REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE REVISION OF THE REPORT ON ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS, TENURE AND PROMOTIONS
ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS,

TEACHING AND PROMOTIONS

Introduction

Ten years have elapsed since the Board of Trustees adopted the original report relating to Academic Appointments, Tenure and Promotions.

A decade of experience has demonstrated the values inherent in observing a body of principles in relation to staff appointments, to tenure and to promotions in both salary and rank.

The plan herein set forth is designed to accomplish the following purposes:

a. To assist the administration by providing sound standards for the original selection of staff members.

b. To result in the retention, encouragement and promotion of the ablest and most promising staff members.

c. To result in the dotation of the incompetent and the mediocre. In this process, it is the University’s obligation to proceed with kindness and consideration and with due reference to all that is best in the University tradition.

d. To protect the University against the establishment of claims by the incompetent and the mediocre as a result of a policy of drift over protracted periods of service.

e. To assure the University that, in the selection, retention and promotions of members of the staff, due cognizance shall be taken of the specific needs of the institution and of the extent to which the qualifications of the individual relate to these specific needs.
f. To assure the University that in appraising the merits of individual staff members total functioning will be considered and also that the appraisal shall involve not merely current performance but future promise as well.

g. To assure the faculty that individuals will be treated with the maximum of impartiality.

h. To offer assurance that accomplishment will not be overlooked but will be recognized and rewarded.

i. To assure the faculty of the maintenance of promotional opportunity.

j. To offer assurance that, in arriving at judgments with reference to the qualities of individual staff members, every use will be made of sound facilities for this purpose. This would imply that department chairmen should elicit the judgments of all those who are in a position to make contributions to the total estimate of the individual.

k. To assure the faculty of security of tenure in the terms herein set forth and of freedom of teaching, of research, and of opinion.

l. To provide appropriate procedures for the determination of claims of incompetency so that faculty members may be guaranteed adequate notice and a fair hearing of complaints bearing on their security of tenure.

PART I Principles as to Selection, Promotion, Privileges and Duties of Persons of Academic Rank

1. Apart from general adjustments in salary related to cost of living
or similar considerations, promotions in rank and increases in salary are not merely a matter of routine or of seniority; rather, they constitute a recognition of merit according to the criteria set forth below.

2. Criteria for evaluation and recognition should be progressively exacting from lower to higher ranks. In each instance promotion should be recommended only upon clear attainment of the standard required for the rank in question.

3. Criteria of merit common, in differing degrees, to all ranks are as follows:
   a. Teaching ability: capacity to excite interest and evoke response in students, to broaden their outlook, to impart knowledge, to see and convey relationships and to encourage the faculty of criticism.
   b. Scholarship and its evidences, both published and unpublished.
   c. Personal attributes: integrity, industry, open-mindedness, objectivity, capacity for leadership and cooperation.
   d. Capacity to awaken in students a sense of their opportunities and responsibilities as free citizens in a democracy.
   e. Possession of the qualifications necessary for the particular rank as set forth in Part III of this report.
   f. Contribution to the need of the department for diversity of field of competence and of point of view in method and approach.
   g. Quality and variety of experience as teacher and scholar, both at this and other institutions.
   h. Contribution to the educational program or the administrative work of the University or any of its units, other
than teaching and research.

i. Contribution by way of student counseling and guidance.

ii. Contribution to the community and its affairs especially in cases where it bears upon scholarship and teaching.

k. Calls to other institutions on the single basis, however, of evidence of the possession of the qualities set forth above.

4. The criteria of scholarship, teaching ability and integrity should receive particular emphasis.

5. These criteria apply to both promotions in rank and increases in salary within rank. In the case of promotions, the minimum standards for each rank as set forth in Part III of this report, should be met; in the case of salary increases such minimum standards should be exceeded and progressive approach should be made toward attainment of the minimum for the next higher rank.

6. It should be the general policy, with rare exceptions, to grant no increase in rank without increase in salary.

7. In the selection of new personnel the minimum criteria for promotion to the rank to be filled should be observed.

8. In the event of a vacancy first consideration should be given to the advancement of a properly qualified person from a lower rank in preference to procuring one from outside the University. This principle does not obtain where no suitable candidate is available or where distinguished personal or highly specialized qualifications or a change in departmental program require the procurement of an outside person. In the event of new appointments consideration should be given to diversity of training and of experience among members of the staff.
9. A teacher, regardless of tenure, is entitled to freedom of research and publication, of class-room discussion of all matters relevant to the subject matter of his course, and of expression of opinion as a citizen, subject to the obligation to be accurate and to exercise reasonable restraint in accordance with the standards of a learned profession.

10. A teacher's privileges imply correlative responsibilities. In addition to maintaining those standards of competence set forth as minima for his rank, and particularly those relating to scholarship and teaching ability, a teacher also has the obligation to maintain a proper attitude of objectivity; conscientious industry and cooperation. Further, he has the responsibility to refrain from introducing into his teaching controversial matter having no relation to his subject; and in making public statements, to extend every effort to indicate that he is not an institutional spokesman.

11. Permanent tenure means tenure terminable only for incompetence, gross insubordination, immorality, conduct clearly inimical to the best interests of the University, voluntary resignation, or retirement; it is an attribute of all ranks above that of instructor, but subject to a period of probation in the rank of assistant professor.

12. Termination by the institution for cause shall only be accomplished by strict adherence to the procedures of due notice, written charges, reasonable opportunity to reply, and a fair hearing, including the right of representation and submission of evidence. Termination shall not become effective until one year's notice of the final decision to terminate. This period of notice shall not
necessarily apply in case of dismissal for immorality or gross
insubordination.

13. Incompetence shall be interpreted as failure to adhere to the minimum
criteria of scholarship and teaching ability set forth in Part III
for the rank in question.

14. The right to dismiss for a particular cause may be lost by failure of
the proper administrative officer to inform the staff member of the
unsatisfactory nature of his services and to take appropriate action.
This principle does not apply, however, when grounds for dismissal
continue or recur after notification has been given.

Part II. Administrative Implementation

1. Each member of the teaching staff should have his services
periodically and competently evaluated according to the criteria
set forth as common to each rank, and in particular those appropriate
for his rank in order that merit or demerit may be recognized and
appropriate recommendations made.

2. Evaluation of services according to the criteria appropriate for each
rank, shall take place annually in the case of all instructors, and
assistant professors who have not as yet attained permanent tenure.
Evaluation in the case of other staff members shall be made at five-
year intervals, beginning with 1955. In each instance the evaluation
shall be made by the department chairman. One copy of each evaluation
report shall be sent to the President and one to the Dean or other
administrative head of the college, school or bureau in question.

3. In the case of difference of opinion as to tenure, promotion or
increases in salary, the usual right of appeal to the Dean, the
President, or a special committee shall be preserved.
4. Evaluation of services of chairmen, both as administrators and otherwise, should be made by the administrative head of the college, school, or other unit in which the chairman's department is budgeted. Evaluation of services of chairmen responsible directly to the President should be made by the President.

5. Rigid application of criteria is to be avoided; it is not essential that a candidate attain a minimum for each of the items indicated; no clear weighting is contemplated, though greater demand should be made for high attainment in scholarship and teaching ability than in any other area of qualification. Varying needs and opportunities require substantial flexibility; but consideration of all criteria and reasonable conformity for those set out below for each rank is definitely desirable.

6. Between those cases that clearly satisfy the qualifications in question, and those that clearly do not, must necessarily remain a substantial area of administrative discretion. No fixed measurements are here practicable; in the last analysis the principles herein stated can be but guides for conscientious consideration, with due regard for the good of the institution and as just and objective an evaluation of human qualifications as is possible.

7. In the case of each new appointment explicit statements in writing should be made to the appointee by the administration as to term of appointment, rank, salary, rights, privileges, duties and responsibilities; specifically, each contract should have printed in it and expressly incorporate the principles set forth herein; and each appointee should be informed that all appointments are legally subject to the legislative appropriation.
PART III Application of Principles to Particular Ranks

The foregoing principles and their administrative implementation are in terms of broad generality. Except where occasional qualifications are expressly set forth or necessarily implied, they are deemed applicable to personnel of all ranks. It remains now to differentiate in specific cases; to indicate differences in emphasis made desirable by the diversity in maturity and experience, and by the progressively exacting standards from lower to higher ranks.

As implied in the title of this Report, the ranks discussed herein, with the exception of Lecturer, are only those having the actual or potential attributes of tenure.

In the following enumeration an attempt is made to state in more specific terms the particular emphasis deemed appropriate for each rank. Generally speaking, it is proper to say that, commencing with the rank of instructor, the qualifications are cumulative for each succeeding higher rank. Thus in determining fitness for promotion or initial appointment it is assumed that the criteria common to all ranks are met in the degree set forth below for each lower rank as well as for the particular rank in question.

So far as practicable, this specific material is divided in the case of each rank, into the following categories: formal requisites for appointment in terms of curricular background and degrees; substantive qualifications in terms of the criteria suggested earlier; nature of services to be performed; tenure status; and compensation. In the latter instance it should be noted that the amounts stated are minima, not maxima.
INSTRUCTOR

Attainment of the rank of instructor is the first substantial step toward permanent commitment to and assured tenure in the profession of teaching. Initial appointments to this rank are necessarily with uncertain knowledge of fulfillment of many of the qualifications essential or desirable for permanent recognition. It is accordingly necessary that initial appointments be on a temporary footing. Since experience and maturity tend to development of latent qualities and to furtherance of known ones, it is only just to the appointee, as well as desirable for the institution, that a period of years be recognized in which these qualities may emerge and develop. Four probationary years should be adequate from both standpoints. At the end of this period the appointee should show clear evidence of eligibility for advancement. If he does not, his appointment should not, ordinarily, be renewed. This he should clearly know at the commencement and at each renewal of his appointments. Otherwise misunderstandings may arise, or failure of the administration to face the issue may result in the continuation of an unpromising appointment such as to raise an equity in the appointee that seriously embarrasses the institution and may even preclude termination of the employment.

Clear attainment of the criteria for promotion to the rank of assistant professor should result in promotion. If budgetary restrictions prevent this, the appointee should be advised of his recommendation and retained so long as there is reasonable expectation that he may receive recognition. If this expectation is not possible, it is an obligation so to inform him and to give every aid toward placement elsewhere.
Unless it is clear that he is capable of attaining a higher rank, his appointment should not be renewed. Only in rare emergencies should reappointment be made after four years; then, only when advancement has been recommended but proves impossible, or services are adequate but unpromising and the economic plight of the instructor requires temporizing. In such case the circumstances should be unambiguously presented to him, placement efforts made and reappointments restricted to as short a term as possible.

**Formal requisites:** Baccalaureate degree and Master's degree or its equivalent, and at least three years of graduate study or of professional experience in the field in which the instructorship is granted.

**Qualifications:** Satisfactory teaching ability; high standards of scholarship; promise of growth and development in teaching, scholarship, or creative productivity.

**Tenure:** For one year; non-permanent during first four years; becoming permanent thereafter in absence of actual notice to contrary. No reappointments after four years without unquestioned evidence of substantial growth and future promise and personality definitely calculated to lead to the realization of such a promise, except where financial limitations or humanitarian considerations, as noted above, require some temporary extension of this tour of service.

**Minimum salary:** $2700.

**Assistant Professor**

**Formal requisites:** Ph.D. degree (or its equivalent).

**Qualifications:** Demonstrated ability as a teacher; definite record of scholastic accomplishment, either published or unpublished; undoubted evidence of continuous development and superior personal characteristics.
Tenure: Permanent after three years, including time served as instructor in this University.

Minimum salary: $3900.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Formal requisites: Those of assistant professor.

Capacities: Those of assistant professor, plus established reputation in scholarship, artistic creation or other scholastic activity.

Tenure: Permanent.

Minimum salary: $5100.

PROFESSOR

Formal requisites: All those of lower ranks.

Capacities: Marked capacity for direction of research; scholarship of national recognition; consistent contributor to chosen field of learning; established reputation as a teacher, except in cases of research professorship or directorship of bureaus or agencies where teaching ability is not required.

Tenure: Permanent.

Minimum salary: $6000.

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH PROFESSOR

Formal requisites: Those of professorial rank.

Capacities: Prominence in creative scholarship as evidenced by the following criteria: the highest esteem of fellow workers in his field, honors bestowed upon him, such as offices in professional societies, and invitations to visiting and memorial lectureships, highly rated publications and creative work, listing in appropriate general and professional biographical volumes and the high caliber and attainment of his students.
Responsibilities and Privileges: Responsible directly to the Dean of the Graduate School for leadership in research in his chosen field with freedom to cross departmental and college lines in the furtherance of his research program; release from all departmental and college administrative and teaching responsibilities except those which he may care to undertake after consultation with the appropriate Dean and departmental Chairman.

Tenure: Permanent.

Minimum salary: $10,000.

LIMITED ASSIGNMENTS IN PROFESSIONAL COLLEGES

In some of the professional colleges it is not possible to make the criteria for the rank of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor apply without modification. There are, in these cases, appointments which imply limited professorial duties. Compensation is frequently on the basis of honoraria so that titles cannot be clearly associated with compensation. For these special cases it is recommended that the requirements with respect to the salary associated with different ranks be relaxed.

LECTURER

The title of lecturer is to be given to a member of the instructional staff for whom it is undesirable to assign a rank. It is used for certain temporary and part-time appointments where one of the higher ranks would be given if the appointment were a permanent, or full-time, one. There may be other circumstances which make it desirable to give this title; but the title—lecturer—is not assigned where the duties and responsibilities of the
position or the experience and qualifications of the individual are not at least equivalent to those connected with the rank of assistant professor.

COMMITTEE:
Robert E. Mathews
Harold R. Valley
Walter C. Weidler, Chairman.
Dean Hoimberger moved that the report be approved. This was seconded by Professor Stahly.

During the discussion Dean Hoimberger questioned the advisability of publishing the minimum salary for each rank.

Dean Hoimberger then moved that the report be tabled and made the special order of business at the next meeting of the Council. This was seconded and was carried.

The Council adjourned at 4:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lawrence D. Jones
Secretary
Report of Executive Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences on Revision of Tenure Rules

The Executive Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences has studied the problem of the revision of tenure rules at The Ohio State University and feels that some revision is desirable. After gathering information by conference and questionnaire, the Committee discussed several proposals, developed a set of principles and prepared a proposal illustrating the principles. This report is a summary of the deliberations.

The Purpose of Academic Tenure

Academic tenure is necessary for the preservation of academic freedom, which is the vital force in encouraging development of new and original ideas. Progress in many fields depends on academic freedom and tenure helps preserve this freedom. In tenure a faculty member has protection against certain types of pressures, which, if allowed to operate, might restrict expression of his views.

Acquiring tenure in the academic profession represents complete acceptance by the profession after a long period of preparation. It is similar to obtaining a license to practice engineering and medicine and being admitted to the bar. This acceptance carries with it permission to practice the profession and the correlative responsibility to observe meticulously its standards. Having accepted, the individual can lose his right to practice only for serious errors and only after grounds for expulsion have been established through a proper hearing.

Comparison of Plans

At The Ohio State University we have been fortunate through the years that our procedures in handling tenure cases have steadily improved and have been clarified. Our policy on granting tenure, however, has remained relatively unchanged and in the minds of some faculty members is too liberal in view of our stature as an institution.
This is borne out by the data shown on Tables I, II and III. Table I is a comparison of patterns of tenure acquisition in the lower two ranks between Ohio State and some other universities. The instructorship is essentially a non-tenure rank in most institutions and Ohio State is in a very small minority in granting tenure at this rank. Tenure for the assistant professor rank is more variable. The two most frequent patterns seem to be a three year probationary period or no tenure. Although our procedure falls into the three year pattern, we count time served as an instructor, and therefore, again are more generous than almost any other institution.

Table II is a comparison of patterns of tenure acquisition in the upper two ranks between Ohio State and some other universities. The pattern in these two ranks is quite variable but we again are on the liberal end of the scale.

Tables I and II cover plans where tenure is tied to rank. Such systems are called term-rank plans. Systems in which length of service is the sole determining factor are called all rank plans. A comparison of patterns of these plans is shown in Table III. Obviously the OSU plan grants tenure more liberally than most of the institutions having all rank plans and is more lenient than the AAUP plan.

Principles

The Executive Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences debated the issues in an attempt to agree on certain principles before drawing up a proposed plan. The Executive Committee recognizes that principles which seem important in this College may be unimportant in other colleges and believes that a uniform University plan is more important than strict adherence to the suggested principles. A list of these principles follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Permanent after four years in absence of notice to contrary.</td>
<td>Tenure after &lt;br&gt;1 yr. 0% &lt;br&gt;2 yr. 0% &lt;br&gt;3 yr. 0% &lt;br&gt;4 yr. 0% &lt;br&gt;5 yr. 3.5% &lt;br&gt;6 yr. 6.9% &lt;br&gt;7 or more yr. 3.5% &lt;br&gt;No tenure 86.1%</td>
<td>Tenure after &lt;br&gt;1 yr. 0% &lt;br&gt;2 yr. 0% &lt;br&gt;3 yr. 0% &lt;br&gt;4 yr. 0% &lt;br&gt;5 yr. 5% &lt;br&gt;6 yr. 5% &lt;br&gt;7 or more yr. 5% &lt;br&gt;No tenure 80%</td>
<td>(Basically a pre-tenure rank). &quot;Up or out&quot; policy at 14% of institutions; range is 3-6 years, and median is approximately 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Permanent after three years, including time served as Instructor at O.S.U.</td>
<td>Immed. tenure 3.4% &lt;br&gt;After 1 yr. 0% &lt;br&gt;2 yr. 0% &lt;br&gt;3 yr. 34.5% &lt;br&gt;4 yr. 6.9% &lt;br&gt;5 yr. 6.9% &lt;br&gt;6 yr. 0% &lt;br&gt;7 or more yr. 6.9% &lt;br&gt;No tenure 41.4%</td>
<td>Immed. tenure 5.0% &lt;br&gt;After 1 yr. 0% &lt;br&gt;2 yr. 0% &lt;br&gt;3 yr. 15.0% &lt;br&gt;4 yr. 5.0% &lt;br&gt;5 yr. 15.0% &lt;br&gt;6 yr. 5% &lt;br&gt;7 or more yr. 5.0% &lt;br&gt;No tenure 45.0%</td>
<td>(Basically a pre-tenure rank). Tenure after probational period including service at lower rank - 36% (range is 2-12 yrs.; median is 6 years). &quot;Up or out&quot; policy at some institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table II

**A Comparison of Patterns of Tenure Acquisition for Associate Professors and Professors**

*(Term-Rank)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Immediate tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60% have some variety of automatic tenure acquisition other than all rank automatic acquisition. Immediate tenure by promotion or initial appointment-14%. Immediate tenure by promotion, but after probationary period if by initial appointment-14%. Tenure after probationary period, including service at lower rank-27%. Tenure after probationary period at that rank, however reached-5%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Immediate tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78% have some variety of automatic tenure acquisition other than all-rank acquisition. Immediate tenure by promotion or initial appointment-23%. Immediate tenure by promotion, but after probationary period if by initial appointment-28%. Tenure after probationary period including service at lower ranks-23%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immed. tenure 24.5%</td>
<td>Immed. tenure 35.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After 1 yr. 0%</td>
<td>After 1 yr. 5.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 yr. 10.3%</td>
<td>2 yr. 5.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 yr. 37.9%</td>
<td>3 yr. 25.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 yr. 3.5%</td>
<td>4 yr. 10.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 yr. 3.5%</td>
<td>5 yr. 10.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 yr. 0%</td>
<td>6 yr. 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 or more yr. 6.9%</td>
<td>7 or more yr. 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicated 10.3%</td>
<td>Not indicated 5.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No tenure 3.5%</td>
<td>No tenure 5.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immed. tenure 27.6%</td>
<td>Immed. tenure 40.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After 1 yr. 3.4%</td>
<td>After 1 yr. 5.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 yr. 13.8%</td>
<td>2 yr. 10.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 yr. 31.1%</td>
<td>3 yr. 25.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 yr. 3.4%</td>
<td>4 yr. 10.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 yr. 3.4%</td>
<td>5 yr. 5.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 yr. 0%</td>
<td>6 yr. 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 or more yr. 6.9%</td>
<td>7 or more yr. 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicated 10.4%</td>
<td>Not indicated 5.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table III

A Comparison of Patterns of Tenure Acquisition

(All-rank)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same for all ranks</td>
<td>All ranks, beginning with full-time instructor: Probationary period should not exceed seven years, including in this period full-time service in all institutions of higher education; however, when after a term of probationary service of more than three years in one or more institutions a teacher is called to another institution, it may be agreed in writing that his new appointment is for a probationary period of not more than four years, even though the person's total probationary period is thereby extended beyond the normal maximum of seven years.</td>
<td>After 1 yr. 0% 2 yr. 5% 3 yr. 40.0% 4 yr. 5.0% 5 yr. 5.0% 6 yr. 10.0% 7 or more yr. 25.0% No tenure or no policy 10.0%</td>
<td>After 1 yr. 0% 2 yr. 2.7% 3 yr. 13.5% 4 yr. 10.8% 5 yr. 2.7% 6 yr. 10.8% 7 or more yr. 43.3% No tenure or no policy 16.2%</td>
<td>Same policy for all ranks: Tenure after 7 years 38% (Range is 1 to 14 years)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Acquisition of tenure should be divorced from promotion to the rank of assistant professor.

