaluation"
- Review of "Course Materials"
- Review of "Student's work"
- Optional visitation to lecture, studio, critique, etc. (Dates: _____)
- Review of Student Evaluations
 - SEI
 - Students' Narrative Comments
- Discussion of plans for new teaching methods, projects, courses
- Discussion of overall teaching effectiveness and goals for future

Comments: (below and on back of this sheet)

Rating (circle one):

Incomplete Unsatisfactory Satisfactory

Signed: _____ Faculty Date: _____

Signed: _____ Peer reviewer Date: _____