

Ohio University
College of Health and Human Services
PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY

INTRODUCTION

This document is designed to provide an outline for implementing the guidelines set forth in the Ohio University Faculty Handbook. The policy is designed to ensure continuity of process and to guide schools and faculty in their tenure and 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 serve to operationalize those criteria and guidelines specified in this document and the Faculty Handbook.

PRINCIPLES

"The College [Health and Human Services]... [strives to] be a national leader in the preparation of health and human service professionals and scholars. Such leadership will be distinguished by its interdisciplinary emphases and roles in defining state-of-the-art practices, enriching our communities through model outreach activities, and advancing scholarship that informs policy and practice....The College faculty... engage in research and creative activities that contribute to the development, interpretation, and application of new knowledge within professional disciplines and enhance the educational experiences of our students. We value student learning and inquiry through rigorous curricular and co-curricular activities that prepare them to assume leadership roles as professionals in a competitive, diverse and global environment (HCCS Vision and Mission Statement, 2005)."

Achievement of the College's mission requires contributions of its faculty in three broad areas:

1. *Teaching*, which encompasses those activities that directly or indirectly prepare students for their role in their chosen discipline,
2. *Focused¹, thematic scholarly endeavors*, which lead to creative works and/or new knowledge, which apply or integrate existing knowledge to improve practice and/or instruction, which expand our understanding of the world, or which enhance the scholarship of teaching, and
3. *Service*, which addresses those activities which improve the community in that we live and includes professional, institutional, and public service.

An overarching goal of the College of Health and Human Services is to provide an environment in which 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 for pre-tenure faculty, a collaborative approach to career goal setting, an emphasis on formative evaluation, and a commitment to work with faculty to secure resources necessary for faculty success. The College values an environment in which our community members exhibit the highest degrees of collegiality, University citizenship, and professionalism.

¹ 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.

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee

It is recognized that faculty performance is complex and dynamic; consequently, the assessment and evaluation of faculty work² must reflect this complexity. Evaluation of any individual will be based on a combination of that individual's expertise and performance, contribution to the respective school, and effort directed toward the accomplishment of the missions of the College and the 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, and challenges. The dossier will include a statement about workload distribution along with a specification of the resources the University/College/school has provided to the faculty member to achieve work objectives (e.g., internal grants, start-up funds, summer research support, laboratory space and set-up, course reductions, etc.). Faculty members who have received investment in the form of University resources are expected to demonstrate corresponding gains in those areas of workload specifically targeted by those resources. In the dossier, the candidate will highlight common themes, areas of strength, and challenges that have been identified and addressed. 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 work will: (a) examine the reason for the work in addition to the work itself, and (b) focus on the intrinsic value of the work while keeping in mind the work's value in relationship to the institutional mission, disciplinary expectations, and personal goals. The College's expectations as outlined in this policy are based in several areas:

1. Faculty need to reflect upon the quality of their work and dialogue with colleagues as they develop quality indicators of that 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 will receive an annual formative evaluation from the school's Promotion and Tenure Committee and school director. This evaluation will provide the faculty member with specific feedback to improve his/her progress towards tenure and promotion. The use of a written plan for annual objectives can serve as a useful mechanism for discussion with the candidate, the relevant school committee, and the school director, in consultation with the dean. Senior faculty members are also encouraged to guide and shape the professional development of any faculty member as part of the mentoring process.

The College criteria are designed to provide a framework for the schools and to serve as a guideline for members of the College of Health and Human Service's Promotion and Tenure Committee as they review candidates in preparation for their recommendations to the dean. Each school is responsible for developing specific criteria for tenure and promotion that reflect its mission and simultaneously meet College criteria. Although schools may have criteria that exceed those of the College, they cannot have standards below those specified by the College document. Each school develops its own set of guidelines within the framework provided by the University and College to be used in tenure and promotion decisions.

²*If the typical College workload is considered to include teaching of 8 to 12 credit hours per quarter, research activities, service duties within the University and the profession, then the expectation is that every faculty member will engage in faculty activities that are considered to be the equivalent (in time, effort, preparation, intellectual energy, and productivity) of a faculty member who carries that typical load. Specific criteria for what constitutes a typical workload may vary according to individual schools and programs within schools.*

Orig Date:	Orig By:	Rev Date:	Rev. by:
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee

Both formative and summative evaluations of the faculty member's efforts are essential to judging the meaningfulness of individual performance in moving through the tenure and promotion process. Formative evaluations occur through four complementary processes: (a) the annual merit reviews where faculty work is reviewed both pre- and post-tenure, (b) the oral and written reviews of progress toward tenure or promotion completed by the school's Promotion and Tenure Committee and director, (c) consultation between the committee chair, the director of the respective school, and the faculty, and (d) pre-tenure review. Summative evaluations occur at the time of the tenure and promotion decisions.