2. Time in service before acquiring tenure should be lengthened in the lower ranks.

3. A review of a staff member's prospects should be made at the end of several years' service, even though tenure is not granted, in order to prevent the occurrence of injustices to the individual or university at the end of a long period of non-tenure status.

4. The plan should be simple but definite.

5. The plan should have enough latitude to prevent hardships to the University in attracting men of unique background.

6. It should be possible to grant tenure to instructors in unusual cases.

A Tenure Proposal

The Executive Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences submits the following proposal as a suggestion of the type of plan which operates within these principles and at the same time brings us closer to current practice in other institutions. Hopefully, the plan may improve our prestige in the academic community.

General procedural features of the plan:

1. Promotion may be considered at any time.

2. The length of probationary service may be reduced or eliminated in consideration of service in other institutions or organizations (see item 7).

3. Time on special contracts will not count toward tenure.

4. Part time service will not be credited toward tenure. Part time service is defined as less than 50% service to the University or to University-related organizations.
5. Time on leave, to a maximum of two academic years, will count toward tenure.

6. Before a review of his status, a faculty member should be notified so that he may submit information about his qualifications if he wishes. After the review is completed, he should be informed of the decision as soon as possible.

7. Recommendations of a department regarding the acquisition or denial of tenure and the reduction of probationary periods will be approved or disapproved by the Dean after consultation with the Dean of the Graduate School and the Vice President, Instruction and Research.

The plan as it applies to each rank:

Instructor

1. The rank of instructor is normally a non-tenure rank, but the acquisition of tenure is possible after a seven year probationary period at The Ohio State University.

2. The department will review the case of each instructor at the beginning of his fourth year of service and will submit a written recommendation to the Dean to retain the instructor without tenure or to terminate his service at the end of the fourth year.

3. The department will review the case of each instructor at the beginning of his seventh year of service and will submit a written recommendation to the Dean to grant the instructor tenure or to terminate his service at the end of the seventh year.

Assistant Professor

1. Tenure in the rank of assistant professor may be granted after a seven year probationary period at The Ohio State University, including service as an instructor.
2. The department will review the case of each assistant professor at the beginning of his fourth year of service at The Ohio State University, including service as an instructor, and will submit to the Dean a written recommendation to retain the assistant professor without tenure or to terminate his service at the end of the fourth year.

3. The department will review the case of each assistant professor at the beginning of his seventh year of service at The Ohio State University, including service as an instructor, and will submit to the Dean a written recommendation to grant the assistant professor tenure or to terminate his service at the end of the seventh year.

Associate Professor

1. An assistant professor at The Ohio State University will acquire tenure upon promotion to the rank of associate professor.

2. A new appointee to the rank of associate professor at The Ohio State University will normally serve a two year probationary period. The department will review the case at the beginning of the second year and will submit a written recommendation to the Dean to grant the associate professor tenure or to terminate his service at the end of the second year.

3. In consideration of prior service in other comparable institutions or organizations, immediate tenure is possible to a new appointee to the rank of associate professor. The department will submit to the Dean a written recommendation for waiver of the probationary period.

Professor

Tenure is automatic upon promotion or appointment to the rank of professor.

February 13, 1961
Faculty Appointments
Promotions
and
Tenure

The Ohio State University
Introduction

This publication constitutes a revision of the statement on Academic Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure as approved by The Ohio State University Board of Trustees, October 15, 1951. The revisions were proposed by a special committee of the faculty, after careful review of the 1951 document, and were approved by the Administrative Council and forwarded to the Faculty Council for further consideration. On June 5, 1962, the Faculty Council approved a revised statement, and, upon recommendation of the Council, this statement was adopted by the University’s Board of Trustees on July 13, 1962.

This booklet describes the selection, promotion, and tenure of those employees of The Ohio State University who hold faculty rank. Another publication outlines the policies and rules relating to the working conditions of civil service and comparable employees.

Definition of the University Faculty

The University Faculty is defined in Section 1 of Article IV of the By-laws of the Board of Trustees and in Rule 25.01 of the Rules for the University Faculty as follows:

* The University Faculty shall be constituted as follows: the President of the University; the members of the President’s Cabinet; the Deans; the Associate Deans, Assistant Deans and Secretaries of the Colleges and of the Graduate School; all persons with the faculty rank of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor (providing that persons holding the rank of Instructor have served the University on a Regular appointment in that rank for at least six quarters); all persons with the faculty rank of Professor Emeritus, Associate Professor Emeritus, and Assistant Professor Emeritus; the Director, Mershon Center for Education in National Security; the Director of Libraries; the Registrar; and the Director of Admissions.

* Revised by the Board of Trustees, July 13, 1962.
Part I

Principles of Tenure:
Statements of Privileges and Responsibilities

1. This University, through its Board of Trustees, has adopted Rules relating to tenure and to the privileges and responsibilities of persons holding faculty rank. These Rules are contained in a section on Rules for the University Faculty in the booklet, Statutes, By-Laws, Rules, which is available on request.

2. Those sections of the Rules relating to appointment and tenure include the following:

21.05 Election of Faculty and Staff; Tenure.*

The Board of Trustees shall annually elect the President, and all employees of the University not in the classified civil service. However, permanent tenure is an attribute of all academic ranks, subject to a period of probation as established by action of the Board of Trustees. It is terminable only by voluntary formal resignation, by retirement, by death, or for incompetence, grave misconduct or for the causes set forth in Rule 21.03.

Termination of tenure for incompetence, grave misconduct or for the causes set forth in Rule 21.03 shall be subject to the procedures outlined in Rule 21.07.

21.06 Appointments and Continuing Employment; Conditions Upon.*

Section 1. Upon nomination and recommendation by the President of the University, the Board of Trustees shall make all appointments to all positions within the University and approve the salaries therefor.

Section 2. All officers, teachers and other employees of The Ohio State University are required to take the following Oath of Allegiance as a condition of their initial appointment and continuing employment:

I, , do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Ohio against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office or position in which I am employed, so help me GOD.

Section 3. In defense of the freedom of those who teach and those who learn, and of the governmental system upon which such freedom is dependent, the conditions hereinafter set forth shall govern all initial appointments and continuing employment by the University.

It shall be sufficient cause for the removal of any officer, teacher or employee of the University, pursuant to the procedure set forth in Rule 21.07, that such officer, employee or teacher advocate, or have membership in an organization which is generally known to advocate the overthrow of the government of the United States, or of the State of Ohio, by force, violence or other unlawful means. (Reference is made to the provisions of Section 143.272, Ohio Revised Code.)

Furthermore, in the event that any officer, teacher or employee of The Ohio State University, called to testify before any legally constituted legislative committee or any court, refuses to testify concerning his membership in an organization which advocates overthrow of the government of the United States or of this State, by force, violence or other unlawful means, on the ground that his answers might tend to incriminate him under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, a hearing pursuant to the procedure set forth in Rule 21.07 shall be held to consider his fitness to retain such position in the University.

3. In Part II of this publication certain probationary periods are established for several faculty ranks. In determining the years under contract in these probationary periods, part-time service and service on Special contract will not be credited toward the attainment of tenure. For the purpose of this statement:

a. “Part-time service” is defined as less than 50% service to the University or to the University and to University-related units.

b. “Special contract” is defined as a contract given to a person whose appointment is temporary; while this temporary appointment may be renewed, it does not indicate permanence of appointment.

4. If termination of tenure is proposed on the grounds of incompetence, grave misconduct, or for the causes set forth in Rule 21.03 above, a procedure as set forth in the Rules for the University Faculty (see especially Rule 21.07) is to be followed.

5. The Rules for the University Faculty also contain a full statement of academic freedom and the responsibilities of those who teach and do research. That statement is contained in Rule 21.01:

21.01. Academic Freedom and Responsibility.*

Section 1. The Ohio State University favors the fullest academic freedom consistent with its educational program and with national security. It believes that steadfast adherence to the principles of free discussion and investigation, with correlative responsibility, is the cornerstone of such an institution in a free society; that the continued strength of the educational process depends upon an unqualified dedication to our traditional freedoms, and the preservation of the moral and intellectual integrity of the teacher. In the United States, in contrast to much of the world where doctrinaire propaganda, officially stated and enforced, is substituted for freedom of individual thought and expression, the molding of the lives

* Rule initiated by Board of Trustees.

* This pamphlet contains those periods of probation as established by the Board of Trustees.
of young people outside the family circle is largely entrusted to the church and the school, and this University holds inviolate the essential rights of the teacher. Honesty and objectivity, however, must always be cardinal principles in teaching, and only those who are free in conscience have the right to teach in a university which is founded upon the principle of intellectual integrity.

Section 2. A teacher, regardless of tenure in The Ohio State University, is entitled to freedom of research and publication, of classroom discussion of all matters relevant to the subject matter of his course, and of expression of opinion as a citizen, subject to the obligation to be accurate and to exercise appropriate restraint in accordance with the standards of his learned profession.

The teacher's privileges imply correlative responsibilities. In addition to maintaining those standards of competence set forth as minima for his rank, and particularly those relating to scholarship and teaching ability, the teacher also has the obligation to maintain the proper attitude of objectivity, conscientious industry and cooperation with his associates and the University. Further, he has the responsibility to refrain from introducing into his teaching controversial matter unrelated to his subject; and in making public statements, he has the responsibility to make it clear that he is not an institutional spokesman.

Part II

Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure

A. In General

1. Personnel administration related to persons having faculty rank is conducted primarily under the direction of Deans and Chairmen (Cf. Rule 13.0503). The appointment and subsequent periodic evaluation of persons with faculty rank for purposes of making tenure decisions, granting promotions, and determining salaries is a responsibility of Deans and Chairmen who maintain personnel records which include evaluative material for persons in their units.

2. The primary criteria to be used in appointing, promoting, and retaining persons having faculty rank are:
   a. Teaching ability and scholarship. This includes personal attributes of integrity, industry, open-mindedness, objectivity, capacity for leadership and cooperation.
   b. Research ability and its evidences, both published and unpublished.

In considering the selection, promotion, and retention of persons having faculty rank, rigid application of the criteria for each rank may not be practicable. The duties and responsibilities of individuals vary greatly and various criteria are of different importance in each individual position. The objective is to determine that a person with faculty rank reaches a level of performance in reasonable conformity with the requirements of a given rank as a prerequisite to tenure or promotion or appointment to that rank.

3. In certain of the faculty ranks set forth below a period of probation is established as a prerequisite to obtaining tenure. In general, the University will follow these periods. However, in exceptional cases and when the person involved has had prior service at or above the level of Instructor at this or another university or organization, such prior service may be included as part of the probationary period. This will be done only upon the written recommendation of the Dean of the College after consultation with the Chairman of the applicable department, the Dean of the Graduate School, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
4. In all cases the attainment of tenure is not automatic. It is earned in accordance with the University's rules relating to tenure and is acquired either in the original appointment or following the probationary period upon the recommendation of the Dean of the College after consultation with the Chairman of the applicable department, the Dean of the Graduate School, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Faculties.

Only units of Colleges, the Department of Physical Education, the Departments of Air Science, Military Science, and Naval Science, and the University Libraries may recommend appointment to the faculty ranks and to the following Special ranks: (a) Part-time designations, (b) Visiting designations, (c) Adjunct designations, and (d) Clinical designations. Appointees to these Special ranks may be accorded some faculty privileges, and appropriate parking privileges.

5. The details of each specific appointment to the University Faculty are outlined in the notice of appointment sent by the Board of Trustees to the appointee.

B. Faculty Ranks

Instructor

1. Attainment of faculty rank of Instructor is the first substantial step toward tenure at this University. Initial appointment to this faculty rank is necessarily with uncertain knowledge of fulfillment of many of the qualifications essential or desirable for permanent recognition. Accordingly initial appointments are made on a temporary basis.

2. Recommendations for appointment as an Instructor reflect the following requisites, capacities, and tenure provisions:

a. **Formal requisites**: Baccalaureate degree and Master's degree, or its equivalent, and at least three years of graduate study or of professional experience in the field in which the faculty rank is granted.

b. **Capacities**: Satisfactory evidence that the person being appointed possesses the capacity to develop and meet substantially the criteria listed in Part II, Section 2, of this publication.

c. **Tenure**: Before an Instructor will be granted tenure, a seven-year probationary period must be met. Service to University as an Instructor will be counted in meeting the probational requirement. During his seventh year of service the person involved will be informed by the Dean if he is to be granted tenure beginning with his eighth year of service. If tenure is not granted, his service with the University will be terminated at the end of that academic year and assistance will be given him toward securing a position elsewhere.

The University, through the appropriate Department Chairman, will make every effort to inform the person involved, during the fourth year of his service as an Instructor, as whether he is to be considered a candidate for tenure. If he is informed that he is not considered a candidate for tenure, services will be terminated at the end of the fourth year; assistance will be given him toward securing a position elsewhere.

The period of time described in this section may be adjusted in exceptional cases according to Part II, Section 3, of this publication.

Assistant Professor

Recommendations for appointment as an Assistant Professor reflect the following formal requisites, capacities, and tenure provisions:

a. **Formal requisites**: Ph.D. degree or its equivalent.

b. **Capacities**: Demonstrated evidence that the person being appointed possesses the capacity to meet substantially the criteria listed in Part II, Section 2, of this publication.

c. **Tenure**: Before an Assistant Professor will be granted tenure, a seven-year probationary period must be met. Service to University as an Instructor will be counted in meeting the probational requirement. During his seventh year of service the person involved will be informed by the Dean if he is to be granted tenure beginning with his eighth year of service. If tenure is not granted, his service with the University will be terminated and assistance will be given him toward securing a position elsewhere.

The University, through the appropriate Department Chairman, will make every effort to inform the person involved during the fourth year of his service to the University (including service as an Instructor), as whether he is to be considered for tenure. If he is informed that he is not considered a candidate for tenure, his services will be terminated at the end of the fourth year and assistance will be given him toward securing a position elsewhere.

The period of time described in this section may be adjusted in exceptional cases according to Part II, Section 3, of this publication.
Associate Professor

Recommendations for appointment as an Associate Professor reflect the following formal requisites, capacities, and tenure provisions:

a. Formal requisites: Ph.D. degree or its equivalent.

b. Capacities: Demonstrated evidence that the person being appointed meets substantially the criteria listed in Part II, Section 2, of this publication and that his growth will continue.

c. Tenure: A person promoted to Associate Professor from a lower faculty rank at this University will acquire tenure upon the effective date of his promotion.

A person appointed from outside of this University to Associate Professor shall normally serve a two-year probationary period. During his second year the person involved will be informed by the Dean if he is to be granted tenure beginning with his third year of service. If tenure is not granted, his services with the University will be terminated at the end of that academic year and assistance will be given him toward securing a position elsewhere.

The period of time described in this section may be adjusted in exceptional cases according to Part II, Section 3, of this publication.

Professor

Recommendations for appointment as a Professor reflect the following formal requisites, capacities, and tenure provisions:

a. Formal requisites: Ph.D. degree or its equivalent.

b. Capacities: Those of the next lower faculty rank and distinguished teaching or research work; consistent contributions to his chosen field of learning; high achievement in research and publication; outstanding contributions in the applicable professional field.

c. Tenure: Tenure is automatic upon promotion or appointment to this faculty rank.

Emeritus Status

A distinguished member of the University Faculty who has served The Ohio State University for at least ten years and who retires from this University may be appointed to Emeritus status upon the recommendation of the Chairman of his Department and the Dean of his College. Upon such appointment, his rank shall include the designation, "Emeritus."
Kuhn supports peer faculty tenure system

10 Nov 73

By Alan Goodman

University Provost Albert J. Kuhn warned Thursday that unless the University develops a long-range faculty tenure policy an all-tenured faculty will be produced depriving opportunities to young faculty members.

Kuhn told about 150 members of the University branch of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) he supported a faculty peer system of tenure decision, but asked that University departments use greater discretion in making tenure recommendations.

"We are facing great pressures of accountability at the current time, both in the face of shifting patterns of enrollment and in order to guarantee a high quality of education," he said.

"TENURE IS VITAL to the character of the University as we know it today, but we must find ways of improving our tenure procedures," Kuhn said.

Kuhn noted that until 1971 no list was kept of what faculty members were tenured in any department, as department offices added faculty every year and did not worry about quotas.

Kuhn said because the University budget and enrollment have stabilized in the last year this policy is no longer possible.

The Office of Academic Affairs which Kuhn heads asked all University departments in October to employ the following criteria in tenuring faculty:

• All department deans or department tenure review committees should take particular care to promote the best possible candidates;
• Promotion should rarely be granted before the faculty member's fourth or fifth year of teaching (It must now either be granted or denied by the seventh year);
• Departments should not promote faculty who do not have the advanced degrees appropriate to their departments.
• Early retirement programs for older tenured faculty should be encouraged.

