



Ohio Administrative Code

Rule 3339-7-05 Annual review of probationary members of the instructional staff.

Effective: November 3, 2016

(A) Each department will establish a committee to initiate tenure recommendations. The membership of this committee is to be determined by the department. In each year of the probationary period, the instructional staff member submits to the department a report of professional activities that addresses the tenure criteria. Subsequently, the department chair or program director (when appropriate), after consultation with the department tenure committee, prepares an annual written evaluation of the member's accomplishments; an evaluation that will provide an assessment of the member's progress toward tenure, including strengths and weaknesses and specific recommendations for improvement. The evaluation prepared by the department chair or program director (when appropriate) must be reviewed and formally acknowledged by the department tenure committee, and the probationer before forwarding to the dean, so that errors of fact and omission might be eliminated. Tenure eligible faculty with a dual appointment must elect their tenure initiating department and division (Oxford or regional) by December 31, 2016. The initiating department and division will be responsible for preparing the annual evaluation. The evaluation must be reviewed and formally acknowledged by both the Oxford and regional deans.

(B) Concerns regarding professional collegiality should be shared as promptly as possible with the person whose behavior is questioned. Notice of uncollegiality must be given to that person in writing no later than his or her next annual evaluation after occurrence of the behavior considered uncollegial.

(C) In the event the tenure committees evaluation differs from that of the chair or program director (when appropriate), the tenure committee shall forward its evaluation to the probationer, with a copy to the dean of the regional campuses (when appropriate). Such evaluations are subsequently reviewed by the dean, and then officially transmitted to the probationer. Whenever the dean's evaluation differs from that of the department chair, the program director (when appropriate) or the department tenure committee, the dean must so inform the staff member, the chair, the program director (when appropriate), the committee, and the dean of the regional campuses (when appropriate), in writing, citing the basis for the judgment.



(D) In the third year of qualifying service, the department tenure committee will also prepare a separate written evaluation of the instructional staff member's progress toward tenure, including strengths and weaknesses and specific recommendations for improvement, and share that evaluation with the probationer and the department chair or program director (when appropriate). The chair or program director (when appropriate) will also write an evaluation of the probationers progress toward tenure.

(E) The provost reviews the evaluations in the third, fourth, and fifth years of a candidate's probationary period. Whenever the provosts evaluation differs from what has already been recorded, this judgment, with reasons, will be reported in writing to the candidate, the department tenure committee, the department chair, the program director (when appropriate), and the dean. The complete documentation should also be distributed to the dean of the regional campuses (when appropriate).

(F) Early in the candidates final year of probationary service, the department tenure committee undertakes a review of his or her cumulative professional record and makes a positive or negative recommendation for tenure to the department chair or program director (when appropriate). After receiving the department tenure committees recommendation, the department chair or program director (when appropriate) makes a positive or negative recommendation. The candidates application is then advanced to the dean, who makes a positive or negative recommendation. The university promotion and tenure committee then considers all candidates who have received a positive recommendation from the department committee, the department chair, the program director (when appropriate), or the dean. Candidates who receive a positive recommendation from the university promotion and tenure committee are advanced to the provost for consideration. Candidates who receive the provosts positive recommendation are advanced to the president. Candidates receiving the positive recommendation of the president are advanced to the board of trustees for final action.