College guidelines are intended to be a framework for all tenured or probationary faculty. However, it is possible that a specific individual faculty member may have a situation that falls outside of these guidelines. If a school director, after consultation with the school's Promotion and Tenure Committee, determines that a just cause to seek a waiver of specific tenure or promotion expectations exists, then a request for waiver shall be forwarded to the College dean with appropriate documentation. The request must be forwarded no later than the first Monday of October one academic year prior to the year in which the tenure or promotion decision occurs (e.g., fall of 2003-04 for a decision that would occur in 2004-05). The dean may consult with the College Promotion and Tenure Committee in deciding the justification for the waiver. A request for a waiver does not assure that one will be given.

PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE COMPOSITION AND PROCEDURES

The College Promotion and Tenure Committee functions in an advisory capacity to the College dean. The College Promotion and Tenure Committee is comprised of one tenured faculty member at the rank of associate or full professor from each school within the College. School directors may not serve as the representative from their school. Faculty members will decline to serve on the College committee in any year in which they will be candidates for promotion. Schools should determine who will serve on the committee by the first Monday in October of each academic year.

It is the responsibility of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee to advise the dean regarding the tenure and/or promotion decision for each candidate. This advice will be given following a review of the materials of all individuals being considered for tenure or promotion as forwarded by the schools. The committee will provide the dean with recommendations and a written summary regarding each candidate.

In cases of promotion, it would be ideal for all College Promotion and Tenure Committee members to hold the same or higher academic rank than that being requested by the candidate. Until such time as this can be achieved, a minimum of four committee members must hold or exceed the rank for which the individual is being considered. Whenever necessary, additional members beyond the minimum one from each school may be appointed to the committee by the dean for the review of a candidate.

The College dean serves as an ex officio member of the committee and may be present at all meetings. The dean's office will schedule the committee meetings with the initial meeting occurring in the fall quarter. The initial meeting provides a time for the committee to review the current CHHS Promotion and Tenure Policy, to establish common understanding about the policy, and discuss characteristics and indicators of quality pertinent to the review process. Committee meetings occurring during the winter quarter to review candidate materials will be scheduled so the committee's work is completed at least two weeks prior to the dean's deadline for forwarding materials and recommendations to the provost.

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee

The committee shall elect a chair at its first meeting. The chairperson has the responsibility of conducting the meetings, maintaining minutes of the meetings, preparing written recommendations to the dean, and conducting the review of the CHHS Promotion and Tenure Policy. In addition, the chairperson will confer as necessary with the dean's administrative coordinator who will schedule the meetings and arrange for the presentation of candidates by the representative of the school's Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Appeals of decisions of school Promotion and Tenure Committees are considered by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. In these cases, the candidate will forward the identical dossier considered at the school level. The dean will also solicit the written input of the school director in order to provide college-level (and above) reviews with consistent materials and basis for evaluation. The College's evaluation of the appeal, including the Promotion and Tenure Committee's advice, will take place within the 30 day time limit for responding. Until the appeal process has been completed, possession of the dossier will remain with the appropriate administrative unit.

Except in those cases in which the College Promotion and Tenure Committee representative is the chair of the school's Promotion and Tenure Committee, it will be the responsibility of the school's committee chair to present the promotion and/or tenure case to the College Committee. In all cases, however, the presenter must be a member of the school's Promotion and Tenure Committee. It is the presenter's responsibility to provide an accurate and balanced summary of the performance of the school's candidate in all areas.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee will conduct a review of the Promotion and Tenure Policy every five years. The review will include input and approval from the faculty. The resulting summary and recommendations of these reviews will be forwarded to the College dean. Ultimately, changes are subject to a majority vote of the Athens Campus Group I faculty. Approval of the revised Promotion and Tenure Guidelines will follow the following timeline (every five years):

March 1	Suggestions for revising P&T Guidelines due to Chair of college P&T committee
April 5	Revised P&T Guidelines sent to all Group I Faculty
April 15	Comments received by the college P&T committee
April 30	Finalized P&T document sent to all Group I Faculty
During the first full week of May	Group I faculty vote by ballot during a school meeting. Ballots will be counted by Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Chair of college P&T committee

If the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines are not approved by majority vote of the Group I faculty the college Promotion and Tenure committee will work with the Dean to make appropriate revisions. Every effort will be made to vote on the revised Guidelines before the end of Spring Quarter. If the vote does not occur, then it will be delayed until the following Fall Quarter.