Kuhn said he hoped such guidelines would lead to a more balanced faculty of tenured and non-tenured members, but admitted he did not know what a reasonable percentage of tenured faculty would be.

He also defined the role the Office of Academic Affairs should play in tenure decisions, which came under fire from some faculty as depriving them of making tenure decisions.

Kuhn said his office should play a leadership role in making tenure recommendations to University President Harold Earnerston, and in turn to the Board of Trustees.

KUHN DENIED he has overruled many department tenure recommendations and did not say how often over-rulings occur.
Faculty duties unclear after 3 years of study; handbook release near

By Ellen Schneider

A statement of faculty teaching responsibilities drawn up almost three years ago is still being juggled among committees and may not be finalized in time to be included in the 1973-74 Faculty Handbook.

The Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) will decide whether the statement will go in the handbook which will come out Winter Quarter George Crepeau, associate provost in the OAA, said.

The decision "won't be an arbitrary one," but will be based on responses from several University groups, Crepeau said.

THE STATEMENT originally was drawn up by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, which was created after the 1970 spring disturbances, and presented to the Faculty Council for approval in April 1971.

Since then, the committee has dealt with the statement primarily as an advisory group making suggestions to OAA.

The committee defined faculty responsibilities in terms of academic fields, students, colleagues, the institution and the community.

The statement could be made "through almost anybody," Crepeau said, but the OAA has "been concerned with it since we began attempting to revise the Faculty Handbook about a year ago."

CREPEAU WOULD not release a copy of the drafts of the statement because "it's still developing and it isn't ready to be publicized."

Teaching responsibilities are now defined under University Rule 20.01, which is also under proposed revision. The instructor must maintain principles of "honesty and objectivity" and competent standards for his rank.

He must also "refrain from introducing into his teaching controversial matter unrelated to his subject" and when speaking publicly, make clear that he isn't a University spokesman.

The teaching responsibilities statement will amplify and call attention to the existing rules, Crepeau said.

THE NEW statement is needed because the University rules are "too general and not all-inclusive," said Bernard Rosen, chairman of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

Rosen said he thinks the teaching responsibilities statement should come through "whatever democratic means we have," which is University Senate, instead of through the OAA.

The Faculty Council rejected the committee's proposed statement in April 1971 and instructed the committee to reformulate it, said Salvatore Marco, then chairman of the committee.

The committee redrafted it and submitted it to the OAA because the provost wanted University counsel to examine it, said 1971-72 committee chairman William Morris.

VIRGINIA VIVIAN, who chaired the committee in 1972-73, said the committee looked at several drafts of the statement and sent its suggestions back to the OAA last spring. "We haven't seen anything from them," she said.

Crepeau said the statement is "not that big" to warrant sending to all faculty members before it's finalized.

"If we were to send it out to all the faculty members, we'd never have one, or it would be so long that no one would read it," he said.

"It's simply a statement of what is."
More emphasis placed on creative work

Faculty tenure rules to stiffen

By Ed McGranaghan
18 Jan 74

Due to the increasing percentage of tenured faculty at the University, tenure procedures are tightening considerably.

Albert J. Kuhn, provost of the Office of Academic Affairs, is in charge of reviewing all tenure and promotion recommendations made by the departments and colleges and has criticized the situation.

Kuhn, in an Oct. 4 memo to the deans of the colleges, expressed some dissatisfaction with the 1973 review of candidates at the departmental and college levels.

"Some units did an outstanding job," the memo said. "However in a few other — and these were often the areas from which the mere number of nominations appeared to exceed good judgment — the documentation was quite weak and there was little evidence of care and responsibility in the decisions reached prior to submission."

Kuhn's concern stems from the rising percentage of tenured faculty at Ohio State. The percentage of total faculty with tenure rose 3 per cent in 1973. "If the present trend were to continue," according to the memo, "the University faculty would be over 75 per cent tenured in four years."

Sixty-three per cent of the current regular faculty are tenured, according to Kuhn.

The memo also said, "five colleges would be about 90 per cent tenured four years from now if this trend were to continue."

In a Nov. 15 speech to the Ohio State University chapter of the American Association of University Professors, Kuhn said, "It is generally agreed that a serious consequence of an over-tenured faculty is the loss of vitality and flexibility in academic programs and personnel."

John Gabel, chairman of the Department of English, said there is "no question" tenure procedures have tightened up. "Last year and this year it's gotten much tighter."

Although Kuhn was not specific, it was suggested by two sources that the Department of English was one of the "units" criticized by Kuhn in the memo.

"It could very well be that this referred to us," Gabel said. "It may very well be that in the past our standards have been lax."

Gabel said he was confident the department had done "a better job of documentation" in regards to their 1974 tenure and promotion nominations.

Tenure is, to a great extent, job security for faculty. Obviously the people most affected when tenure becomes harder to get are untenured faculty members.

The untenured people, according to Gabel, are getting "shaky" over tenure. "They were caught in a cruel time — two years ago they would not have been in this position."

The Department of History was also named by sources as another one of the "units" criticized by Kuhn in the memo.

Marvin R. Zahniser, chairman of the department, agreed with Gabel. "Those without tenure are aware of the greater expectations involved with getting tenure," he said.

One of the "criteria" for judging tenure candidates listed in the Oct. 4 memo is "research and creative work." "Publications in research and other creative accomplishments should be evaluated, not merely enumerated," the memo states.

Concerning scholarly publication as a tenure requirement, Gabel said, "Within the past two years that requirement has become more pronounced."

"There is no question," he said, "that we shall be losing some good teachers here because they have not published substantially."

Kuhn said the evaluation of research and creative work has become more "rigorous."

"I think that good teachers have to evidence mastery of their field both in their teaching and in their research," he said. "I think the excellent teacher will manifest creativity in the classroom and elsewhere."

More than half the colleges have submitted their 1974 faculty nominations. "We're confident the (1974) documentation was much better," Kuhn said.
Students seek voice

The first steps toward placing students on the University tenure and promotion committee were made last Wednesday when Undergraduate Student Government (USG) Student Assembly unanimously passed a representation resolution.

A committee of Student Assembly members will now be formed under USG president Dennis Sargent to work on implementation of the resolution.

The resolution, presented by Les "line, a North Campus representative, said "recent tenure decisions reflect a disregard for student opinion and a de-emphasis on good teaching as basis for promotion and tenure."

Cline, a senior from Lake Milton, said student evaluations, which are used to review a teacher's performance, are not substitutes for representation on the tenure committee.

"Students are only able to testify for a teacher and there seems to be a disregard for student opinion by the committee," Cline said.

Albert J. Kuhn, provost of the Office of Academic Affairs, said he is not in favor of student representation.

He explained that evaluation of a faculty member for tenure involves six or seven years of research and students could not give a complete evaluation.

Kuhn added that student evaluations of faculty members are welcome as far as personality and teaching abilities are concerned. He said these evaluations would go into the reports of the tenure committee.
Quality of professor’s publications questioned

Denial of Boyd tenure arouses controversy

By Mike Allen
17 Feb '76

Last November Carl Boyd, an assistant professor of history, received a terse, four-sentence letter from Marvin Zahniser, chairman of the Department of History. It read, in part, "...you will not be granted tenure and your appointment will not be renewed after 30 September 1976." With that letter, Boyd said, "My whole world came crashing in around me."

When Boyd questioned Zahniser about the adverse decision, as suggested by the letter, Zahniser reported that although Boyd’s teaching was rated as "excellent," and his service to the betterment of the department and University rated "good to very good," the quality of his work accepted for publication was not rated so highly by the Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T) of the department, Boyd said.

BOYD’S SITUATION since then has stirred up controversy among his present and former students. Some believe he has been unfairly treated by the department. During the deliberations, at least five students wrote unsolicited letters to the committee in support of Boyd.

Doug King, undergraduate representative to the Department of History, said, "Boyd’s case has drawn more students to me than anything.

King said, "The general attitude seems to be, ‘He’s a hell of a teacher, and now he’s gone.’ I had him for one course, and I think he’s a hell of a teacher. He’s hard, but he gets his point across."

"THE STUDENTS want quality teachers, and they seem to feel Boyd is a quality teacher," King added.

Student evaluation forms bear this out, but in tenure considerations student evaluations are not always considered as important as other factors such as scholarly achievement.

Arthur Adams, dean of the College of Humanities, said, "I feel the forms are important. I've put out a directive here that I won't consider pay increases or promotion or tenure for an individual without significant student input. Now that leaves the question of what is 'significant' to the people to whom the directive was sent."

MARY JANE O’BRIEN, a former student who wrote to the P&T Committee, called the 38-year-old Boyd "an outstanding teacher."

"I’ve gone here for five years," she said. "Only twice have I seen a professor applauded in class. One of those professors was Carl Boyd. I felt it was a shame to lose someone of his caliber."

Another student who wrote to the committee, Malcolm Muir, a former graduate student, said he felt Boyd "was a fine teacher and an asset to the University. He was willing to spend a lot of time with me that he didn’t have to spend."

Zahniser refused to discuss individual cases. "I’m not about to do it because of my own rules," he said.

He stated that any candidate is given a chance to respond to negative evidence presented to the P&T Committee.

HOWEVER, BOYD responded, "Since I was never told of any negative evidence, I was lead to believe all the evidence was in my favor."

The tenure procedure is lengthy and can be appealed at the department, college, and university faculty levels, Adams said. But Boyd feels the judgment is final.

He said, "Dean Adams has indicated he would be happy to review my case if any new evidence is presented. But I’ve already given them all the evidence available."

"The only answer I have received is that I simply did not present enough evidence in a quality sense concerning my development as a scholar," he said. "It’s going to be very difficult to prove otherwise. It’s chiseled in granite."

"I'M NOT trying to be a martyr," Boyd said. "I've put a lot of time and concern into this university. I just want to point out to others who may someday be in my situation that there are certain structural weaknesses in the system as a whole."

Boyd feels there were procedural problems with the way his case was handled.

He notes that although the six-member P&T Committee is the original deliberating body, the entire tenured faculty votes on the P&T recommendation.

Their recommendation is then sent to the chairman of the department. The department’s statement on ‘futurity’ and promotion says, "...each tenured faculty member shall examine the documentation used by the committee in formulating its recommendation."

Of that group of faculty members, Boyd says he knows at least one was out of town and did not receive any documentation about his case. The member, however, told Boyd he had voted on the case without the documentation.

ZAHNISER would not release the P&T Committee vote or the tenured faculty vote to Boyd or the Lantern.

Among evidence Boyd presented to the committee of his scholarly activity were copies of seven of his articles published in various historical publications and 50 book reviews.

Most of the reviews were published in “Choice.”

On April 10, 1974, “Choice” history editor Louise Lockwood sent Zahniser a letter stating, “We consider Professor Boyd an excellent reviewer, who evaluates books intelligently, literately and succinctly.”

Boyd also presented to the committee a list of outside referees to whom the committee could solicit for information. One of these referees was a prominent military historian with the Department of the Army who the Committee did solicit.

THE HISTORIAN sent Boyd a letter which noted that his assessment of Boyd’s work was sent the same day. Boyd’s letter from the historian was received the day before the full tenured faculty meeting, after the committee’s decision. This indicates, Boyd said, that the P&T Committee did not have a proper opportunity to study the historian’s re-
spone, even though they had solicited it.

Zahniser said although he does not stand by and monitor members of the committee, the members discuss the evidence carefully in meetings, and, "If they haven't done their homework, this quickly comes out in the conversation."

"They can't arrive at a just recommendation unless they have read all the materials," he added.

Of the six P&T Committee members at that time, one is on leave and one was unavailable for comment. Of the other four, including committee chairman Franklin Pegues, only one would comment on Boyd's case.

ALLAN MILLETT, professor of history, said, "I think the feeling was that his published work did not augur out to the accepted standards of the department."

Millet said he is one of Boyd's "personal friends and backers," and that his teaching is "quite good."

However, he stated, "My impression is that his case was looked at very, very carefully."

What bothers Boyd most is that his tenure recommendation was denied primarily on the basis of the quality of his publications. The department statement notes, "In evaluating publications and manuscripts accepted for publication, considerations of quality will take precedence over those of quantity."

Boyd, a specialist in European and Japanese military history, said, "Who is to say what quality is, particularly when people are judging quality in material in which they have no particular expertise?"

Boyd pointed out that only one member of the committee was a specialist in military history.

BOYD WAS appointed as a temporary instructor for three years in 1969. In 1972, he was made an assistant professor.

The early instructorship was understood by Boyd and the department to be temporary; however, in a May, 1973 letter from Zahniser, Boyd was told for the first time that his instructorship would be counted as years of service in tenure review.

From 1969-72, Boyd was not eligible to apply for Assigned Research Duty (ARD) because of his temporary status. ARD allows time off from teaching duties for research.

He applied for ARD during Autumn Quarter, 1974, when he was considered for tenure, but was rejected automatically when the adverse decision was made. Thus, Boyd was given no time off from teaching duties to do research.

"The simple transition to professorship from instructorship without the aid of ARD, which might have resulted in a substantial increase in my publications, is the essence of the problem," Boyd said.

"IN THE FIRST place, I was here for the first three years with the explicit agreement that I would not be here any longer," he said. "Knowing I would not be considered on a permanent basis, I concentrated on my classroom work and the completion of my Ph.D. dissertation."

Boyd said that if he had known his instructorship would be counted, he would have spent more time on research for publications.

Boyd isn't sure now of his future plans, but said, "I'd like to remain in the classroom. I get the most enjoyment from teaching in working with students, but then so do a lot of other teachers."

On staying at Ohio State in some other capacity, Boyd said, "There seems to be no possibility. Because I've soaked five and a half years of genuine concern into the student body, that seems like the type of investment I'd like to follow up on if I had the chance, but obviously I don't."

BOYD IS not alone in his predicament. Colleges across the country are trying to cut down on tenured faculty as student enrollment drops. Zahniser, however, said there was no particular problem in the Department of History.

"Right now we're about 60 to 65 percent tenured," he said. "This isn't excessive in comparison with many departments on campus. Some are 80 or 90 percent tenured."

Adams said that because of the current economic situation, "A lot of professors are hanging in there now. We're trying to keep as many as possible."

"THE SITUATION is very difficult," he added. "There's a general feeling that you've got to have new blood coming in. This presents a problem in terms of what to do with older tenured faculty. It's difficult, and quite frankly, I don't think anyone in the country knows how to handle it."

Boyd has his own opinion of the way the problem of a too-tenured faculty is often handled. "The tragedy of it all, and I'm thinking broadly not personally, is that the most expedient way to do this is to give the hatchet to those coming up the departmental ladder. This prevents young blood and fresh ideas from developing a department," he said.
Kuhn says tenure nominees improved '74 documentation

By Candy Steinbach

Although four colleges are still to be reviewed, the 1974 nominations for faculty tenure and promotion were more carefully prepared at the departmental level than in the past, said Albert Kuhn, provost of the Office of Academic Affairs.

"There was much, much better documentation this year," Kuhn said. Documentation for a nomination included a recommendation from the dean of the college, a resume of the nominee and his career and student evaluations of his teaching ability.

There were also letters from students and people outside the University evaluating the instructor's work outside the classroom.

For some nominations, the instructor's colleagues visited his classroom to evaluate his teaching ability. Examples of his work outside class were also included for some, Kuhn added.

Kuhn said that in the effort to document the nominations, some departments appeared to "mail" them. "Some included everything possible and even threw in the kitchen sink, and I'm not necessarily referring to the home economics college," he said.

There really was not much padding, but those nominations with excessive material were called to the attention of the deans, he added.

"The evaluation process has been rigorous. Generally, it is clear that the whole process has slowed down the rate of tenure and promotion," Kuhn said. The final figures showing how much the rate has slowed have not been calculated.

The Council on Academic Affairs is only monitoring the thoroughness with which the departments considered and granted tenure and promotion, Kuhn said.

"On the whole, it has been gratifying to see that the guidelines for tenure, and promotion that we've worked on for the past three years has been considered and followed," he said.

He said the reviewing is a long process because there are 16 academic colleges and some of those have as many as 10 departments.
Student input stressed in tenure re-evaluations

25 Feb '74
By Kathy Hyett
and Candy Steinbach

A re-evaluation of faculty tenure guidelines to include more student response is being carried out by Undergraduate Student Government (USG) and the University Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

At the Jan. 30 Student Assembly meeting of USG, it was resolved that "recent tenure decisions reflect a disregard for student opinion and a de-emphasis on good teaching as basis for promotion and tenure." (Assembly Bill #3)

Dennis Sargent, USG president, was authorized to form a special tenure committee to study the implementation of this committee.

"The committee represents a cross section of interest," Pam Dizikes, chairman said.

"The committee is seeking new ways in which we can accomplish student input into the tenure," Sargent said.

"The committee is actually an ad hoc committee," Dizikes said. "The purpose is to come out with documentations and proposals ."

"We may intend to gain access to department tenure committees," Dizikes said. "We also plan on talking to faculty members who have felt the sting and students who are frustrated with present tenure procedures. We also plan to evaluate other universities' tenure procedures."

"The big thing that brought the issue home is that good teachers are not getting tenure," Dizikes said. The basic guidelines for establishing tenure are teaching ability, research and publication and opinion.

The only source of student input has been student evaluations.

"It is imperative that we have student representation. The question is who is making the decisions," Dizikes said.

Albert J. Kuhn, provost of the Office of Academic Affairs, has said, "Professionals must decide who the real professionals are."

When asked about the ad hoc committee, Kuhn told the Lantern the committee should approach the different departments because "it is the departments who determine the precise role students play in the tenure and promotion process."

"Nobody has the single answer about the appropriate role students play in the process. We (the Office of Academic Affairs) have done our part by requiring student evaluations in with tenure and promotion nominations," Kuhn said.
USG assembly debates recent tenure position

27 Feb '94

By Kathy Hyett

The Faculty Tenure Ad Hoc Committee, formed by a resolution of Undergraduate Student Government (USG), met Monday for the first time to decide documentation procedures on recent tenure policy.

"We represent a diverse population," said Pam Dzikies, chairman of the committee. "It is imperative that we have student representation on tenure committees," she said.

The three criteria used in determining tenure are teaching ability, research and publication and opinion.

"There is too little weight placed on teaching ability," Cindy Cottingham, assembly member said.

"Teaching ability should be the most important thing. The only person who can decide that is the student."

' Easily manipulated'

"The Council of Graduates is now polling for opinion on this," said Jim Parson, president of graduate students. "We feel that there should not be student representation. As much could be accomplished if the University set up new evaluation forms to be used as student input."

"A graduate student may not want to be in such a position," Parson said. "If they voted against a faculty member on tenure, that member could vote against them on oral exams."

"The problem with the present Student Evaluation Teaching forms (SET) is that they are too easily manipulated," Parson said.

"It's a question of the validity of the SET forms and how they are used and whether or not there could be other modes of presentation," Dzikies said.

At present, the SET forms are the only source of student input. The possibility of extending the documentation to include student representation on selection committees was considered.

"This would involve getting good teachers in the first place," Dzikies said.

Tricky footing

"The resolution (Assembly Bill 31) defines the problem as a student problem," Dzikies said. "Does this also affect faculty? What about the case where assistant professors' lives are at stake?" she asked.

