

## Appendix B.

[Note: Yellow highlights text to be deleted; Green highlights text to be added.  
Section iv.c. needs to be renumbered 1-5]

### Simplified Review Processes for Non-tenure track Instructors

(FS P&T final draft 01-30-2018)

#### GUIDELINES FOR NON-TENURE TRACK PROMOTION

5. Goal: to ensure that promotion is not simply awarded for time in service but that the individual meets the criteria specified for promotion and that there is consistency in instructor performance expectations at the college and university levels
6. Criteria for Promotion to Senior Instructor I
  - a. Four years of full-time service, **calculated from the hire date to December 31 of the calendar year prior to the promotion decision** **or the accumulation of its equivalent for part-time Instructor at 0.50 FTE or greater;**
  - b. Have a graduate degree appropriate to the assigned duties, or comparable educational or professional experience;
  - c. Have special skills or experience needed in the unit;
  - d. Have an exceptional record of achievement in the assigned duties.
7. Criteria for Promotion to Senior Instructor II
  - a. After four years of full-time service at the rank of Senior Instructor I or the accumulation of its equivalent for part-time Senior Instructor I at 0.50 FTE or greater;
  - b. A candidate must have a sustained record of exceptional achievement and evidence of professional growth and innovation in assigned duties.
8. Dossier Expectations Specific to Instructors
  - a. Candidate statement
  - b. Chronological log of courses including
    1. Course number and title
    2. Number of students in each class
    3. Personal SET scores with comparison to parallel unit and college scores
  - c. Teaching portfolio –for one of the individual’s representative courses that has been taught over a period of years, **the candidate should** create a teaching portfolio that includes at least the following
    1. **Syllabus, including learning objectives**
    2. **Outline of learning objectives**
    3. **Evidence of full-cycle assessment**
    4. Examples of in-class materials
    5. Examples of exams, projects, rubrics, and other grading tools
    6. Other “artifacts” that document class success in meeting learning objectives
    7. **Evidence of course evaluation and an improvement cycle**
  - d. Letter from peer teaching committee
    1. Includes documentation of on-going assessments routinely conducted in candidate’s unit
    2. Includes assessment of class portfolio
  - e. Letter from student teaching review committee established and operated as outlined for other faculty. Students will also review the course teaching portfolio
  - f. List outcomes of expected research, outreach, and other unique activities as specified in position description; list scholarship; service, and awards
  - g. At least four letters of evaluation from any of the following categories
    1. Senior I or Senior II instructors in other units in the OSU system
    2. Instructors at other universities or institutions around the nation who are doing similar work and hold a senior rank to the candidate

3. OSU professorial-ranked faculty who can provide a knowledgeable assessment of the candidate's work as the faculty member has worked with instructors doing similar types of teaching
  - h. Candidates submit a list of four evaluators who meet the criteria stated above. From this list, at least two letters will be obtained for the final dossier. If additional names are needed, these will be obtained from the candidate. Letters from at least two other evaluators are to be obtained from a list generated by the unit leader, dean, or unit P&T committee in accordance with practices determined within the unit. All letters must be requested by the unit leader, dean, or the unit's promotion and tenure committee chair, not the candidate. No more than one-half of the letters included will be from the candidate's list. A brief statement must be included as to why each reviewer was chosen.
9. Expedited Process
- a. Assessments are conducted by the unit committee, unit leader, college committee, and college dean. The goal of these assessments is to assure that the candidate has met stated criteria for the promotion. Reviews at the college level should also assure consistency in treatment of candidates across units in the college.
  - b. If all unit and college letters are in agreement on promotion, then the dean's decision is final and forwarded to the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Provost.
  - c. If any one of the unit or college letters is negative, even if the dean's letter is positive, then the package is sent on to the university level for assessment. This is to assure that upper level administration is aware of any issues surrounding the promotion.
  - d. Faculty not approved for promotion by the Provost and Executive Vice President may appeal to the President within two weeks of receipt of the letter announcing the decision. When appealing, the candidate must write a letter to the President stating the grounds for the appeal and facts that support it. No other supporting letters will be considered. The President has the right to request additional information.