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee

PRE-TENURE REVIEW

The dean of the College of Health and Human Services annually consults with school directors prior to the issuance of annual letters detailing a pre-tenure faculty member's progress toward meeting tenure criteria. These consultations afford both summative and formative input into candidate performance. The dean will collaborate with the director and the school's Promotion and Tenure Committee to provide the perspective of his/her office about pre-tenured candidates in order to provide formative and summative input and feedback about the candidate's performance. In this way, the dean's input is a formalized process and can facilitate reciprocal communication at various levels within the home academic unit at a much earlier time than the tenure decision.

Newly hired Group I faculty, in their fourth year of pre-tenure status, will be required to submit a promotion and tenure dossier by the first Monday of October to their school's Promotion and Tenure Committee. 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. The dossier will contain:

- Narrative statement discussing the three areas of teaching, scholarly endeavors, and service and the candidate's strengths and areas for growth in each
- 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 Promotion and Tenure Committee, school director, and dean will review these materials by the end of the first week in January. All parties will meet by January 15 to discuss the candidate's progress toward meeting tenure criteria and will identify suggestions for improving performance. Each candidate will receive a letter that integrates all feedback about his/her progress toward tenure and promotion. The school director will issue the letter on or about February 15.

TENURE

Tenure is the most important decision that an institution makes regarding an individual faculty member. A tenure decision is an institution's statement that an individual's accomplishments across the three areas of teaching, scholarly endeavors, and service have added to the value of the school, 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 or professionally related services. Inherent in the issue of whether to grant tenure is the question, "Is this an individual we would want as a colleague for his/her professional career?" Therefore, while respecting values of academic freedom, University citizenship and collegiality are factors to consider in a tenure decision.

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

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee

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

PROMOTION

Promotion through the ranks from instructor to professor is in recognition of the accomplishments of the faculty member being considered. All faculty members in the CHHS are encouraged to move through the academic ranks to achieve the status of full professor. It is in everyone's best interest to hire faculty members who can successfully move through the academic ranks and develop productive careers. Although minimum periods of time in a given rank are usually expected (3 years in the rank of assistant and 5 years in the rank of associate prior to consideration for professor), demonstrated merit, not years of service, shall be the guiding factor for promotion. A positive decision for promotion to the next rank includes a series of annual performance evaluations in which the candidate documents achievement towards meeting goals and objectives. Promotion shall not be automatic nor will it be regarded as guaranteed upon completion of a given term of service.

A recommendation for early promotion is possible but requires that a case be made for exceptionalism.

Instructor to Assistant Professor

Promotion from the rank of instructor to assistant professor requires an ability to teach effectively and the possession of the appropriate terminal academic degree (or its equivalent) as defined by the academic unit. Promise of growth in teaching, scholarly and creative activity and service is also necessary.

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 has contributed to a focus within the candidate's discipline or field of study and demonstrates the candidate's intellectual and/or artistic development;
4. A record of service appropriate to the discipline, the academic unit and, where possible, the school, College, and/or University.

Associate Professor to Professor

Promotion to the highest rank requires academic achievement and a professional reputation that is recognized as superior. In many instances, this will have resulted in national or international recognition for some aspect of the candidate's professional scholarly, teaching, and service activities.

Only the faculty member who has the following can earn the rank of professor

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee

1. A demonstrated continued growth and cumulative record of teaching effectiveness;
2. A substantial record of peer-reviewed scholarly activity that has contributed to a focus within the candidate's discipline or field of study and demonstrates the candidate's intellectual and/or artistic development;
3. A demonstrated leadership in service that is discipline- and University-based.

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 tenured within the College 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 in the College of Health and Human Services 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 tenure and/or promotion should strive to balance time and effort spent addressing these three areas in ways that professional growth is verified over time. An excellent teacher is expected to provide substantive evidence about the knowledge, skills, and commitment necessary for leading students with variant strengths, needs, and capabilities into a growing understanding of the subject matter, the practices, and the competencies pertinent to their disciplines. An excellent teacher collaborates with others in the development and delivery of courses and is active in the creation, revision, and review of curriculum. 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. An excellent teacher maintains a high level of knowledge and expertise in his/her respective discipline or area of specialization. Specific benchmarks of teaching excellence can be found in Attachment B of this policy.

Strategies for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness for all faculty members may include, but are not limited to things such as: self-evaluation, classroom visitations, student evaluations of teaching, school director evaluations, peer evaluations, external review, and evidence of evaluation 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 available for the mid-tenure review and then add to and revise this portfolio in preparation for tenure and/or promotion. The basic framework for the teaching portfolio can be found in Attachment C. Candidates should incorporate relevant teaching benchmarks (see Attachment B) into 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'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, and the chairperson of the

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee

school's Promotion and Tenure Committee (other committee members also may be involved) and will reflect the goals and needs of the program and the professional goals of the individual faculty member. The director shall provide a written record of decisions that may later affect promotion and tenure decisions to the faculty member and copies retained in his/her permanent file. These documents may be used in the evaluative materials submitted by the candidate at the time of review.