"It's ridiculous to turn a person away after six years with no good replacement because you can't keep them at the assistant professor level," said Alan Silverman, representative from Arts and Sciences Honor Council.

"Trying to document cases where faculty have been stung is going to be the trickiest footing," Silverman said.

Assembly Bill 31 also resolves that "the Ohio State University require voting representation of students on all tenure and promotion committees."

"Student opinion is too important," Cottingham said. "We should be given voting privilege."
Tenure question is meeting topic

By Kathy Hytet

At the second informal meeting of the Office of Academic Affairs and representatives of Undergraduate Student Government (USG) and the Graduate Student Council, questions of tenure and a student evaluation booklet were discussed.

In view of the present controversy over student representation on faculty tenure committees, Albert J. Kuhn, provost for the Office of Academic Affairs, suggested that the students put the pressure on the individual departments for representation.

"There are 88 departments," Kuhn said, "and 16 different colleges. Each has a different discipline. The recommendation for promotion or tenure starts at the department level."

There are structured committees in each department that make recommendations to the committee chairman for promotion and tenure, Kuhn explained. The chairman of those committees has the responsibility to keep a record of the teacher's performance in their departments.

The recommendation then goes to the committee. If it passes there, it must be approved at the college level. Kuhn, along with the chairman of that department and the dean of that college, put the final recommendation together.

Each recommendation must include recommendations from the chairman, a resume, evidence of research and instructional service and evidence of teaching ability. A person is automatically brought up for tenure at the end of six years. If they do not receive tenure, they are not rehired. Approximately 350 cases are brought up for tenure each year.

"I have said that professionals should evaluate professionals," Kuhn said. "This does not exclude student evaluation. The Student Evaluation of Teacher forms are not the only source of student input."

"The English Department uses an evaluation from the American Association of University Professors. Other colleges, such as The College of the Arts, and the physics and history departments, use their own evaluation form. If a college sends us a recommendation without student documentation, it is sent back to the college," Kuhn said.

"The evaluations differ because of the area involved," Kuhn said, "You can't put medicine and English into the same mold."

"There is too much emphasis on books and not enough on teaching ability," Sharon Farmer, vice-president of USG, said. "Only students can judge that."

"The thing that all of the 88 colleges have in common is that they all have students," Dennis Sargent, president of USG, said. "The student should be viable in evaluating."

"There is emphasis on teaching," Kuhn said. He pointed out that teaching ability is first on the criteria of the recommendation forms. "Research potential must be also considered."

"If research shows up in teaching, then we are talking about teaching," George Crepeau, provost of instruction, said.

"It is not I who decides if the student will vote," Kuhn said, "but the individual departments."

"Teaching is an art for which there is no body of critical judgement. It's a value judgement. It's not as simple as just having a student vote."

"We need a broad base to pull from," Kathryn Schoen, assistant provost for faculty, said. "We are working to get as much input as possible."

The evaluation has to be representative of the six year period," Kuhn said. "A student can't evaluate one course for a 30-year tenure."
Students present tenure report

By Kathy Hyett

The subject of student input on tenure committees met with disapproval, indignation, and concern at the Council of Deans meeting Thursday.

Cynthia Cottingham, USG ad hoc committee on tenure member, presented the committee’s present findings to the deans.

The ad hoc committee was formed to investigate present tenure procedures and their validity. At present, professors are considered for tenure after six years of full time teaching. They are considered on the basis of teaching ability, research and publication and peer opinion. The committee is studying the impact and absence of student input in the procedure.

“We (the committee) have been informed that there is a greater emphasis on teaching than in the past,” Cottingham said. “I hope that is true. We are suggesting more student emphasis on tenure considerations.”

“We feel that there is too much emphasis placed on graduate teaching,” Cottingham said. “Undergraduate students’ needs are different.”

“In most cases, the same teachers teach graduate courses as teach undergraduate,” Albert Kuhn, provost of the Office of Academic Affairs, said.

“Research is stressed more on graduate levels,” Cottingham said. “There are people who prefer to teach and there are those who prefer to do research.”

“This is a fundamental misconception,” Kuhn said. “My gripe is that there are teachers doing fantastic research and crummy teaching.” Cottingham said. “We, as students sitting in classrooms with professors who shouldn’t be there.”

The question of judging teacher quality was discussed. “Just because a teacher is courteous and eloquent in class doesn’t mean that he is a quality teacher,” Henry Cramblett, dean of the College of Medicine, said.

“You can’t understand the quality of teaching without understanding the body of knowledge,” Arliss Roaden, dean of the graduate school, said.

“I think that faculty should evaluate research but students should be the ones to evaluate teaching,” Cottingham said. “I don’t think that faculty members are in other teachers’ classes enough to evaluate them on that criteria.”

“You are setting research off as something different from teaching,” Arthur Adams, dean of humanities, said. “The point of teaching has to be the quality of knowledge in the classroom. You can’t separate them.”

“Reading books and journals does not bring precision in knowledge,” Adams said. “It has to be put down in writing.”

“I suggest that you look at tenure history,” Roaden said. “The outstanding teacher awards are nominated by students.”

“We have been in school 13 or 14 years. I think that we have some expertise in judging teaching quality.”

“The point of the discussion here is for us to try and understand each other better. It seems that students are passing resolutions without adequate knowledge of procedure,” Kuhn said.
Tenure figures fall

By Candy Steinbach

28 March 1974

A 21 per cent drop was shown in the number of 1974 faculty tenure and promotion nominations as compared to the 1973 figures.

In the memo from the Office of Academic Affairs sent to all deans, Albert J. Kuhn, provost of the Office of Academic Affairs, said 91 per cent of those nominations were approved as compared to 85 per cent the previous year. There were 328 nominations submitted this year, a decrease of 88 from 1972-73.

Tenure is a guarantee of permanent employment for full time faculty members, usually assigned after a probation period of seven years at the member’s academic rank.

Tenure hard to end

Once granted, tenure cannot be terminated unless the faculty member resigns, dies, is proved incompetent, commits some grave misconduct or violates his loyalty oath to the University.

Tenure is based upon the faculty member’s teaching ability, scholarship ability, research and publication. "Colleges and departments were more selective in the process of recommending nominees," Kuhn said. "Those they recommended had stronger documentation and were recommended more fully, clearly and compellingly."

Six per cent decrease

Only nine per cent (31) of the nominations were denied or returned to the colleges, a decrease of six per cent from 1972-73.

A part of those recommendations will come up next year because they were judged "premature" or "early," Kuhn said.
Problems surround tenure decisions

17 APR 74
By Lisa Holstein

Tenure:
Most people on campus can throw the word "tenure" about in intelligent conversation, but even faculty members may not have a full understanding of what it is, where it started, and what the rationale behind the concept is.

Tenure is defined in the policy documents and reports of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) as "a means to a certain end: specifically:
"(1) Freedom of teaching and research and of extra-mural activities and,
"(2) A sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability."

The implications of tenure, however, have gone beyond the cut-and-dried definition. Controversy has arisen over the consequences of too many tenured faculty members in an institution, both on the University's budget and on the shifting enrollment patterns.

The possibility that tenure may be safe ground, behind which incompetence can be hidden has been argued, and recently, at Ohio State, there has been agitation for student representation on tenure committees.

Experts decide:
Resistance to student representation on tenure committees is on the grounds that students do not have the scholarly background and expertise to pass judgment on the abilities of a tenure nominee.

Kathryn T. Schoen, associate provost in the Office of Academic Affairs which reviews all tenure recommendations, said, "We don't in this office, decide who will be tenured in chemistry because we are not chemistry experts.

"It would be wrong for us to make that decision and impose unqualified people on the qualified teachers.

Student opinion does count in tenure decisions. Tenure at Ohio State today is based on the faculty member's teaching ability, scholarship ability, research and publication.

These criteria differ from those demanded of the earliest university faculties, who could remain "masters in good standing" even without conducting a class.

Definition changed:
The most significant common idea is that only experts can be the judges of expertise. In many departments, Schoen said, only the faculty members with the most seniority sit on tenure committees.

Today the ability to relate knowledge to students counts heavily in tenure recommendations. Teaching performance is the first criterion listed in qualifications for tenure in the University Faculty Handbook (FHB).

Schoen stressed that student evaluations are important in tenure judgments, but "only a part of the total process.

"We want input from a lot of different sources so the data base is broad," Schoen said. The data base includes not only evaluations by classes as a group, but unsolicited letters written by students opinions of graduates, people in the field and "scholarly peers" who have observed the candidate's teaching ability.

Schoen said a tenure candidate's file should contain an "orderly review over a period of time."

The probationary period, normally seven years, is expected to provide the needed "broad data base" for making judgments. If during that time, scholarly ability is not proven, the teacher's contract is not renewed. In other words, a teacher moves "up or out," Schoen added.

Lifetime job:
Once tenure is granted a faculty member may remain with the University for life, being "moved out" only on the grounds of proven incompetence, serious misconduct, or violation of his loyalty oath to the University, according to the FHB.

This lifetime right to employment was not won without a fight. As explained in "Academic Freedom and Tenure" by George Joughin, in January, 1913, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) was formed to undertake the gradual formulation of general principles respecting the tenure of the professional office and the legitimate grounds for the dismissal of professors.

Up until that time, professors served for life at the "pleasure" of lay controllers and trustees. Scholars feared dissmissals were often attacks on academic freedom "officially disguised as something else," according to Joughin's book.

In 1913, a professor resigned at the order of the president of Wesleyan because of a speech in which he urged "less rigid observance of the Sabbath and the subordination of church-going to good works," the book added.

His statements were judged to be "far out of harmony with the spirit of the college which is profoundly in sympathy with the Christian churches."

Denial of rights:
He and other professors had not only been denied their constitutional right to freedom of speech, they were denied pre-dismissal hearings and were refused review of their cases by courts of law, according to Joughin's book.

The protection of academic freedom became a foremost goal of the AAUP. They sought to make dismissal process judicial and investigations a professional obligation conducted in a professional way.

It wasn't until 1940 that the idea of judicial tenure began to gain in favor among college presidents, but the idea seems well-entrenched today. The burden of proof in judging competence of a tenured faculty member lies now with the administration and ulterior motives for removal are harder to disguise, the book explained.

The AAUP statement of 1940, still accepted today along with the revisions, further describes tenure as "indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society."

Flexibility vital:
But another part of that obligation is vitality and flexibility in academic programs and personnel, both of which could be lost through over-tenured faculty, says Albert J. Kuhn, Provost of the Office for Academic Affairs.

Speaking in 1973 to an OSU-AAUP meeting, Kuhn said that 51 faculty members were granted tenure that
year, an increase of 3 per cent of total tenured faculty. If the present trends continue, the University faculty in four years will be 75 per cent tenured, and five individual colleges would be 90 per cent tenured.

Kuhn said, “We must resist the natural tendency toward a fully tenured faculty.” He cited the need for “young colleagues” in providing “new ideas, fresh outlooks and enthusiasm.” An overtenured faculty could have consequences on the University budget through lifetime commitments to employment that may in the future be impossible to meet and may affect the very foundation of tenure itself.

**Shaky future**

As a case in point, the guarantee of lifetime employment received a setback due to falling enrollments when the University of Wisconsin System was forced to “lay off” over 80 tenured faculty members — with faculty concurrence.

The potential for repetitions of this action in the face of unstable enrollments and limited university budgets is still there.

Tenure as a tradition and tenure as a judicial right has come under attack from many quarters. As a guarantee of permanent employment, its future may be as shaky as the economic condition of the nation.

But as a guarantee of academic freedom, tenure is a well established and respected tradition.

The historical privilege of scholars and the imperatives of the AAUP are supported by the University’s policy on tenure, which according to Kuhn is “vital to the nature of academic life, vital to the character of the university as we know it today and want it to be.”
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15 May 1974

Mr. William Rounds
News and Information Service
108 Administration Building
Campus

Dear Bill,

In response to your inquiry of the other day concerning which members of the faculty served the longest active tenures the following information is provided:

Joseph N. Bradford 1885-1936 51 years
James A. Pollard 1923-1973 50 years
Francis P. Weisenburger 1924-1974 50 years
Charles Wells Reeder 1906-1955 49 years
William McPherson 1892-1940 48 years
Alpheus W. Smith 1909-1957 48 years
Thomas E. French 1895-1942 47 years
George W. Eckelberry 1915-1962 47 years
Frank C. Caldwell 1893-1939 46 years
Elvin F. Donaldson 1925-1971 46 years
John C. Wilce 1913-1958 45 years
Thomas B. Haber 1924-1969 45 years
Adolph E. Waller 1918-1963 45 years

In addition to these faculty members, it should be pointed out that three administrators had exceptionally long tenures of service.

William C. McCracken 1886-1946 60 years
Carl Steeb 1899-1958 59 years
Edith Cockins 1895-1944 49 years

Sincerely,

[signature]

William J. Vollmar
University Archivist

WJV/d
Tenure described as job security

Tenure is a concept described by various sources as "job security," "academic freedom," and a "method of keeping senile professors out of the unemployment lines."

Specific policies for granting tenure vary within individual departments, but according to the University Faculty Handbook, all policies are based on the faculty member's teaching ability, scholarship, research and publication.

In the Department of History, the policies are spelled out in the department's "Revised Statement on Faculty Retention and Promotion of Spring 1974."

DEPARTMENT chairman Marvin Zahniser said the policies are designed to insure that "if a person is clearly a superior scholar and teacher and has a genuine service record to the department and university, he will be granted tenure."

A faculty member is reviewed in his fourth year of service. If the review is favorable, he is considered for tenure in his sixth year of service.

THE DEPARTMENT chairman appoints a six-member Promotion and Tenure Committee consisting of four full professors and two associate professors. This committee evaluates the evidence presented by the candidate, then returns a recommendation to a meeting of the full tenured faculty.

The faculty votes, then recommends to the department chairman what they think his action should be. His recommendation is then sent to the Dean of the College of Humanities. All faculty members and the chairman must thoroughly study all evidence before voting and all members must vote.

"AFTER ALL this, it's quite clear that if a person is not meeting his teaching obligations, he will not be granted tenure," Zahniser said.

The dean of the College of Humanities studies each case, then sends his recommendation to the Office of Academic Affairs with documentation. The office makes the final decision, then the department chairman notifies the candidate.

Each case must be thoroughly documented by the candidate. This documentation includes evidence of his performance as a teacher, development as a scholar, and development as a member of the department and the university, according to the department's statement.

CANDIDATES present evidence concerning their teaching performance including evaluation forms from students and faculty, testimony from colleagues and results of visitations to the candidate's classes by members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. In addition, the committee may solicit evidence, such as personal interviews with the candidate.

As evidence of scholarly development, the candidate includes his publications, reviews of works for journals and other pertinent materials.
Tenure-granting study closes after year of detailed research

By Mike Allen

The Student Assembly Ad Hoc Tenure Committee has concluded there is a lack of emphasis on teaching qualifications and a lack of student input in tenure considerations in relation to the weight put on research.

The conclusions were reached following the committee's year-long study of tenure-granting procedures at Ohio State.

The report is being completed for presentation to Student Assembly by committee spokesmen Dennis Bechtel, a senior from Fredericktown, and Cindy Cottingham, a senior from Akron.

Cottingham said, "Many people think we have forgotten this issue because we have been studying it for so long, but we wanted to make sure we did enough research to make valid conclusions."

Cottingham said the committee was repeatedly told by administrators that undergraduates are not competent enough to judge the value of a professor.

She said at a Council of Deans meeting last year, she was told "by several deans" that undergraduates "just can't decide who is a good teacher.

"One dean told me that if a faculty member can't tell good jokes in class, we would think he's a good teacher. They think we can't distinguish between a good and a poor instructor," she said.

Bernard Rosen, associate professor of philosophy, was chairman of the USG Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility which studied tenure last year. The committee released its results in November.

BECHTEL SAID the Rosen committee came to three basic conclusions — there is an increase in student input in tenure considerations, there is no de-emphasis on teaching and all evidence of good teaching ability is considered.

Tenure considerations are based on the candidate's teaching ability, research and service to the University and community.

Cottingham said, "Kuhn has told us time and time again that teaching is considered equally with research. We have found it's just not that way."

SHE ADDED, "In most cases where there has been a controversy over a tenure decision, it's where research has been given the upper hand. It's never the other way around."

The tenure committee contacted college deans and departmental chairs through personal interviews or questionnaires. They held a hearing for student opinions, studied records of other universities and exchanged information with other committees including Rosen's. They also contacted faculty members and reviewed books and articles on tenure.

Bechtel said, "In short, I think it's been very well researched. That's why it's taken us this long."

THE COMMITTEE felt the Rosen committee was not specific enough. To that committee's claim that there is an increase in student input, Cottingham replied, "That is true, because years ago they didn't even have student evaluation forms. But they have also increased the need for research and publication, so that cancels out the added importance of student input."

"Basically, we think they're not intentionally de-emphasizing teaching," she said. "But by increasing research, this has also happened."

The committee has suggested five recommendations to make tenure decisions more responsive to the student body:

- Teaching should be judged equally with research.
- Students should vote on tenure committees.
- Publications should be de-emphasized or disregarded.
- There should be established a mechanism for letting students know when a faculty member is being considered for tenure.
- There should be a change in student evaluation forms.

"It has been shown that students consistently give good marks on the forms," Cottingham said. "We feel they are not a very valid method of evaluating student opinion. We think each department should give out their own evaluation forms geared to the department, with open-ended questions.

"They should also be given out at some time other than right before or after the final exams, when students are eager to just get out."
Faculty Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure

PART I PRINCIPAL RULES FOR APPOINTMENTS AND TENURE

A. APPOINTMENTS

21.03. Appointments and Continuing Employment; Conditions Upon.*

Section 1. Upon nomination and recommendation by the president of the University, the Board of Trustees shall make all appointments to all positions within the University and approve the salaries therefor. Such appointments, for a period not to exceed four academic quarters, shall be evidenced by a notice of appointment signed by the secretary of the Board and sent to the appointee for acceptance. The notice of appointment form is a budgetary convenience containing some detail relating to the employment relationship during the term of the appointment, such as salary, title, and the quarters during which service is to be rendered. The form is used for appointment to many and varied kinds of service, including appointment to positions which may be tenure accruing and others which are not. Neither the issuance of the notice nor its contents is intended to reflect any commitment by the Trustees as to the recipient's tenure or as to renewal of appointment.

Section 2. All officers, teachers and other employees of The Ohio State University are required to take the following Oath of Allegiance as a condition of their initial appointment and continuing employment:

I, . . . . . . . . . . . . , do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Ohio against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office or position in which I am employed, SO HELP ME GOD.

Section 3. In defense of the freedom of those who teach and those who learn, and of the governmental system upon which such freedom is dependent, the conditions hereinafter set forth shall govern all initial appointments and continuing employment by the University.

It shall be sufficient cause for the removal of any officer, teacher, or employee of the University, pursuant to the procedure set forth in Rule 21.07, that such officer, employee or teacher advocate, or have membership in an organization which is generally known to advocate the overthrow of the government of the United States, or of the State of Ohio, by force, violence or other unlawful means. (Reference is made to the provisions of Section 143.272, Ohio Revised Code.)