It is the candidate's responsibility to present evidence of a consistent pattern of high quality effective teaching. Evaluations based on a wide variety of instruments might be one form of documenting such a pattern. The responsibility of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee is to address the following questions: Is there clear and sufficient evidence to support the candidate's effectiveness as a teacher? Have the CHHS 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). Faculty members in the College of Health and Human Services are expected to contribute to the understanding and/or improvement of the world in which we live. Scholarly and/or creative activities are the mechanisms for accomplishing this component of faculty responsibility. Scholarship includes original research from a focused³ 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. Given that CHHS includes many disciplines with diverse perspectives, the substance and nature of contributions in this area will reflect this diversity.

Scholarship includes those activities that are directed toward the discovery or creation of new knowledge, integration or synthesis of current knowledge that creates new understandings and interrelationships, application or use of knowledge to improve practice, and teaching or enhancement of the educational value of instructional efforts within the institution or discipline. Good scholarly endeavors possess the following characteristics:

1. A strong intellectual base that demonstrates a high level of discipline-related expertise,
2. Originality, and
3. An impact upon or a level of significance for the relevant audience.

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 focus or program of study that connects these activities.

Quantity is neither the primary nor the driving factor in assessing scholarly/creative activity. Schools may choose to identify some quantitative expectations. The quality of the work, the influence the work produces, and the level of contribution to a particular body of knowledge are the substantive issues that will be reviewed for tenure and/or promotion.

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

³Focus 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

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		<i>May 14, 2007</i>	<i>P&T Committee</i>

Ohio University. Criteria used to evaluate activities of the various disciplines represented within the CHHS may vary and an external review of scholarly materials by expert peers beyond this University allows an opportunity to obtain insight from the discipline where the candidate is most closely aligned. The discipline-based variations found within the respective schools of the CHHS provide each school with opportunities to establish its own values and culture. The quality of a candidate's scholarly activities should reflect these 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 unique body of knowledge. Peer review occurs in the usual submission and acceptance for dissemination of and funding for scholarly or creative work (e.g., by discipline based review boards, juries, editors, or publishers). The use of external reviewers is another form of peer review and is a mechanism used in CHHS tenure and promotion decisions. Each school specifies the process to be used in collecting and using information from external reviewers and makes this clear to faculty as they go through the review process. 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 these external reviews become part of the candidate's dossier. (Suggested guidelines for external reviewers for tenure and/or promotion 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 focused activities that meet the characteristics of scholarship identified in this document. 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 seeking tenure and/or promotion will have a record of service linked to citizenship within the University, College, and/or school. 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 tenure and/or promotion 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/College/University (e.g., committee work at all levels, membership on external committees/task forces, activities that contribute to achievement of specific goals).
2. Disciplinary/professional contributions that assist professional, scholarly, or disciplinary 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).
3. Private or community contributions that calls upon the specific professional expertise of the faculty member involved (e.g., serve on the board of directors of a relevant agency, teach a class in a public (K-12) school, involvement with professional practice).

Given the large proportion of disciplines within CHHS that include a practice component, there is the strong possibility that faculty members will be active practitioners within their specific

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee

discipline. Contributions that do not go beyond the utilization of discipline-specific knowledge will most often be considered as service.

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 knowledge to the identified societal problem, issue or concern.
3. Peers external to the school has judged the activity as exemplary and leading to the improvement of practice.

Reference List

Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

List of Attachments

Attachment A: Preparation of Dossiers

Attachment B: Teaching Benchmarks

Attachment C: Teaching Portfolio

Attachment D: Guidelines for Seeking External Reviewers for Tenure or Promotion

Attachment E: Scholarly Benchmarks

Attachment F: Service Benchmarks

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee

ATTACHMENT A
PREPARATION OF DOSSIERS

The basic document used in the evaluation of any candidate for the purpose of tenure and promotion is the dossier. The dossier originates with the candidate, is reviewed by the school and College Promotion and Tenure Committees and the dean, and is forwarded to the provost.

The *dossier* is to be a three-ring, one-inch, loose-leaf notebook with a front pocket. This is the only document that is forwarded to the provost. The candidate uses the dossier as a way to present a record of his/her teaching, scholarly activities, as well as evidence of service in a clear narrative summary that can easily be reviewed and understood by others.

The dossier is to be organized in the notebook in the following manner. It is helpful if dividers are used between the major sections (additional details regarding each section will follow the initial listing of order).