*Rule initiated by Board of Trustees.
Faculty Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure (continued)

A. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS (continued)

No teacher attains tenure automatically. It may be acquired either in the original appointment to the regular faculty rank of professor, upon promotion from within the University to the rank of associate professor, or following a probationary period.* The granting of tenure requires the recommendations of the dean of the college after consultation with the chairman of the applicable department, with the concurrence of the dean of the Graduate School, the provost, the president, and the Board of Trustees.

When some of the nominations from a college involve the granting of tenure, the dean should provide a statement showing how the proposed actions will affect the long-range staffing pattern of the department and of the college, taking into consideration expected attrition, budgetary limitations, the need for flexibility, and the effect on that fraction of the faculty already with tenure.

Recommendations for promotion and/or tenure should be based on the merit of the individual, on a consideration of comparable achievement in the faculty member's own field or in closely related fields and on the judicious use of the fiscal resources of the department and college. Whenever possible, consideration should be given to how the nominee stands in relation to other people in his field outside of the University who might be considered alternative candidates for the position. All available evidences should be considered and it is the responsibility of the academic units to provide complete documentation.

In accordance with a policy of equality of opportunity, decisions concerning appointment, promotion, and tenure are based on the following criteria without discrimination as to race, creed, religion, national origin, age, or sex.

B. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

Each candidate will be judged with respect to the proposed rank and duties, considering the record of his performance in:

1. teaching;
2. research or other creative work; and
3. service to the instructional unit, the college, and the University and public service related to his academic expertise.

In evaluating the candidate's qualifications within these areas, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. Each candidate is expected to be engaged in a program of work that is both sound and productive. As the University enters new fields of endeavor 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

*Rule initiated by Board of Trustees.

*As specified in PART III. Regular Faculty Ranks.
Faculty Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure (continued)

B. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE (continued)

particular significance in appointment or promotion to the rank of professor, (i) opinions of graduates who have achieved notable professional success since leaving the University; and (ii) the number as well as caliber of students guided in research by the candidate and of those attracted to the campus by his repute as a leader.

2. Research and Creative Work. Evidence of productivity and creativity should be sought in the candidate's published research or recognized artistic production, architectural, or engineering designs, or the like.

Publications in research and other creative accomplishment should be evaluated, not merely enumerated. There should be evidence that the candidate is continuously and effectively engaged in creative activity of high quality and significance. Work in progress should be assessed whenever possible. When published work in joint authorship (or other product of joint effort) is presented as evidence, it is the responsibility of the department to establish as clearly as possible the role of the candidate in the joint effort. Account should be taken of the type and quality of creative activity normally expected in the candidate's field. Appraisals of publication or other works in the scholarly and critical literature provide important testimony. The department chairman is expected to supplement the opinions of his colleagues within the department by critical appraisals from distinguished scholars at other universities.

Textbooks, reports, circulars, and similar publications normally considered evidence of teaching ability or public service should be considered creative work when they present new ideas or incorporate scholarly research.

In certain fields such as art, architecture, dance, music, literature, and drama, distinguished achievement may be considered in addition to distinction in scholarly analysis involving the particular branch of creative endeavor. In evaluating artistic creativity, an attempt should be made to define the candidate's merit in the light of such criteria as originality, scope, and depth of creative expression. It should be recognized that in music, drama, and dance, distinguished performance, including conducting and directing, is evidence of a candidate's creativity.

In all research and creative work, care must be taken to assure the involvement of students as apprentice researchers and creative artists.

3. Service. The faculty plays a vital role in the administration of the University at all levels and in the formulation of its policies. Recognition should therefore be given to scholars who prove themselves to be able administrators and who participate effectively and imaginatively in faculty government and the formulation of departmental, college, and University policies. Service by members of the faculty to the
Faculty Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure (continued)

C. PROBATIONARY SERVICE, DURATION OF APPOINTMENTS (continued)

nonrenewal decision which he believes to have been improper. In that instance, however, the burden of proof is on the probationary faculty member to establish that the nonrenewal decision was improper.

1. Extension of the Probationary Period for Part-Time Faculty

Where a member of the regular faculty has served for a period of less than full-time service (but at a level of 50 percent or more), the probationary period may be extended. Such extension must be requested at least one year in advance of the expiration of the usual probationary period and must have the approval of the dean and the provost. In such cases, the extension shall be for an integral number of years, based on the principle that the usual probationary period should represent full-time service. (For example, either two years at a 50 percent level or four years at a 75 percent level would permit a one-year extension.) The maximum permissible extension of a probationary period will be three years in the case of a probationary instructor or assistant professor, one year in the case of a probationary associate professor.

2. Prior Service

When a faculty member has had prior service at or above the level of instructor at this or another university, such prior service may be included as part of the probationary period. This credit will be agreed to prior to the initial appointment and only upon the written recommendation of the chairman of the department and the dean of the college with the concurrence of the provost.

3. Multiple Appointments

For persons with multiple appointments, whether members of the regular faculty or the auxiliary faculty, it is important that there be a single department (or academic faculty, division, school) which will be responsible for assessing in the professional development of the faculty member and the evaluation of the faculty member; for maintaining complete records, and for initiating promotion recommendations. While tenure is a shared responsibility involving the University, the college, and the department, it is essential that a single department (or academic faculty, division, school) be responsible for the appointment of a member of the regular faculty and be responsible for initiating tenure or nonrenewal recommendations and for any eventual tenure commitment.
Faculty Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure (continued)

C. PROBATIONARY SERVICE, DURATION OF APPOINTMENTS (continued)

Multiple appointments totaling 50 percent or more service to the University shall be considered to be the same as a single appointment of 50 percent or more for the purpose of determining eligibility for tenure or tenure candidacy if at least one of the appointments is an appointment to a regular faculty position.

4. Campus Assignment

The Ohio State University provides instructional programs at several locations including the central campus in Columbus, regional campuses in Lima, Mansfield, Marion, and Newark, the Graduate Center at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base (Dayton), and the Agricultural Technical Institute (Wooster). Members of the regular faculty who receive tenure while rendering primary service on a particular campus hold tenure only at that campus.

5. Change of Tenure Status

When a faculty member moves from one department (or academic faculty, division, school) to another, responsibility for tenure consideration or tenure moves to the new instructional unit. Also, a faculty member may be considered for service on a campus other than the one at which he initially rendered regular faculty service or earned tenure. In the case of such reassignment, which must have the prior approval of the dean and of the provost, responsibility for tenure will move to the new location.

A tenured faculty member of the regular faculty who voluntarily agrees to reduction of his appointment below 50 percent service to the University (as specified in the notice(s) of appointment) loses tenure except in the case of an approved leave of absence. Similarly, a tenured member of the regular faculty who changes to an auxiliary faculty position loses tenure.

6. Leaves of Absence

The period of a leave of absence may not be credited in the probationary period unless there is a written agreement to so credit it. Such an agreement will require the approval of the dean and of the provost.

Faculty Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure (continued)

D. STANDARDS OF NOTICE

In cases of nonrenewal of an appointment to a regular faculty rank, the University will, in so far as possible, observe the following standards of notice: (1) not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if a one-year appointment expires during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its expiration; (2) not later than December 15 of the second year of academic service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or if an appointment expires during the second academic year, at least six months in advance of its expiration; and (3) at least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years in the institution.

These standards of notice will not apply in cases of termination for cause.

Decisions regarding renewal of members of the auxiliary faculty (adjunct, clinical, visiting titles, or lecturers) are made annually in accordance with criteria and procedures of the appointing instructional unit and in accordance with University policies relative to auxiliary faculty positions.

PART III REGULAR FACULTY RANKS (REQUISITES, CAPACITIES, AND TENURE ACCRUAL)

A. INSTRUCTOR

Recommendations for appointment as an instructor are subject to the following conditions:

1. Formal Requisite: Baccalaureate degree and master's degree, or its equivalent, and at least three years of graduate study or relevant professional experience.

2. Capacities: Satisfactory evidence that the person being appointed possesses the capacity to develop and meet substantially the criteria described in PART II, B Criteria for Promotion and Tenure.

3. Tenure: Before an instructor will be granted tenure at that rank, a seven-year probationary period must be met.

Initial appointments as an instructor are on a probationary basis. Performance is ordinarily reviewed annually during the probationary period to determine whether or not the appointment will be renewed, subject to the standards of notice set forth in PART II, D. If the appointment is renewed for a fourth year, the University will make every effort to inform the person involved during the fourth year as to whether he is to be considered a candidate for tenure. If he is informed that he is not considered a candidate for tenure, his appointment will not be renewed after the end of the fifth year. If the appointment is renewed for a sixth
A. INSTRUCTOR (continued)

year, the person involved will be informed by the dean, during the sixth year of service, if he is to be granted tenure beginning with his eighth year of service. If tenure is not granted, his appointment will not be renewed after the end of the seventh year.

B. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Recommendations for appointment as an assistant professor are subject to the following conditions:

1. Formal Requisite: Ph. D. degree or equivalent qualifications.

2. Capacities: Demonstrated evidence that the person being appointed possesses the capacity to meet substantially criteria in Part II, B Criteria for Promotion and Tenure.

3. Tenure: Before an assistant professor will be granted tenure at that rank, a seven-year probationary period must be met. Service to the University as an instructor (without interruption) will be counted in meeting this probationary requirement. Tenure may be granted at an earlier time upon promotion to associate professor.

Initial appointments as an assistant professor are on a probationary basis. Performance is ordinarily reviewed annually during the probationary period to determine whether or not the appointment will be renewed, subject to the standards of notice. If the appointment is renewed for a fourth year, the University will make every effort to inform the person involved during the fourth year as to whether he is to be considered a candidate for tenure. If he is informed that he is not considered a candidate for tenure, his appointment will not be renewed after the end of the fourth year. If the appointment is renewed for the fifth year, the person involved will be informed by the dean during his sixth year of service, if he is to be granted tenure beginning with his eighth year of service. If tenure is not granted, his appointment will not be renewed after the end of the seventh year.

C. ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Recommendations for appointment as an associate professor are subject to the following conditions:

1. Formal Requisite: Ph. D. degree or equivalent qualifications.

2. Capacities: Demonstrated evidence that the person appointed meets substantially the criteria described in Part II, B Criteria for Promotion and Tenure and that his professional development will continue.

3. Tenure: A person promoted to associate professor from a lower rank at this University will acquire tenure upon the effective date of his promotion.

A person appointed from outside of this University to associate professor will serve a three-year probationary period. During the second year, the person involved will be informed by the dean if he is to be granted tenure beginning with the fourth year of service. If tenure is not granted, the appointment will not be renewed after the end of the third year.

D. PROFESSOR

Recommendations for appointment as a professor are subject to the following conditions:

1. Formal Requisite: Ph. D. degree or equivalent qualifications.

2. Capacities: Demonstrated evidence that the person being appointed has met the criteria described in Part II, B Criteria for Promotion and Tenure with distinction and that these outstanding contributions will continue.

3. Tenure: Tenure is automatic upon promotion or appointment to this regular faculty rank.

Set forth in Part II, D.
Tenure guarantees jobs, but salary cuts possible

By Ron Stiebler
4-27-78

The university’s tenure policy — aimed at protecting instructor’s jobs — may be hampering quality education, according to Walter Craig, university ombudsman.

However, Craig added that one must take the good aspects of tenure with the bad.

“If it were not for tenure, I know of several good teachers that would not be at this university,” he added.

The university tenure policy works much like corporation policies, Craig said. Companies show appreciation toward long term employees by securing their jobs until retirement, despite other applicants who are more qualified for the position.

Tenure, given to faculty members after seven years of good service, is presently held by 70 percent of the faculty at this university, according to OSU Polls, an organization that conducts scientific polls from the Department of Behavioral Science.

The ombudsman listens to many student complaints against teachers, however “very rarely” do they involve incompetence in the classroom, Craig said.

“Most complaints do involve teaching methods and testing procedures,” he added.

“It is hard to fire a member of the college who has tenure,” Roy Kottman, dean of the College of Agriculture said. “Only if an instructor misses classes, shows incompetence and is short of poor teaching activity, may the instructor be fired,” Kottman said.

To get tenure, a teacher applies during the fourth teaching year at Ohio State. Tenure is considered during the instructor’s sixth year and after seven years they are either awarded tenure or removed from the university.

Tenure considerations after a teacher’s seventh year is handled by a special committee in the Department of Academic Affairs. If this final screening is successful, the teacher has a permanent job.

Tenure is awarded to instructors displaying strength in three major areas. They must show favorable teaching skills, display an active role in the community or university and engage in scholarly activity — such as research, according to Terry Roarke, assistant provost.

Another aspect of research is the importance of publications. Roarke said publications are important if involved with research. However, teachers in theater for example, aren’t expected to publish reports, but rather work on theatrical productions, he said.

“Tenure consideration is a matter of being presented with a folder, not a person. The folder represents a portion of the person’s strengths in teaching and extracurricular activities in hope that it partially reflects that person,” Roarke said.

No teacher “hides” behind tenure and although they cannot be fired, their salaries can be cut, Roarke said.

Although mandatory retirement is required at age 70, many could retire at an earlier age because “many lack both initiative and communication skills needed to properly instruct students,” said David Hahn, associate professor of agricultural economics.

Faculty members must “continuously work harder to communicate with students,” Hahn said. In many cases, as teachers get older, they drift farther away from student lifestyles, he added.

“In another 10 years I will take on the grandfather image. I’ll have to sharpen my communication skills and meet the changes,” Hahn said.

A good teacher is one who “can stimulate the student’s curiosity and desire to learn more about subject matter,” according to Hahn.

Because 30 percent of the instructors at Ohio State are either looking for tenure or retiring, new teachers are needed, according to university sources.

Once a teaching position is available, choosing replacements is difficult, Kottman said. A job selection committee within each college at the university selects new teachers, he said.

Kottman looks for good instructors — people who will make the college better. He said the committee looks for several basic qualities:

- Good past job ratings
- Past history of good grades
- Knows multi-teaching skills
- Demonstrate ability to improve and do a better job.

Young teachers are an asset to the university because they understand today’s students and know the latest developments in their fields, Hahn said.
Award-winning professors denied tenure by university

By Michelle Dorsey
5-24-78

Two OSU assistant professors who received teaching awards have been fired this year.

David Shapiro, assistant professor of economics, and John A. Secrist, assistant professor of chemistry, did not receive tenure this year. Both professors have only one more year to teach.

Shapiro was evaluated after teaching six years and Secrist after teaching four years. Their respective departments decided they would not be granted positions as associate professors. Shapiro's and Secrist's research and publications were judged insufficient by their departments.

Shapiro received the Alumni Award for Distinguished Teaching in May 1976 and Secrist was given the 1977 College of Arts and Sciences Student Council Distinguished Teaching Award.

Both assistant professors said their departments should consider teaching ability more in evaluating assistant professors for tenure, instead of concentrating so heavily on their research and publications.

"There's clearly a lot more weight put on research than teaching," Shapiro said. "Ostensibly this is an institution of higher learning."

Elaine D. McCrate, a former student of Shapiro, said, "Shapiro is an excellent teacher. He's highly articulate, organized and manifests a lot of enthusiasm for the subject. Shapiro was one of the only professors in the economics department that felt that women could be as good as men in economics." McCrate said.

Edward J. Ray, chairman of the Department of Economics, and Devon W. Meek, chairman of the Department of Chemistry did not want to comment on the situation.

Michael L. Lichstein, assistant professor of economics, said, "Shapiro does seem to be actively working on a number of projects." An assistant professor should have three to five publications in good journals to be considered for tenure, Lichstein said.

Shapiro and Secrist have published the minimum amount. However, both assistant professors said their departments felt the publications weren't in quality journals. Shapiro said he wrote articles for government publications which were not refereed, the articles were not judged before publication. "You have to have so many articles in refereed journals," he said.

Shapiro said his research concentrates on the sex discrimination of women in the labor market. "My interests seem to be more policy oriented than theoretical," Shapiro said.

Shapiro wrote sections for a four part monograph series, "Years for Decision," that will soon be published. Shapiro said his sections were on the participation of young women in the labor force.

John F. Swenton, professor of chemistry, said, "Secrist's teaching ability is demonstrated by his award He's published very little and I agree with the ruling of the department."

Secrist said his research is on organic synthesis, the making of natural products by man. According to Secrist, the Department of Chemistry felt his work was not exciting or substantial enough. Secrist said he could see the department's point of view. However, they could not see his, he said.
Tenure: job security or shelter?

By Greg Victor and Arthur Ditty

A professor is fined by his students when he comes to class late. Students oust an instructor when they deem his teaching and views intolerable.

Professors' salaries are regulated by a student legislative body.

Unchecked student control of a university, and its professors, reigned during the late Middle Ages, when civilization was shedding the ignorance and fears of medieval times. Such control created an uncertain world for teachers and researchers seeking to espouse their new ideas.

To counter these insecurities and anxieties, a new policy emerged to give the scholar freedom to express his ideas.

TODAY, a professor's academic freedom is enhanced at most American universities by enforceable tenure rights, guaranteeing professors permanent staff positions.

The history of the academic world is that of "anti-social scholars criticizing the king, so this group fought for and won this special right (tenure)," said Dean Arthur E. Adams of the College of Humanities. "Learned scholars must speak the truth and damn your eyes."

But tenure has sparked questions concerning professors' rights and their duty to the university and its students.

Does such a guarantee breed "deadwood" faculty members who can only be removed if guilty of gross personal misconduct or incompetence?

Why should professors be offered "a special right" not guaranteed elsewhere in our democratic society?

Should double standards exist between tenured and non-tenured faculty members?

These questions will probably be overlooked as Ohio State prepares to harvest this year's crop of tenure candidates. Those selected will join the more than 70 per cent of the University's 3,015 faculty who are tenured.

Before a professor at Ohio State is granted tenure, he or she must be reviewed annually by a department chairperson and after four years, given the green light - you are a candidate for tenure - or the red light - you are not.

After a chairperson recommends a candidate for tenure, the college dean then reviews the decision. All tenure appraisals eventually make their way through the University hierarchy to the Board of Trustees where a final decision is theoretically made.

Actually, the department chairperson carries the most weight, since he is closest to the candidate's work. "You have to try to judge from a few years' research what someone will do for the next 42 years," said Edward J. Ray, chairman of the Department of Economics.

THE JUDGEMENT period, seven years at Ohio State, must be long enough to determine the candidate's qualifications and decide if he should be kept. However, the period must not be so long that it unreasonably withholds the security provided in a tenured position.

But the probationary period offers little security for the tenure candidate as he struggles with political and social pressures as well as the University's formal expectations.

"Up to the point you get tenure, there is not academic freedom" an assistant professor said. He noted that departmental political pressures come to bear on candidates during the competition before tenure is granted.

Adams, dean of humanities, acknowledged some professors "sell out" just to get tenure. In the process, academic freedom is stifled, but Adams said those who compromise themselves please department heads "shouldn't get tenure."

But many tenure candidates find that, although they don't have to "sell out," the rocky probationary road is a bit smoother if they "fit in."

"You must fit in, get along, be a hail fellow well met," according to Assistant Professor of History Peter Hoffer.

Hoffer was denied tenure after his sixth-year review, petitioned his department chairman for a re-review in his seventh year and passed at the department level, but was denied by his dean.

The history department has helped him search for a job, Hoffer said, and "in many ways, I am unconventional and not suited to this place."

History is not a politicized department now, he added, "but it may become political because of budget cutbacks and latent factions could become real factions."

According to Economics Chairman Ray, "There is no real check if an entire department is conservative and one faculty member is liberal. The biggest danger is with small groups, such as five-man departments. Grudges then get one in trouble."

"It is an advantage to have a large department because then no one individual can subvert the system."

MANY PROFESSORS in the probationary period find the stakes too high and the times too stressful to talk about tenure.

Assistant Professor of Geography Harold Moelling is presently under review for tenure and would only say the subject "is too sensitive from both a personal and professional point of view for those being reviewed."

Ray said such reticence exists because "one can undermine four to six
years of work and effort if the wrong thing is said. They hesitate to go public because they can undo their own case."

Slobodan Mitric, assistant professor of civil engineering, who was recently denied tenure after his fourth-year review, said, "you constantly feel you are underachieving. "You live in mortal fear of not getting tenure or a promotion," he added.

Although Mitric contends Ohio State provides more freedom than other institutions, a candidate for tenure must constantly prove his worth.

"If you do a good job teaching, you don't have time to get brownie points," he said. Brownie points, Mitric added, consist of joining dozens of public and University committees and "fitting in" the department.

**BEING UNCONVENTIONAL**, such as whistling in the corridors, according to Mitric, can also work against the candidate.

Mitric added he was told by his department chairman that he posed some kind of threat to his peers who do not consider him "a serious academic."

Tenure was originally designed to protect professors from the whims of higher-ups, he said, but today "it is a fairly good mechanism for rejecting those the organization doesn't like."

In government or business these days, it is almost impossible to fire someone, so it's not necessarily bad that such a mechanism exists, he added.

While these informal criteria test a candidate's compatibility, state statutes, trustees' by-laws and University rules spell out formal procedures to determine a candidate's competence.

Although formal, and recognized University-wide, these criteria: publication, research, teaching ability and service, are vague and overlap.

The first, publication, puts "great pressure" on young professors who seek tenure because "it's positive, objective evidence that can be submitted by a candidate," Ray said.

According to an assistant professor who refused to be identified, "In practice, the major criterion (to be granted tenure) is publication."

He was given a handout listing tenure criteria when he entered his department that said, "nobody is given tenure without publication."

But he was never told how many published articles were necessary, he said. Articles are also judged by quality, "but my complaint is that I don't know how the procedure was really done," he added.

Adams said subtle judgments of quality are tough to make, because "These aren't eggs you're judging, they are human beings."

Some professors have published 15 articles in high-quality journals, for example, and they cannot understand why someone else with only five published articles is granted tenure, Adams said.

Ellin Carter, an English instructor, said she published nothing while teaching composition courses but nevertheless was granted tenure.

Hoffer failed his sixth-year review, he said, "Because my publication was not of a high enough quality."

Publication should be stressed, Hoffer said, because a university is the only place where articles can be published based on research unencumbered by political or social pressures.

But Hoffer was troubled by the unclear criteria used to judge his publishing record. He had 11 articles published in prestigious journals, but the department prides itself on judging the quality of published material and not letting the publication itself judge an article acceptably because it decides to print it, he added.

"When you see how much is published, you wonder if anyone ever reads it," Mitric said.

Another criterion required by University rules is research.

"You cannot separate research from teaching," said Kathryn Schoen, associate provost for faculty and academic affairs. "It's a matter of circulating new ideas among students and professors."

SCHOEN NOTED even exceptional candidates are limited if they have not done enough research.

"With tenure, you're spending money and committing yourself to a person," she said. "Any research broadens a person and makes him more eligible for an institution like Ohio State."

Drawing money into a department through research grants is one way to overshadow other deficiencies, Mitric said.

"If I had brought in $100,000, no one would tell me anything," he said.

Mitric feels diverse roles within a department should be encouraged, but that present emphasis placed on garnering research funds forces each professor to compete with the others and do the same things.

For example, he said, research that requires graduate student assistants and extensive computer programming is more expensive than evaluative research in which a professor collects research results and synthesizes them into a comprehensive package.

Office research, as Mitric calls it, requires little money but is essential to bring raw data into perspective. But tenure candidates are forced to concentrate on data research to fulfill tenure expectations.

According to Ray, research is assumed worthwhile if someone is willing to pay for it. If the department is in a budget squeeze, research grants are probably considered even more important. Ray said, because they bring more money into the department.

Another formal criterion a tenure candidate must satisfy is "teaching ability" — judged by Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) forms and other department professors.

"Our office requires documents reflecting the teaching ability of a candidate," said Schoen. "We need student input."

Nevertheless, some deans and department chairpersons believe teaching and tenure do not always mix. They argue tenure need not be granted to instructors and professors who teach remedial and elementary courses that do not involve controversial ideas and, therefore, do not involve questions of academic freedom.

Some university administrators across the nation have proposed keeping these instructors for an indefinite number of years without granting tenure.

But such proposals will do little for scholars who feel they need tenure to pursue higher academic disciplines.

**PROFESSORS** are not given enough time to teach and meet their other academic obligations at the same time, Mitric said. To write and do research, you need "long blocks of time to prepare and think, but if you also teach and open your door to students, there isn't twenty minutes to be found for contemplation," he added.

"Everyone looks at your SETs," Mitric said. "But the SETs are unreliable because, if you are teaching a 'captive course' that students must take, the evaluations will be lower."

Mitric also said evaluations vary if given after easy or hard midterms.

"There's only one person who wants to pick you out to say he often has poor SETs," he said.

Other professors question the validity and usefulness of student evaluations as well.
"SETs in the long run will not get you tenure," said an assistant professor who wished to remain anonymous. "Major awards, however, like a distinguished teaching award, can help at certain times," he added.

The faculty handbook states: "Service by members of the faculty to the community, state and nation in their special capacities as scholars should likewise be recognized."

Assistant History Professor Hoffer directed a bicentennial studies group in 1974 that was praised by Congress as a model for other universities, conducted radio talks and spoke at other colleges.

His services were deemed "adequate," he said.

The handbook adds: "Contributions to student welfare through service on student-faculty committees and as advisor to student organizations should be acknowledged..."

"Sure service on committees plays a role in granting tenure," Economics Chairman Ray said. "It contributes to the department. We don't want someone to run off and hide in his office. One must have a genuine concern to increase the quality of the department."

If a chairman believes a candidate does not have a genuine concern for the department or fails in other areas, tenure will be denied.

Once denied, a faculty member has one recourse: appeal.

APPEALING denied tenure does not involve "an adversary proceeding," Schoen said. "Nonrenewal is not a charge of incompetence or immorality. It does not prevent a person from seeking other employment."

Nevertheless, a candidate can only appeal his nonrenewal if he has evidence an evaluation was improper.

The Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility reviews only the procedures and hearings in which a candidate was denied tenure. The committee is limited to a procedural review because its members include professors from widely divergent disciplines.

"You can't have an English professor looking at the records and work of a biology professor and decide if his record warrants tenure," Schoen said. "The people on the committee can only determine if an improper evaluation occurred and if all the evidence was considered."

In spite of this, an assistant professor denied tenure said:

"I presented everything I could think of, but I don't know what they did with my evidence. So if I were to appeal, I wouldn't know where to start my case, yet I have the burden of proof."

But once tenure is granted, another story emerges.

"Tenure was never meant for job security," Schoen said. "True scholars do not need tenure to keep their job."

"But when the economy closes in," Schoen added, "a priority is put on job security."

Thus, the security tenure offers makes a professorship very attractive to scholars, and universities can offer lower salaries. Without such security, many would transfer to higher paying jobs, forcing universities to compete for needed faculty by paying more.

While professors pay for their security by working at lower salaries, students pay for professional peace-of-mind as well when they encounter "professional deadwood" instructing their classes.

But no one can prove professors stagnate because they feel secure.

RARELY does a university's rule book spell out what constitutes grounds for dismissing a tenured professor. Schools are deliberately vague to insure the latitude necessary to consider each case individually.
COLUMBUS, Ohio -- A seven member faculty committee has been appointed by Ohio State University Provost W. Ann Reynolds to develop criteria for terminating the appointments of tenured faculty. The committee, called the "Ad Hoc Committee on Policies for Termination of Tenured Faculty During Financial Exigency," will be chaired by James C. Garland, professor of physics. A preliminary set of guidelines for the release of tenured faculty was prepared during the 1980-81 academic year by the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, chaired by Robert M. Pfister, professor of microbiology.

"Financial exigency", explained Garland, "is a financial crisis brought about by a continued, persistent shortage of operating revenues. The dismissal of tenured faculty for financial reasons is an extraordinary step which must be undertaken with the greatest regard for the rights of the faculty, for the sanctity of academic freedom, and for the integrity of the University. The committee believes that it must also study the role of the faculty in defining and responding to financial exigency".

The committee will draft policies and procedures for terminating tenured faculty appointments in a financial crisis. Its recommendations will receive wide circulation among the Ohio State faculty and administration before being submitted to the University Senate for approval, according to Garland.

The committee expects to complete most of its work by Sept. 30.
Ad Hoc Committee - 2

The other members of the committee are: Andrew Chen, professor of finance; Vincent Hamparian, professor of medical microbiology and pediatrics; Norman Rask, professor of agricultural economics; Gerald Reagan, professor of foundations and research; Barbara Rigney, associate professor of English; and William B. Shook, professor of ceramic engineering.

---0---

(Contact: James C. Garland, 422-7277)

##
Terms for tenured faculty layoffs defined

By Kelly Hibbett 10-8-81

Tenure means job protection for OSU faculty. But under guidelines released Wednesday, that protection may be eliminated under chronic financial conditions.

Termination of tenured faculty is justified during financial exigency or program cutbacks for academic reasons, according to a report from the Ad Hoc Committee on the Release of Tenured Faculty.

The first of a two-part report on establishing policies for dismissal of tenured faculty at OSU was completed last week. Provost W. Ann Reynolds appointed the committee in August.

The report sets guidelines for two conditions which constitute termination — financial exigency and academic considerations.

Two other justifications for dismissal already are covered in existing regulations at OSU. They are justification "for cause," such as gross incompetence or criminal offense, and medical disability.

Financial exigency is defined as "a state in which there is a continued, persistent shortage of funds severe enough to jeopardize seriously the quality of the university and its ability to fulfill its academic mission."

The report states the financial shortage must be long-term and "persist into the foreseeable future."

Termination for academic considerations involves the evaluation of programs versus students' needs. "Just as needed new programs must be born and nourished, unneeded old programs must be encouraged to wither or die," the report said.

In a released statement Reynolds said the report is the first step in preparing guidelines only, and there are no immediate plans at OSU for termination of tenured faculty or for declaring financial exigency.

"Unlike many other universities, Ohio State does not have guidelines for procedures to follow in case it is necessary to terminate tenured faculty," Reynolds said.

Reynolds could not be reached for additional comment.

James C. Garland, professor of physics and chairman of the committee said he is hopeful that the report in its final form will gain national recognition.

"There are hundreds of universities having budget problems that do not have guidelines to fall back on like these," he said.

"People need rules. They need to know they are going to be treated fairly. It is essential they have guidelines, and they need to know before anything serious happens."

Garland said the report does not jeopardize the job protection of tenure which is granted to faculty members by a peer-review process after a probationary period.

Termination is considered critical to academic freedom and security for academic values, the report states.

Garland said termination of tenured faculty for academic considerations was not "dreamed up" by the committee. There has been a long-time understanding that programs should be cut if they are not needed, he said.

"I hope it wouldn't terminate faculty very often. If it is not for saving money, then I hope they would relocate faculty."

The committee, which is composed entirely of faculty members, recommends faculty involvement from the earliest stages when establishing financial exigency appears necessary.

Faculty participation "would minimize the chances of creating the hostile and litigious atmosphere which often accompanies an institution's efforts to cope with severe budgetary problems," the report states.

Part two of the report will recommend specific criteria and procedures, along with appeal processes, to be followed in terminating tenured faculty. It will be completed in late October.

The first part of the report will be discussed in a faculty forum at 4 p.m. Oct. 19 at Dreese Laboratories 113. It will be presented to the University Senate Nov. 14.

Part two of the report will be presented to the Senate in December.

The completed set of recommendations is expected to go to the Board of Trustees for approval and incorporation into regular university policies.
Tenure release committee delivers first report

Published on these pages is the first report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Policies for Termination of Tenured Faculty. The report, entitled "The Release of Tenured Faculty - Part 1: The Implications for Termination," was presented to the provost Sept. 30. A second report will follow this month. If this report is adopted by the university, the committee and the courts that will review it would have to decide whether the institution is justified in terminating a professor's tenure or whether the institution is justified in terminating the professor's tenure based on the criteria set forth in the report.

1. What circumstances justify the termination of a tenured faculty?

1.1 A general understanding among the national academic community that tenure awards the holder the right to continued employment except for very few specific exceptions. This right has been upheld by the courts in numerous cases, even for faculty at institutions in which the rights are not defined by written contract. It is further generally accepted by the academic community and by the courts that these justifications for the involuntary termination of tenured professors must not threaten the values which tenure seeks to protect.

1.2 According to long-standing academic tradition there are four, and only four, such circumstances. Two of them, dismissal for cause (for incompetence or criminal action) and dismissal for medical disability, are treated adequately in existing university regulations. The other two, for reasons of academic exigency and academic considerations which mandate the involuntary termination of faculty, are inherently judgmental. The members of this committee agree that this tradition is consistent with widely established principles of academic freedom. We further are confident that the overwhelming majority of faculty and administrators at institutions share our judgment.

Practically speaking, the committee feels that the university should inform any tenured professor who receives a letter of termination which of the above reasons being invoked for his or her dismissal. There is an implicit obligation on the university to demonstrate that its reasons are merited and sound. The committee further feels that it is clear that the burden of proof rests with the institution. At first thought, our focus on "academic exigency" and "academic considerations" as distinct and separable issues may seem contrived or unrealistic. After all, in a period of financial exigency, would not the university simply ask the faculty to perform the functions of tenured faculty in weak departments, but not so severe as to require the justification of campus-wide financial exigency. We reject this notion not only because it lacks appropriate safeguards against abuse, but also because we believe that it is untenable in the examination of program elimination efforts elsewhere, we have observed that those administrators who used such a rationale to dismiss tenured professors not only failed in the attempt but also did serious harm to their institutions.

2. Termination for financial exigency.

2.1 It is not desirable to invoke "financial exigency" as a justification for terminating tenured faculty and there is reasonable agreement within the campus community that the term is phrasing that is not well understood or well defined. For example, does financial exigency mean that the university should not have to deal with problems that arise from the allocation of funds to the university and its ability to fulfill its academic mission. Perceptions of enrolment, of institutional subsidies, and of other sources of revenues must indicate that the shortage will be long-term, persisting into the foreseeable future. There are several features of our definition which merit elaboration. First, we stress that financial exigency must reflect an anticipated chronic condition. The university must suffer temporary budget problems—years in which appropriations fall below anticipated levels or costs rise more rapidly than expected. Such transient problems can usually be accommodated by hiring freezes, salary freezes, across-the-board budget reductions, and deferral maintenance. It is only when budget problems become chronic that these and similar options no longer work. Second, the institution may become necessary, it is essential to state that tenured professors should not be fired in response to cyclical budget fluctuations.

Our definition places the emphasis on operating budgets rather than capital assets. We do not believe the university should be required to maintain a "frozen" faculty structure, but it is important to recognize that temporary or significant changes in the university's financial condition are not indicative of chronic problems. Furthermore, most assets (e.g., buildings, special collections, etc.) serve the mission of the institution and, once lost, would leave the institution in a permanently weakened condition. Our view must not be construed to mean, however, that the university should not periodically review its capital holdings with the intent of disposing of superfluous assets. As we will discuss subsequently, in a budget crisis the money gained from the disposal of unneeded holdings could be used to provide for the university's continuing existence. Our definition stresses the campus-wide nature of financial exigency. In establishing a condition of financial exigency, therefore, the university must not point to enrollment declines or other problems in specific academic units. Rather it should establish that general budgetary considerations have made it impossible for the institution to maintain quality at its
A. Why do academic considerations justify dismissing tenured faculty?

Universities obviously must respond to the changing educational needs of society. As new disciplines emerge, existing disciplines acquire new vitality, programs must grow and professors must be hired to educate students and conduct research. The other side of the coin is that existing academic specialties may no longer remain viable.

Student enrollment in those fields may permanently decline. A graduate program may be unable to attract graduate students or research funding. A formerly valuable service to the community may no longer be required.

Because money is always limited, even in the best of times, an institution of quality must be able to direct resources to the areas of greatest need—from the program to the excellent program; from the department to the department to the few students in the department with too many students; from the antiquated specialty to the emerging specialty. Just as needed new programs must be born and nourished, programs that are no longer viable must be encouraged to wither and die.

Such educational considerations may occasionally justify the administrative decision to demonstrate that tenured faculty is not necessary to the mission of the university. Without primary faculty participation, there would be no guarantee that protection would be afforded those academic units which were central to the university's academic mission. Further, it should be noted that legitimate academic criteria for eliminating programs are different than the criteria used to close down a program merely because the student load is too small. The standard for academic programs must be encouraged to wither and die.

B. How does termination for academic reasons differ from termination for financial exigency?

Program curtailment for academic reasons is a continuing aspect of wise academic management and should not necessitate the extraordinary administrative action justified by financial exigency. Furthermore, the absence of cost-cutting measures should enable the process to proceed deliberately and with minimal disruption of the campus environment.

Because the process is not optimal for all disciplines—rather than to conserve inadequate resources—the guiding principle is to invoke involuntary dismissal only as a last resort. Thus, the university has a strong obligation to try and relocate displaced faculty, to compensate faculty who lose their jobs, and to smooth the discontinuities in professors' careers brought on by this type of program changes. Although the long-term goal is to direct resources into sensible directions, over the short term the curtailment of programs may prove relatively costly to the institution.

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) sets forth recommended institutional procedures for terminating appointments because of academic considerations. Briefly, the AAUP recommends that the institution must be ended for legitimate academic reasons, every effort should be made to relocate the affected faculty elsewhere in the institution. If relocation is not feasible, the faculty must be given a reasonable period of time to find new employment. During that period, the institution should bear the cost of the training. Only if all efforts at relocation fail may the professor's appointment then be terminated. In the event involuntary termination is necessary, the institution shall compensate the discharged professor with severance pay.
Faculty proposes changes to tenure rules

By Jim Dostefani
Lantern staff writer

Most of the approximately 100 faculty members who attended a meeting Wednesday to discuss proposed rules for the termination of tenure faculty opposed the current draft of the rules.

But faculty in attendance agreed the rules were necessary, and some proposed additions and changes to the guidelines.

Faculty members who spoke at the meeting opposed the rules on two points: the proposed Tenure Evaluation Unit (TEU) would undermine the basic principles of tenure by restricting tenure to the department; and the “vague” definition of financial exigency used in the rules.