Tab: Vitae

Current curriculum vitae

Tab: Narrative [written, expository summary that address the eight (8) categories outlined in the OU Faculty Handbook and listed below]

- I. Academic Preparation
- II. Professional Experience
- III. Instruction and Advising
- IV. Scholarly Accomplishments
- V. Professional Associations
- VI. Committees and Service
- VII. Interdisciplinary Contributions
- VIII. Other Factors
 - a. Institutional Investment and Accountability

Tab: Appendix A

Copy of the original appointment letter and any documents that stipulated conditions for this particular tenure and/or promotion.

Tab: Appendix B

Summary of information on teaching effectiveness

Tab: Appendix C

School criteria, practices, and procedures governing recommendations for promotion and tenure plus the progress toward tenure evaluations.

Tab: Appendix D

Letters from external reviewers, Review Form for Promotion and Tenure, school's Promotion and Tenure Committee's letter, school director's letter, and dean's letter⁴.

⁴ Appendix D is not the responsibility of the candidate, but will be compiled by the committees.

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee

The following material provides more detailed information about each section of the dossier. It is intended to assist the candidate in preparing the most complete picture possible so that “. . . administrators beyond the departmental level (dean, provost, president) may discern the essential “fit” and arrive at independent judgments concerning the “match” between departmental criteria and faculty performance” (adapted from “Guidelines for Preparing Promotion/Tenure Dossiers”, Office of the Provost).

CURRICULUM VITAE will include the following items:

- Name
- Office Address
- Office Telephone Number

Academic Preparation (in reverse chronological order from the most recent to the earliest)

Scholarly and Creative Activities (Identify whether these activities are in review, accepted and, if published, identify the full name of the publication, title of the journal, volume, issue, page numbers, etc. In organizing these activities, it is essential to identify which activities are refereed.)

- A. Journal Publications (differentiate between refereed, reviewed, and invited)
- B. Books and Chapters in Books
- C. Presentations (differentiate between platform and poster presentations, refereed and invited)
- D. Grants/research conducted (indicate granting agency, role and responsibility, year(s) of award, yearly amount)
- E. Abstracts (these should be referred or peer reviewed and only listed in one place on the CV)

Professional Experience (in reverse chronological order from the most recent to the earliest)

- Instruction and Advising (in reverse chronological order)
 - Courses/workshops taught during at least the past five (5) years
 - Field or clinical instruction
 - Seminar papers, theses, and dissertations indicating whether serving as advisor or committee member

Professional Associations

Committees and Service

Interdisciplinary Contributions

Special Assignments and/or Administrative Responsibilities

NARRATIVE SUMMARY:

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee

1. The narrative summary is to be written in complete sentences using either the first person or the third person narrative style.
2. For candidates seeking tenure, the narrative summary should focus on the progressive growth while at Ohio University and indicate growth potential within the respective academic unit. Be certain to address the school's criteria for tenure. Copies of all annual evaluations of progress toward tenure shall be included as part of Appendix C of the dossier.
3. For candidates seeking promotion, the narrative should focus on the individual's progressive growth since the last promotion or since beginning employment at Ohio University (whichever is more recent). Be certain to address the school's criteria for promotion.
4. Books, journal articles, student evaluations, etc. should be discussed in a summary format and critically assessed. When appropriate, these items can be included as appendices (begin with Appendix E) and provide in a format that is separate from the 3-ring, loose-leaf dossier notebook (e.g., crate with hanging files or portable file boxes).
5. Appendices A through D of the dossier will include the specific items listed earlier in this document.
6. Materials included within the appendices should show evidence and/or support for narrative statements. While it is important to include the appropriate documentation of activities, it is not necessary to include everything. For example, if a manuscript has been published then a copy of it will serve as evidence and it would not be necessary to include all of the correspondence prior to its publication. However, if strength wants to be shown regarding the influence of the work, then the narrative might include information about where, when, and frequency of citations have been made relevant to the published article.
7. The narrative summary is to be arranged in the following eight (8) sections. If there are no school criteria for a specific section or sub-section (e.g., Interdisciplinary Contributions), the heading is to be copied and N/A (not applicable) entered under it. If criteria have been generated which reflect unique school expectations, they are to be inserted with validating evidence as subheadings under Section IV-G for Section VIII as appropriate.
 - I. Academic Preparation
 - A. Institutions, dates of study, and degrees awarded. Also list postdoctoral awards, residencies, and other postgraduate study whether leading to a degree or not.
 - B. Other continued educational experiences that enrich the candidate's professional status
 - II. Professional Experience
 - A. Teaching and/or other professional experience in reverse chronological order. Specify dates.
 - B. Certifications and/or licenses

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee

III. Instruction and Advising

Much of the documentation of this section will be found in the teaching portfolio. The teaching portfolio will be part of the supplemental materials provided to the school and College committees. The narrative will include the following:

A. Teaching Load

1. Courses taught over the past several years. Include no more than the past five (5) years. For each of these years, specify the following for each quarter: (a) MCF and course numbers, (b) course titles, (c) enrollments in each section, and (d) indicate whether course is required or elective.
2. Strategies for use and evaluation of technologies to enhance teaching outcomes.
3. Indicate any changes in area, number, or level of courses taught. Indicate any change in assignment or "job-description" since initial appointment.