A TEU, which usually exists at the department level, is a group of faculty which shares an area of expertise and is responsible for review of its members. Tenure is currently awarded in the university as a whole. The proposal would award it within departments.

“We knew the TEU would receive a lot of flak,” Glen Schmidt, chairman of the select committee which wrote the rules, said.

But he said the TEU does not question the locality of tenure.

“It was intended to be used as a mechanism to keep individuals from being isolated and terminated,” Schmidt said. He added that he did not hear any alternatives to the concept of the TEU proposed at the meeting.

Faculty members also called for a much stronger definition of financial exigency than the one in the proposed rules, which states financial exigency is an “imminent financial crisis” affecting the “quality” of the university.

Rules of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) suggest use of the word “survival” instead of “quality” in the definition.

“I don’t think the committee will buy the word ‘survival,’” said Richard Lanese, president of the OSU chapter of AAUP.

“But AAUP will insist on seeing a definition that would justify involuntary dismissal of faculty for financial reasons.”

Schmidt said “there will have to be some changes made in the definition,” and asked for written proposals from faculty before the Faculty Council considers the rules on May 14.

Lanese recommended deleting a section of the rules dealing with release of tenured faculty in periods other than financial exigency.

According to the rules, the decision to release faculty in periods other than financial exigency must be based on “educational considerations.”

Lanese said the vagueness of the term “educational considerations” would “destroy the meaning of tenure.”

“Tenure protects academic freedom and provides job security.”

“To have a good faculty, you have to provide security. If we destroy the meaning of tenure, we destroy the university’s ability to attract good faculty.”

Faculty also proposed an addition to the rules which would provide that, if a department disbanded during financial exigency were reestablished, faculty members released when the department was disbanded would have a chance to get their old jobs back.

Schmidt said the committee would study the proposed change, but said financial exigency implies a crisis expected to last several years, so the reinstitution of a disbanded department was unlikely.

Lanese said he believes the rules will be revised, but he did not rule out organized action by AAUP if the changes are not satisfactory to the group.

“We fully expect to achieve our goals through negotiation,” he said. “If not, we may try for a faculty referendum.”

Schmidt refused to comment on the possibility of a faculty vote on the rules.
More faculty discussion to go into firing process

By Kelly Hibbett

On Oct. 19, OSU faculty protested the university's hurried approval process for rules on the firing of tenured faculty during financial emergencies or program curtailment.

On Monday, OSU President Edward H. Jennings completed a plan which takes into account their recommendations.

His plan will allow for more faculty discussion of a report devised by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Release of Tenured Faculty. The seven-member faculty committee was appointed by Provost W. Ann Reynolds this summer.

The first part of the committee report, completed in September, dealt with guidelines for termination. Part two will be finished by Nov. 30. It will decide procedures OSU should follow for deciding who will be dismissed.

Larry R. Thompson, who was appointed special assistant to the president in late October, said the Jennings' plan recommends how the report will be disseminated to faculty for discussion.

According to Thompson:

The plan calls for the University Senate Steering Committee to form a broad-based subcommittee to incorporate faculty suggestions into a final, rewritten report. The subcommittee will include chairmen from various senate and university committees.

The Faculty Council will be responsible for gathering faculty comments, suggestions and proposed amendments to the report through letters and open faculty meetings.

After the senate is notified of action taken, the provost, the president, and the OSU legal council will review the final version of the report before it is taken to the OSU Board of Trustees for approval.

"This is a rational approach to a difficult problem. It will give faculty and university governing bodies a chance to study and recommend revisions for the report," said James C. Garland, chairman of the ad hoc committee and professor of physics.

"We have from the beginning felt careful deliberation was important and felt pressed that it was moving too quickly," Garland said.

Originally, the senate was to vote on part one of the report Nov. 14 and part two in December.

But after the Oct. 19 faculty forum, the steering committee decided to forward the report to the Faculty Council for further discussion before the final senate vote.

Michael C. Gerald, chairman of Faculty Council and professor of pharmacy, said Jennings has slowed down the approval process.

"He wants us to move this thing along, but he feels it is essential that we have input," he said.

Jennings said the current financial uncertainty makes it urgent for the rules to be in place. "But it is a faculty issue and we must do everything we can to make sure faculty discuss the issue.

"We have laid out a process to make sure the faculty has every opportunity to do just that," he said.
TO: All OSU Faculty

FROM: Michael C. Gerald  
Chairman, Faculty Council

SUBJECT: Call for Written and Oral Faculty Responses to "Release of Tenured Faculty" Report

OPEN HEARING ON REPORT
Meeting Date: 21 January 1982, 3:00 p.m.
Location: Weigel Hall Auditorium, 1866 College Road

The report of the Ad Hoc Faculty Committee on the Release of Tenured Faculty has been issued, and Provost Ann Reynolds has recently distributed copies to all faculty members via their campus addresses. In an open letter to Provost Reynolds, reprinted in the 5 November onCampus, President Edward Jennings charged Faculty Council to conduct open meetings on the report and "request comments, suggestions, and proposed amendments, if any, from all the faculty and various committees of the Senate."

The written and oral feedback received prior to and during the scheduled open meeting will be directly transmitted to the Senate Steering Committee's appointed Select Faculty Committee for Formulation of Rules for Release of Tenured Faculty. After rules have been developed "as expeditiously as possible" in the words of President Jennings, your Faculty Council representative will be asked to take formal action on your behalf prior to the ultimate submission of the final document to the Board of Trustees.

Publicly and privately, President Jennings emphasized and reemphasized his desire to have full and active Faculty participation on this issue. How can you participate to ensure that the rules developed adequately protect the rights of tenured faculty in an equitable and acceptable manner, and yet permit the administration to appropriately respond in the event of a chronic financial disaster, or when justifiable academic considerations dictate the reduction or elimination of programs?

1. Read and analyze the report carefully and attempt to exercise the same degree of academic objectivity you normally employ in your scholarly endeavors, or when reading the literature in your area. Discuss the report with your colleagues and actively
that seek clarification or a panel response. The Select Rules Committee would appreciate a copy of your statement or a summary thereof for its consideration and records.

Please do not hesitate to contact your Faculty Council Coordinators (see below), or me (2-9388) if you have any questions, problems, suggestions, or comments. Many thanks for your interest, and we shall look forward to receiving your written comments and participation at our open hearing on 21 January.

Many best wishes for a happy and healthy holiday season and New Year.

MCG/rhs

cc: President Edward Jennings
    Provost W. Ann Reynolds
    Professor Richard Gilson

Constituency

College of Administrative Science
College of Agriculture and Home Economics
College of The Arts
College of Biological Sciences
College of Dentistry
College of Education
College of Engineering
College of Humanities
College of Law
College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences
College of Medicine
College of Optometry
College of Pharmacy
Colleges of Social and Behavioral Sciences
College of Social Work
College of Veterinary Medicine
University Libraries
Departments of Military, Air and Naval Science
Lima Campus
Mansfield Campus
Marion Campus
Newark Campus

Faculty Council Coordinator

Clark Leavitt
Joan Gritzmacher
Ann Blombach
Gordon Stairs
Gary Racey
Desmond Cook
Douglas Kerr
Barbara Rigney
John Kozyris
William Palmer
M. Rosita Schiller
Richard Hill
Michael Gerald
Daniel Hughes
Harold Schneiderman
Charles Diesem
Laura Blomquist
Don Lair
William Angel
Ralph Hunt/William Bradfield
Franklin Proano
Terry Long
COLUMBUS, Ohio -- Ohio State University will hold a public hearing on Jan. 21 as the next step in developing procedures for releasing tenured faculty and eliminating programs in times of financial crisis.

The Faculty Council will conduct the hearing from 3 to 5 p.m. in Weigel Hall, 1866 College Road, on the campus.

Under discussion will be a two-part report drafted by an ad hoc faculty committee after 4½ months of study.

The first part of the report, "The Conditions for Termination," was published in October and later revised. This section deals with an overall philosophy to be followed if budget problems create a need to eliminate programs and dismiss tenured faculty. It also addressed the separate issue of the release of tenured faculty due to changing educational circumstances which dictate the curtailment of programs for academic reasons.

The second part discusses and then recommends specific criteria and procedures, along with appeal processes, to be followed in terminating tenured faculty.

Tenure is a form of job protection granted faculty members in a peer review process after a probationary period, usually seven years. The principle of tenure is considered critical to academic freedom and faculty governance of universities.
These incentives include an early retirement program, a voluntary resignation program, severance compensation and a re-assignment training leave program.

After analyzing comments on the proposal, the Faculty Council will forward information to the Steering Committee of the University Senate or to a Select Committee named to put the recommendations into rule form and then to the central administration.

Eventually the procedural rules would come to the university's trustees for approval.

Professor James Garland was chairman of the ad hoc committee that drew up the two-part report. Michael Gerald is chairman of the Faculty Council (faculty members of the University Senate), and Glen H. Schmidt heads the Select Committee to formulate the rules.

---0---

(Contact: James Garland, 422-7277; Michael Gerald, 422-9388; Glen Schmidt, 422-6851).
Committee issues second tenure report

By Steve Sterrett

OSU on Campus
17 Dec 1981

The Ad Hoc Faculty Committee on Release of Tenured Faculty after four and one-half months of study presented its two-part report to the provost on Dec. 4.

The recommendations contained in the report, "The Release of Tenured Faculty," are to form the basis of amendments to the Rules of the University Faculty dealing with terminating tenured faculty positions.

A preliminary Part One of the report, "The Conditions for Termination," was published in October. The ad hoc committee revised Part One to respond to comments from faculty members in meetings and letters.

At the request of the ad hoc committee, the revised Part One and Part Two, "Recommendations Governing Involuntary Termination," are being distributed in report form to faculty members, rather than being published in this newspaper.

In accepting the report, Provost W. Ann Reynolds thanked the ad hoc committee for its dedication. "In my opinion, the committee's report can form a basis for assuring faculty of important safeguards should program curtailment ever have to occur at the Ohio State University," she said.

"We are all relieved that the legislative provision of our budget in November removes the acute need for these guidelines. Nonetheless, ... we do need to move expeditiously towards adoption of such procedures after wide consultation with the faculty," Reynolds said.

In Part One of the report, the committee suggests an overall philosophy to be followed if budget problems create a need to eliminate programs and dismiss tenured faculty, emphasizing that financial exigency should be established before specific programs are targeted for curtailment.

Part One also addresses the separate issue of releasing tenured faculty due to changes in educational circumstances which dictate the curtailment of programs for academic reasons, rather than financial reasons.

Part Two discusses and then recommends specific criteria and procedures, along with appeal processes, to be followed in terminating tenured faculty.

Tenure is a form of job protection granted to faculty members in a peer review process after a probationary period, usually seven years. The principle of tenure is considered critical to academic freedom and faculty governance of universities.

Procedures for review

In a letter published in OSU onCampus on Nov. 5, President Jennings outlined a process for consultation on the recommendations before proposed amendments to the faculty rules are forwarded to the University's Board of Trustees for review and adoption.

The president suggested that the University Senate Steering Committee appoint a panel to put the recommendations in the form of rules. The Steering Committee responded by appointing the Select Faculty Committee to Formulate Rules for Release of Tenured Faculty. This committee, in turn, chose Glen H. Schmidt, professor and chairman of the Department of Dairy Science, as its chairman.

Jennings also asked the Faculty Council to hold open meetings and hearings on the complete report and to obtain comments, suggestions and proposed changes to the recommendations. He said the Faculty Council should encourage comments from all the faculty and from various committees of the University Senate.

After receiving and analyzing the comments, the Faculty Council should send the information to the Steering Committee or the select committee, and then to the central administration for review, Jennings said.

Michael Gerald, professor of pharmacy and chairman of the Faculty Council, said a public hearing on the recommendations will be held Jan. 21 from 3-5 p.m. in Weigel Hall. Representatives of faculty and campus organizations and committees and individual faculty members will be able to testify, he said.

Definition is changed

Among the major revisions made in Part One of the report is a modified definition of the term "financial exigency." The new definition is: "Financial exigency which justifies the termination of tenured faculty is an imminent financial crisis which seriously jeopardizes the quality of the University's academic programs and the ability of the University to fulfill its obligations to the public. Projections of enrollment, of instructional subsidies, and of other sources of revenues must indicate that the shortage of funds will be both severe and persistent."

Speaking for the committee, Chairman James Garland, professor of physics, explained that the definition was modified to include the phrase "imminent financial crisis," to respond to the criticism that the original definition did not seem to require a severe enough fiscal situation.

He also noted that "the phrase 'quality of the University' was replaced by 'the quality of the University's academic programs,' the evaluation of which is subsequently vested in representatives of the faculty-at-large."

Part One calls for "a group of faculty members and administrators" to meet with central administration to review whether the University is in a state of financial exigency. "It is essential for the faculty members on the group to include professors from diverse academic specialties and constituencies, with broad collective experience in university governance and budgetary matters," the report says.

Garland explained that his committee "did not feel it was appropriate to specify the size of the group or how it would be selected. These decisions should be made by the select committee and approved by the faculty."

Part One also includes a new recommendation for ending financial exigency. Once the state of financial exigency has been determined, "no further establishment of financial exigency will be required for one year, at which time the full procedures must be invoked again. The Board of Trustees may declare the state to be ended at any time," the report says.
In Part Two, the committee offers guidelines for terminating faculty positions “once individual programs had been identified for elimination or reduction.” The committee was not charged with developing criteria and procedures for determining what programs should be cut.

**Basis for recommendations**

The committee’s recommendations in Part Two are based on two precepts. “The first is that tenured faculty members must not be involuntarily terminated so long as their tenuring unit remains in existence,” the report says. A tenuring unit is the group of peers which evaluates each faculty member for tenure, most often a department.

“The second precept is that the University has an institutional commitment to tenured faculty members which goes beyond the bounds of a specific tenuring unit. Accordingly, before any tenured faculty are dismissed, the University must attempt to reassign them to other academic programs, if necessary providing a period of retraining to facilitate that reassignment.”

Central to the committee’s recommendations is that the University should develop some economic incentives for voluntarily reducing the number of tenured faculty members in departments which must be reduced in size, but not necessarily eliminated. These incentives include an early retirement program, a voluntary resignation program, severance compensation and a reassignment training leave program.

The committee recognizes that the reassignment of a faculty member to another department may conflict with “the right of an academic department to choose its members, according to its own criteria and standards.” The committee upholds “a department’s ultimate right of refusal,” but suggests some positive incentives for a department to accept a reassigned faculty member.

The report expresses the concern of the committee that, without careful planning, “the burden of program reduction often falls heavily on the shoulders of the probationary faculty” and “presents a particularly ominous specter to women and minorities.”

The committee reaffirms the University’s commitment to affirmative action and suggests that affirmative action must work “at the level of individuals and at the level of academic programs.” whose existence reflects affirmative action goals.

In addition, the committee recommends that departments facing a reduction in the number of faculty should not simply cut the jobs of untenured faculty. Departments should use a variety of programs to encourage tenured faculty to voluntarily leave, thereby saving enough money “to preserve the positions of those assistant professors the department would like to retain,” the committee says.

**Committee members named**

Serving on the ad hoc committee appointed by the provost last July were, in addition to Garland, Andrew H. Chen, professor of finance; Vincent V. Hamparian, professor of medical microbiology; Norman Rask, professor of agricultural economics; Gerald M. Reagan, professor of education; Barbara H. Rigney, associate professor of English; and William B. Shook, professor of ceramic engineering.

The members of the select committee are, in addition to Schmidt, Robert G. Turnbull, professor of philosophy; Leslie Blatt, professor and chairman of the Department of Physics; Desmond Cook, professor of education and psychology and chairman of the Senate Rules Committee; Mildred Munday, assistant professor of English and secretary of the university faculty; and Geoffrey Keller, professor of astronomy and chairman of the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

Appointed as ex officio members without voting rights were Michael Gerald, chairman of the Faculty Council, and either Garland or another member of the ad hoc committee. Larry Thompson, special assistant to the president, is serving as a consultant to the committee.
Faculty future: the tenure report and OSU

Faculty says tenure essential for job security, academic freedom

By Laura Palko
Lancet staff writer

All too often, tenure is thought of only as a safeguard against losing a job, or as an escape from the economic hardships of the "real world."

OSU faculty realize a tenure policy is essential for academic freedom and responsibility in the university as well.

Protecting tenured faculty in the case of financial emergency at OSU is addressed in a report submitted by the Ad Hoc Faculty Committee in early December.

The committee, led by James C. Garland, professor of physics, proposed policies concerning the conditions for dismissing tenured faculty and recommendations governing involuntary termination.

Academic freedom is endorsed by the university "as essential to attain the goal of the free search for truth and its free exposition."

"The most critical element of tenure is academic freedom and the protection of that freedom of inquiry," OSU President Edward H. Jennings said.

He said he feels OSU faculty considers the academic freedom gained from tenure invaluable.

With academic freedom, instructors can teach, conduct research, and publish findings in their own manner. They also are able to seek changes in academic and institutional policies without fear of reprisal, the OSU faculty handbook says.

Increase in work quality, economic incentives and professional and social recognition are among the benefits of gaining tenure. But gaining tenure is a long and difficult process.

Tenure may be earned by all teachers with regular faculty status. The regular faculty includes all faculty with the titles of professor, associate professor, assistant professor and instructor serving in positions totaling 50 percent or more service to the university.

No teacher attains tenure automatically. Nominations for tenure originate in the department where a peer group provides information about the candidate's qualifications and detailed evidence to support the nomination.

Each candidate is judged on performance in teaching, research or other creative work, and service to the university, the handbook says.

The recommendation then is considered by the college and the dean. If the nomination is favorable, it is subject to the approval of the provost, the president, and the OSU Board of Trustees.

Faculty members are subject to a probationary period, usually lasting seven years. They are notified of their status during their fourth and sixth years at OSU. Tenure is then granted during the eighth year if their appointment is renewed.

If an appointment is not renewed, the faculty member must leave the university within a year.

"Tenure has been a part of all major American universities for decades in order to protect academic freedom," Provost W. Ann Reynolds said.

"I treasure the tenure status I have in the department of anatomy at this university," she said. Reynolds received a tenured faculty position for the first time in 1967 at the University of Illinois.
Emergency report draws mixed reactions

By Laura Palko and Craig Jolley
Lantern staff writer

An unscientifc random survey of OSU faculty members on a two-part report on the release of tenured faculty shows mixed feelings about the proposed policy.

A majority of the faculty members polled had not read the report, or declined comment.

Those faculty who were familiar with the report proposals and consented to share their comments generally agreed that the policy was carefully thought out by the Ad Hoc Faculty Committee.

But some were not pleased with the report's contents.

"I think the recommendations will be devastating to the complete teaching system the first time they are used," said William P. Baker, associate professor of music.

"With private industry starting to offer tenure, faculty will start leaving."

Baker said the long-range effect will, in his opinion, keep faculty from coming to OSU because of reluctance to join a university where no job security is offered.

James A. Bartos, associate professor of accounting, also feels faculty will not want to teach at OSU when the policy first goes into effect.