B. Teaching Effectiveness

This sub-section contains discussion of student learning including: (a) organization and presentation of courses, (b) quantity of work in relation to credit hours, (c) level of work in relation to number of course, and (d) preparation of students for subsequent courses.

1. Student "feedback" – profile or summary from formal questionnaires, excerpts from testimonial letters from students, oral comments, enrollment
2. Collegial esteem – recognition of preparation of students for higher level courses, team-teaching, observation of teaching, cooperative planning of curriculum, testimonial letters.
4. Awards and other recognitions. Selection for an assignment to special programs.
4. Other evidence of teaching effectiveness (e.g., development of new courses or programs, modifications of courses).
5. Reports of director, dean or associate dean, school committees, self-rating, career directions of eminent advisees and graduates.
6. Documentation related to peer reviews

C. Interdisciplinary Teaching

Include explanation of contribution or effectiveness from director.

D. Advising and Supervision

Academic and personal counseling, direction of independent study, supervision of laboratory/field/clinical work, direction of theses and dissertations, assistance in student life activities and programs.

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee

IV. Scholarly Accomplishments

Research, publications, papers read, abstracts, creative or performance activities, etc. with **all** items listed for books and articles in professional journals and juried works (items A and B below). List accomplishments for at least the **last five (5) years** for items C through G listed below. Provide evaluations or evidence of professional judgments for these scholarly accomplishments. In the case of multi-authored works or co-investigator status, indicate the relative nature and description of your contribution. Written feedback from external reviewers will be part of this evidence.

A. Books

B. Articles in professional journals

C. Other publications (e.g., chapter or section or volume, monograph, technical reports, reviews)

D. Internally and externally supported research projects and grants

E. Peer reviewed papers, posters, and other scholarly presentations

F. Workshops, service programs, and invited guest speaker

G. Other professional accomplishments (e.g., consultations, workshops, service programs, patents received)
)

V. Professional Associations

Leadership roles, memberships, attendance at meetings of local, state, regional, national organizations; memberships on committees and commissions; offices held; contributions to the profession. Include evaluations of the significance of these activities.

VI. Committees and Services

Contributions to University governance by attendance and participation in faculty meetings at area/school/College/University levels; service on area/school/College/University committees; chairing of committees; service on *ad-hoc* committees and task force groups; participation special functions such as convocation and graduation ceremonies. Supply in each case a brief statement by the committee chair evaluating the service rendered.

VII. Interdisciplinary Contributions

Contributions to interdisciplinary or intercollegiate programs other than those found in III-C above and activities with evaluative report from the director; service on thesis/dissertation committees in fields outside of own discipline; program development and curriculum planning in cognate areas. Include evaluations of the quality and effectiveness of these contributions.

VIII. Other Factors

Information, beyond that treated in items I through VII above, judged by candidate and/or committee to be relevant in the consideration of tenure or promotion. Items that may appear in this area could be travel, service work in community, civic or political activity. The relevance and school criteria for these factors must be clearly presented with evaluations of any factor presented.

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee

APPENDICES INCLUDED IN THE DOSSIER

- Appendix A:** Copy of original appointment letter and any documents that stipulated conditions for this particular tenure and/or promotion.
- Appendix B:** Summary of information on teaching effectiveness
- Appendix C:** School criteria, practices, and procedures governing recommendations for tenure and promotion plus annual progress toward tenure evaluations.
- Appendix D:** Outside reviewers letters, Review Form for Promotion and Tenure, school's Promotion and Tenure Committee's written recommendation, school director's summary (see below) and recommendation, and dean's recommendation.

Director's Summary and Recommendations: Based upon your knowledge of the individual and the accompanying documentation, provide your own professional director's judgment of this candidate. Judge teaching effectiveness on the following bases: student learning or outcomes, quality of course presentation, quantity of work in relation to course credit hours, level of work in relation to level of course, etc. Indicate your perception of strengths and weaknesses with respect to all criteria of your school. Where this judgment is not related to material covered in the dossier or its appendices, supply supporting data to justify statements or identify the judgment as subjective and/or unsupported. Data in response to the following questions, when applicable, provide the kinds of supporting material needed:

1. Why should s/he be promoted this year and not last year? Were there serious shortcomings then that have been since remedied? Was there work in progress then that is now completed? Why should the promotion occur this year rather than waiting for next year? Are there shortcomings not sufficiently remedied? Work still in progress?
2. How does this candidate "measure up" to your views of the ideal faculty member in your discipline?
3. What is the percentage value of the candidate's salary increment during the past three years, and how does it compare with those increments received by other faculty members in the school?
4. Is your recommendation based upon the recommendation by the Promotion and Tenure Committee of your school?
5. What was the vote of the committee?
6. Have in mind when preparing this summary statement that it is your judgment as the director which is being sought. The documentation provided by students, colleagues, committees, and the individual's vitae

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee

will speak for itself. What is needed here is your own professional assessment.

Appendix E and forward: Can be used to organize the evidence that supports the critically descriptive narrative summary. These appendices need to be carefully referenced in the narrative summary and organized in such a manner that reviewers can easily access them. These materials are not a part of the loose-leaf notebook that is forwarded to the provost.

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee

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.

- I. Shows commitment to students by:
 - A. Meets classes regularly
 - B. Returns graded/evaluated material promptly
 - C. Holds regular office hours to assist students in functioning and performance related to course work
 - 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 guidelines 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 by:
 - 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;

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee

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 CHHS when in need of clarification.
- C. Is accessible to students.
- D. Follows University, College, and School guidelines for advising availability.
- E. Collects evaluation of advising according to school procedures and acts on that feedback when appropriate.
- F. Gives accurate information when advising.
- G. Shows evidence of student success resulting from faculty advising activities.

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee

ATTACHMENT C
Teaching Portfolio

“What is a teaching portfolio? It is a collection of materials documenting teaching performance. It brings together in one place one’s most important teaching strengths and accomplishments. The portfolio is to teaching what lists of publications, grants, and honors are to research and scholarship.”

“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 or tenure would normally contain items from three broad areas: the products of good teaching; material from oneself; and information from others.”

“Possible items for inclusion in a teaching portfolio are shown in the inserts. These lists are not meant to be all-inclusive nor definitive. Rather, they illustrate the wide range from which to select items relevant to a particular teaching situation.”

The following is a list of the types of items that frequently are found in teaching portfolios. A candidate will want to choose from this listing (and possibly include items that are not on this list) to document his/her effectiveness as a teacher of high quality.

- 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.
 - 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 or institution.
 - 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.

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		<i>May 14, 2007</i>	<i>P&T Committee</i>

- 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 campus center for teaching and learning.
- F. Statements from colleagues at other institutions on such matters as how well students have been prepared for graduate studies.

Note: the above material is from the work of Peter Seldin.

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee

Attachment D
*Guidelines for Seeking External Reviewers for Tenure or Promotion**

Colleges and universities throughout the country commonly solicit external letters of review for faculty seeking promotion and 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 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 is most helpful if it directly answers the questions, "What is the individual's contribution to his/her professional field in terms of scholarly endeavors?" "Is the work (scholarship) worthwhile?" Does it add to the research or scholarship base?". Specifically, we are interested in the length of time the external reviewer has known the candidate and in what capacity; the reviewer's professional judgment of the quality and significance of the candidate's productivity; and the reviewer's professional judgment of the candidate's work in relationship to other successful individuals at that stage of professional development. Focusing on the quality of the scholarship in relationship to the field of study allows the reviewer to focus on the quality of the contribution to the discipline rather than whether or not the candidate has met the standard for their institution which might be different from the standard at Ohio University.
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 reviewer. Similarly, since Ohio University is a Carnegie Doctoral/Research University – Extensive, letters would not normally be sought from Baccalaureate institutions. This may require modification for faculty in baccalaureate-only programs.
3. Academic reviewers should be from university faculty holding the rank to which the candidate aspires or higher. Letters from faculty 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 professorate. Letters from those outside academe should be from professionals who have prominence in the discipline. Overall, letters from university faculty remain necessary because of their general understanding of tenure and promotion standards within a university. Those outside academe do not work in the same arena. They may be able to comment on the quality of the work, but not in relation to general tenure/promotion expectations. For example, a professional accomplishment in a local venue may be quite good to them, but it is not always seen to have had sufficient dissemination or critique in a university. Nor can reviewers outside academe fully understand the circumstances under which faculty work in terms of time or resources. This may be even more obvious as we embrace Boyer's definition of scholarship.

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee

5. It is advisable for the school director to discuss the appropriate profile of potential reviewers with the candidate before the list is assembled. Reviewers should be objective and knowledgeable in related research content areas outside of Ohio University who are qualified to evaluate the candidate's scholarly achievement. These individuals should not be former graduate school professors, co-authors, etc. The candidate should not contact the external reviewers at any time during this process. The candidate need not solicit letters. Excessive letters become superfluous. The case should rest on its own merit.
6. Candidates are to submit a list of eight to ten reviewers to their director.
7. Directors or director designee, with the assistance and advice of the school's Promotion and Tenure Committee, may seek review letters from individuals not included on the list provided by the candidate. This will vary relative to the director's concurrence with the candidate on the qualifications and objectivity of the reviewers. When the director solicits letters, simply notify the candidate as to the persons to be contacted and the letter to be used. Allow them to comment on it prior to sending in accordance with University tenure and promotion policies. If a candidate is being considered for full professor, most colleagues in their field should know their work. Some creative disciplines are exceptions, but overall this is a basic assumption. Reviewers, therefore, do not need to know the candidate personally.
8. Letters must be requested directly by the school director or director designee. There should be a standard format for the letter. It should ask for a vitae or a biography of the reviewer. The director or a member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee should summarize the vitae or biography in a few paragraphs. The summaries should be attached to the reviewer's letter.

It must be understood that when external letters are sought, the University is not abdicating its responsibility for independent judgment. Faculty may be recommended or not recommended for tenure/promotion regardless of the opinions of the reviewers. The external letters are simply one part of the dossier and, if the candidate merits promotion, 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 tenure or promotion is deserved. If not, perhaps there is reason for waiting until the case is stronger.

*These guidelines should be read in conjunction with the Ohio University and CHHS Policies on Promotion and Tenure and should not be construed as superseding them.

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee

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's Promotion and Tenure Committee to explain how a specific contribution meets scholarly/creative guidelines. The basic notion underlying scholarly work is that it adds to the world of knowledge; therefore, work in this area requires: (a) strong intellectual base which demonstrates a high level of discipline-related expertise, (b) a high level of originality, and (c) significance or impact for the relevant audience. Peers within and beyond Ohio University will have reviewed any work included in this area.

Some schools 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 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. Quality must be the defining characteristic, and faculty members within the schools of CHHS will need to have ongoing dialogue concerning quality indicators.

I. Work associated with publications and comparable material:

- A. Authoring of:
 - 1. Books
 - 2. Manuals, workbooks, monographs, exhibit catalogs
 - 3. Chapter in a book
 - 4. Article in a refereed or non-refereed journal
 - 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

- B. Editing in which the faculty member is listed as the editor (It is possible that work in this area would be considered service rather than scholarly. The candidate and the school committee will need to explain the fit in the chosen category.):
 - 1. Books
 - 2. Manuals
 - 3. Journal within the discipline
 - 4. Guest editor of specific issue of a journal (usually the issue is devoted to the expertise of the guest editor)

- C. Editing 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 committee will need to explain the fit in the chosen category.):
 - 1. Editing of journal articles
 - 2. Editor of professional association newsletter

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee

3. Editorial consultant of a journal

- D. 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
- E. Professional exhibits and shows
 1. Single artist juried exhibit or show
 2. Pieces of work in a juried exhibit or show
 3. Designer of juried exhibit or show
 4. Invited judge/juror for a juried exhibit or show
- F. Professional presentations and posters
 1. Refereed presentations at professional meetings
 2. Refereed papers that 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., CHHS Scholarly Activity Award, 1804 Fund
- H. Invited presentations, panel participation, other invited 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

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee

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. The service area 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 requires the faculty member to be focused on the development of knowledge (including new applications) while service activities entails the faculty member's abilities to focus the contribution through the use of knowledge previously attained. Service as part of the faculty member 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. A mere listing of activities will not be sufficient. Candidates must provide evidence about the work contributed to each specific activity listed. A mere listing of activities is insufficient. The following activities are examples of those things that could fit in this area.

1. School, 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, College, and/or University.
4. Student organization advising.
5. Advisory committee membership.

Examples of professional service:

1. Professional service may include things such as the editing of journals and newsletters, the organization of conferences, leadership in professional organizations, and serving on accreditation teams. Candidates should explain whether these activities should be viewed as scholarly activities or service based upon how explanations and/or 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 materials).
4. Community outreach projects developed through the University.
5. Peer reviews of grants for foundations.

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		<i>May 14, 2007</i>	<i>P&T Committee</i>

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'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.

Revision approved by majority of faculty voting 5/28/02

<i>Orig Date:</i>	<i>Orig By:</i>	<i>Rev Date:</i>	<i>Rev. by:</i>
		May 14, 2007	P&T Committee