"I don't think too much of the report because I see it leading them (OSU) to replacing a lot of high-priced faculty with a lot of low-priced faculty," he said.

Carl W. Birky Jr., professor of genetics, does not think there will be a serious possibility of faculty reluctance to teach at OSU when the policy is approved.

"Every university can get into financial difficulties," he said, adding that OSU may be a little more prepared for financial trouble by thinking ahead.

The section of the report dealing with program elimination is at the heart of the matter, according to Albert H. Soloway, dean for the college of pharmacy.

He also felt the university will try to do the best they can to provide fair compensation benefits for tenured faculty who are involuntarily dismissed.

Soloway said the college faculty met to discuss the report and talk with Michael C. Gerald, professor of pharmacy and Faculty Council chairman.

"I thought it was a well-studied document," said Jack L. Beal, assistant dean for the college of pharmacy. "Generally, I'm in favor of the report," he said.

Arthur E. Wohlers, retired professor of education administration, said, "Whoever initiated it (the report) should be patted on the back."

Provost W. Ann Reynolds appointed the seven-member faculty committee last summer.

"It is absolutely necessary for a university to have a statement like that" in times of reduced student enrollment and less money, Wohlers said.

Some people are going to be hurt, but the proposals are fair, he said. "How else do you keep a total faculty on their toes?" Wohlers added.

George S. Serif, professor of biochemistry, agrees with the need for a policy and feels the faculty will have more to say about the policy of tenure, "which is encouraging."

The faculty council is scheduled to meet Jan. 21 from 3 to 5 p.m. in the Weigel Hall auditorium for an open hearing on the merits of the faculty committee report.
Big Ten wrestles with shrinking funds

By John Steele
Lantern staff writer 1-8-82

State budget cuts are forcing Ohio State and other Big Ten schools to reassess the status of many academic programs and faculty. Tenure, the password of academic freedom and research, is facing its own re-evaluation.

Recently, an ad hoc faculty committee at OSU submitted recommendations concerning the voluntary and involuntary release of tenured faculty.

Similar problems have occurred at the University of Illinois in Urbana, Michigan University in Ann Arbor, University of Minnesota in Minneapolis and Michigan State University in East Lansing.

Richard Lanese, OSU chapter president of the American Association of University Professors, said the report has some serious weakening provisions.

But considering the short time the committee had to work on the guidelines, it is a "remarkable document," he said.

Lanese, also professor of preventive medicine, said the report's definition of financial exigency comes close to justifying the release of tenured faculty, but not close enough.

The report defines a financial exigency as "an imminent financial crisis which seriously jeopardizes the quality of the university's academic programs and the ability of the university to fulfill its obligation to the public."

"There should be clear indication that the state of Ohio is in financial trouble before such a declaration is made," Lanese said.

"The public also has obligations to the university, its students, faculty and future students for the future plans of the community," he said.

Lanese said acceptance of the report will be difficult because there is no mention of who decides "how, when, by what means and which programs are to be cut."

Without specification this "important intermediate step" could be abused or put in the wrong hands, he said.

"There should be a permanent standing committee to study problems like these. It is too complex a subject for a group formed at a crisis moment to understand fully," he said.

AAUP Past President and Astronomy Professor William M. Protheroe, said the report "was an improvement but still flawed."

Lanese and Protheroe agree on one major weakness in the report. The guidelines would prohibit dismissal of a faculty member while his tenuring unit (departmental peers) is in existence, but only if the faculty member is qualified to be reassigned to another academic program. Otherwise, involuntary termination is possible.

Other Big Ten schools also are faced with making some hard choices.

Martha Friedman, chairwoman of the Illinois Senate Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom, said her committee has been studying program cost-cutting instead of faculty dismissal because university policy prohibits firing tenured faculty during financial exigency.

"The regulations are to protect the exercise of academic freedom," she said.

Michigan AAUP President Robert Weeks said Michigan has nothing comparable to OSU's report at Michigan.

"There have been similar proposals but nothing has come of them. I wish there was more faculty involvement, he said.

Weeks said the need for faculty termination guidelines was evident when university officials abolished Michigan's geography department.

"It was crude and without the appropriate academic due process," he said.

Usually when the curriculum is changed, AAUP focuses on three areas - early faculty consultation, administrative consideration and meaningful input, Weeks said.

He said these points were violated by Michigan officials during reassignment of the geography department faculty.

"Harold Shapiro, president of the university, said his goal was to make Michigan smaller but better. But the evidence shows that the faculty is shrinking while the student body is increasing," Weeks said.

Minnesota AAUP President Bruce Overmier said the university may have to cut its budget 25 percent because of state across-the-board cuts.

He said the university is considering a 10 percent tuition increase in spring and a 15 percent increase next fall.

"Personally, I would the increase will be between 15-20 percent. And while AAUP permits the firing of tenured employees because of educational reasons, the declaration of financial exigency would create chaos," Overmier said.

"You are throwing out the stability of a university once that valve of tenure is taken away."

Michigan State has ended its state of financial exigency with a $20 million retrenchment program including reduction of the work force by attrition, program reduction and prioritization, said Connie Stewart, vice president of university relations.

"The winter of 1981 ended five to six months of protests, open meetings and counter-proposals," she said.
Report troubles vice provost

By Laura Palko
Lantern staff writer 1-12-82

Minority faculty members ultimately will suffer career problems if OSU faculty approves the tenured faculty termination report, according to Frank W. Hale Jr., vice provost for minority affairs.

Hale sent a letter opposing the report to James C. Garland, chairman of the ad hoc faculty committee which released the proposals early in December. Garland could not be reached for comment.

Hale also plans to present his argument at the faculty hearing of the report Jan. 21.

The committee report includes a discussion of the effect of program reduction on untenured faculty, minorities and women.

According to the report, the university goal of affirmative action must be reaffirmed by both the faculty and the administration in a time of financial crisis.

"It is ultimately the administration that must place the funding priority on academic programs whose existence reflects affirmative action goals," the report says.

Alternatives to dismissing untenured faculty focus on providing economic incentives to voluntarily reduce tenured faculty in a program.

Hale said protection for untenured faculty outlined in the report, however, is not adequate when "the traditional approach in institutions of higher education is that 'the last hired are the first fired.'"

Minority faculty are usually "latecomers" to the university, and are concentrated in the lower ranks, he said.

Hale cited the tenure system as one factor restricting minority progress toward educational equality.

The requirements for tenure include a review of the candidate's teaching performance, written publications and research work.

Hale said minority faculty often spend more time serving the university than they receive credit for.

While white and minority untenured faculty most often are burdened with heavy teaching loads, Hale maintains that the minorities, especially blacks, are confronted with additional demands as counselors.

These faculty members, serving as "official counselors" for minority students, are sought out for advice and inspiration as role models, Hale said.

The time and effort devoted in formal and informal counseling puts minority faculty at a competitive disadvantage with white colleagues, Hale said. "Time devoted to students is basically (in a functional sense) time lost for research," he said.

Another point of Hale's opposition is that minority scholars are usually interested in research dealing with issues of race. Such issues, and the publications that print them, are considered "unscientific by a body of white academic mainstream intellectuals..." he said.

The limited opportunities for minority members to advance in their academic career are squeezed even further by the promotion and tenure system, Hale said.

He urged the committee to consider his opinions in their decision to maintain the work of affirmative action at OSU.

Ex-TA sues trustees

By John J. Joyce
Lantern staff writer 1-13-82

A $150,000 sex discrimination suit has been filed against the OSU Board of Trustees in U.S. District Court by a Department of Pharmacology research assistant.

Joanne Walker, 270 Walhalla Road, claims her denial of tenure in 1975 was a violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

While Walker had an appointment as both a research and teaching assistant from Jan. 1, 1975 to Nov. 25, 1975, she was treated unequally compared to males, the suit claims.

On Nov. 25, 1975, she says, she received a letter saying her teaching appointment would be terminated. The letter from Joseph R. Bianchine, chairman of the pharmacology department, gave no reason for the future dismissal, the suit says.

In June 1976, her instructor status officially was terminated and she was taken off tenure track, the suit says.

Walker continued to work as a research associate, however, and expressed desire for a faculty appointment.

But in October 1978, the suit states, Bianchine posted an open faculty position in the department and filled the post a day later with Gopi A. Tejwani, a male.

Walker's suit, filed Jan. 7, seeks $100,000 compensation for loss of income and professional advancement, and $50,000 compensation for sexual discrimination.

Walker began working for OSU in 1981 and was a research and teaching associate in the departments of microbiology, physiology, pathology and veterinary pathology.
Students to review tenure plan

By Laura Palko
Lantern staff writer 1-15-82

The University Senate Steering Committee approved Thursday a plan to allow student input in the discussion of the termination of tenured faculty report.

Discussion of the report is scheduled for Jan. 21 from 3 p.m. to 5 p.m. in the Weigel Hall auditorium.

The meeting was originally intended for faculty members only, but the steering committee decided to include the entire university community in discussing the report proposals.

All undergraduate, graduate and professional constituencies, as well as university departments from academic affairs to traffic and parking are invited to present their opinions.

"What we are trying to do is get the benefit of full university discussion," said Richard D. Gilson, steering committee chairman.

OSU Provost W. Ann Reynolds last summer appointed an ad hoc faculty committee with the task of formulating proposals for the release of tenured faculty in case of financial emergency.

The ad hoc committee, chaired by James C. Garland, professor of physics, submitted the complete report to the provost and the steering committee in December.

Persons wishing to share comments on the report at the hearing should contact the office of the University Senate in order to be assured of a time slot on the program agenda.

Representatives of university groups will have five minutes to present their views. Individuals speaking on their own behalf will have three minutes for presentation, said Michael C. Gerald, Faculty Council chairman.

Additional comments from persons not included in the formal program will be heard at the end of the meeting, he said.

"I think we need an open hearing," Gerald said, "especially if there is a departure from the rules from Garland."

Organization is crucial in a situation that could be chaotic, he said.

After careful consideration of the input at the hearing, and written comments submitted by faculty members, the Faculty Select Rules Committee will develop a set of technical rules. These rules must be consistent with the outlined policy on the release of tenured faculty, said Gerald, also a member of the select rules committee.

The faculty council will then vote on the rule proposals. If the rules are accepted, they will be presented to the University Senate for approval.

The committee to submit rules to the senate has not yet been identified, Gerald said.

Only after the senate and the Senate Rules Committee pass the policy rules will OSU President Edward H. Jennings ask the OSU Board of Trustees for final approval.

Gerald said the rules committee will not attempt to draft rules until all opinions of the report are considered.

"We are moving with all deliberate speed," he said, but the policy will not be "railroaded" in order to meet a deadline.

The tenure report as it moves its way through the university governing structure.
Rules committee expansion controversial

By Laura Palko
Lantern staff writer 1-15-82

Three new members will be added to the Faculty Select Rules Committee assigned to develop technical rules based on the tenured faculty termination report.

The University Steering Committee Thursday voted 6 to 3 to name one student leader, an untenured assistant professor and a minority faculty member to the rules committee.

Provost W. Ann Reynolds motioned to expand the committee members in order to have better university representation when the proposed rules for the release of tenured faculty are formed.

Reynolds said she also spoke for OSU President Edward H. Jennings who “strongly believes in wide representation.”

Steering committee members, opposing the additions, argued that rules concerning tenured faculty release should be made only by tenured faculty members.

They said rules will be more effective in the future if they are drafted by affected faculty. “They alone will be responsible for their actions,” one steering committee member said.

Michael C. Gerald, a non-voting member of the select rules committee, said the rules committee would become a “political forum” rather than the coordinated effort of a peer group.

The present Select Rules Committee consists of six voting members. They include Glen H. Schmidt, committee chairman; S. Leslie Blatt, chairman of the department of physics; Desmond L. Cook, professor of psychology; Mildred B. Munday, assistant professor of English; Geoffrey Keller, professor of astronomy; and Robert G. Turnbull, professor of philosophy.
OSU faculty tackles policy on furloughs

By Gary Kiefer

Ohio State University faculty members spent three hours Thursday haggling over layoff alternatives that one professor termed "our new three Rs — retraining, reassignment and retirement."

The comment, from education professor Howard Gauthier Jr., was made during an OSU Faculty Council hearing. He was referring to provisions in proposed guidelines for dismissing tenured faculty during a financial crisis.

THE GUIDELINES recommend that, if an academic department must be cut, the tenured faculty members be offered an early retirement plan or the chance to be reassigned to another department, after retraining, before they are dismissed.

OSU President Edward Jennings opened the meeting in Weigel Hall auditorium by emphasizing to the audience of 300 people that no immediate faculty layoffs are planned despite the $20 million state subsidy cutback he expects OSU to suffer before June 30.

"There has been no discussion of program elimination," he said. "Even when this policy is developed, I would hope that it would not have to be used."

JENNINGS SAID later that he will outline his plan for dealing with the subsidy cut during a noon speech on Tuesday in Mershon Auditorium.

In a related matter, he also canceled as "inappropriate" his own March 9 formal inauguration ceremony, saying he will request instead a brief installation ceremony following the Feb. 5 meeting of OSU trustees.

Thursday's Faculty Council hearing had been scheduled long before the state's budget crisis was revealed. The guidelines under discussion were put together by a seven-member committee formed last July.

But many of the faculty members gathered in the auditorium found it difficult to disregard the immediate budget problems in considering a policy for the future.

PHYSICS PROFESSOR James C. Garland, chairman of the committee that devised the guidelines, acknowledged that he has received many questions from faculty members about what other cutbacks would be made at OSU before faculty layoffs would begin.

"If the release of tenured faculty is being called the last resort, they want to know what are the first resorts," Garland said.

Tenure is a form of job protection that means the faculty member has passed a peer review process following a probationary period, usually seven years.
COLUMBUS, Ohio -- Ohio State University will hold a public hearing on May 5 as the next step in adopting university rules for releasing tenured faculty members and eliminating academic programs in times of financial crisis.

The Faculty Council will conduct the hearing at 3 p.m. in room 100 of Independence Hall, 1938 Neil Ave., on the campus.

Under discussion will be a set of proposed university rules drafted by a select committee, which has been working since last December. The committee's work is based largely on a report on tenure release issued by a faculty panel late last year.

Glen Schmidt, chairman of the Select Rules Committee for the Termination of Tenured Faculty, emphasized that the proposed rules have not been formulated as a means of firing professors. In a severe budget crisis, the university already has the authority to do that, he said.

"Rather, in formulating these rules, we have been concentrating on setting limits to termination and providing protection to tenured faculty members from arbitrary termination which would undermine the principle of tenure," Schmidt said.

He also noted that the release of tenured faculty must be viewed as a "last resort" after other measures have failed to resolve the financial crisis.

The proposed rules outline procedures and appeal processes to be followed if the university's budget problems create a need to eliminate academic programs and release tenured faculty members.
resort' to be invoked after all reasonable efforts at retrenchment have proved inadequate.

"Further, we agree that the conditions for such release should be much more stringent when programs are discontinued for academic reasons, rather than financial exigency."

In response to faculty concerns, however, the committee made several important additions to the report when writing the rules, Schmidt said.

The select committee is recommending that the Council on Academic Affairs be responsible for reviewing all proposals for program curtailment and that the Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee develop voluntary incentive programs to reduce the number of tenured faculty members in departments which must be reduced in size or eliminated.

In a related action, the Steering Committee of the senate is developing a proposal to create a permanent, university-wide fiscal committee. The proposal is scheduled to be brought before the senate for approval at its May 8 meeting.

If a fiscal committee is established, then this body, under the rules proposed by the select committee, would determine whether the university was in a state of financial exigency, a situation which would permit invoking the rules to terminate tenured positions, and would make recommendations to the university president.

³

(Contact: Glen Schmidt, 422-6851, and Michael Gerald, 422-9388.)

-sas-
New guidelines proposed by a faculty committee governing the dismissal of tenured faculty in a financial crisis would establish a permanent fiscal committee to report to the president and the University Senate, committee member S. Leslie Blatt said Thursday.

The new rules differ from the original draft of the rules in two areas, Blatt said. The original rules called for a committee to be appointed only during a financial crisis.

"A permanent committee would know enough about the way the budget works to determine if financial exigency exists," Blatt said.

The University Senate will consider formation of the fiscal committee at its May 8 meeting, he added.

The new proposal also would give the Council on Academic Affairs the responsibility of reviewing any proposal for dealing with a financial crisis severe enough to warrant termination of tenured faculty.

The council would advise the president and present its findings to the senate, Blatt said.

The first draft of the rules called for the creation of a new group to study proposed measures for dealing with financial exigency, he said.

The new guidelines are different from those originally proposed, but Blatt said the reason for writing the rules remained the same.

"The intent was to write explicit rules to limit the ways tenured faculty could lose jobs" during financial exigency, he said.

The new proposal defines financial exigency as "an imminent financial crisis" that "cannot be alleviated by temporary or voluntary measures."

Both proposals recommend tenured faculty not be dismissed as long as their tenure evaluation unit exists at OSU.

A tenure evaluation unit is a group of faculty who share an area of expertise and is responsible for review of its members. Blatt said tenure evaluation units usually exist at the departmental level.

The new plan also calls for financial incentives to implement voluntary reduction of tenured faculty.

Under the early retirement program scheduled to go into effect July 1, a faculty member could retire with benefits, but boost his income by teaching one quarter each year.

The rules also include a "buy out," or voluntary resignation program, under which a faculty member could resign with one year's pay. Blatt said the legal aspects of such a program still must be explored.

The new guidelines provide an appeals system for faculty who are terminated, and stipulate that OSU's affirmative action programs not fall victim to program curtailments.

An open faculty meeting to discuss the proposed rules is scheduled for 3 p.m., May 5 in Independence Hall 100.

The guidelines will be submitted to the Faculty Council for approval on May 14 and are scheduled to go before the University Senate on June 1.

New draft on tenure policy set

4-22-82

The latest draft of the OSU policy on the release of tenured faculty is scheduled to be distributed to faculty members on Friday, Glenn Schmidt, member of the Council on Academic Affairs, said Wednesday.

Schmidt said the council "will play a major role" in the process.

A faculty meeting on the policy statement is scheduled for May 5, and the proposal will go before the University Senate on June 1, he said.
OSU professors dispute rules for dismissal in financial crisis

By Don Baird  5-10-82
Dispute OSU Reporter

Ohio State University professors argued Wednesday over whether a proposed set of rules will endanger their jobs or protect them.

The suggested rules resulted from a call made last year by Provost W. Ann Reynolds for a policy governing the layoff of faculty members in a financial crisis.

During a public hearing in OSU's Independence Hall, some faculty members blasted the rules as vague and open to abuse.

They predicted the rules would frighten away potential faculty and damage OSU's national reputation.

But faculty members who drew up the rules defended them as a guarantee of fair and honest layoff procedures to be used if the state's budget crisis worsens.

The dispute centers on tenure, a form of job protection which guarantees faculty members can speak out on controversial issues without fear of being fired for their opinions.

Late last year, a faculty committee named by Reynolds reported, "Several recent court cases have clearly established that universities do have the right to terminate tenured professors" during financial emergencies.

A second committee then was named by the University Senate to draw up specific layoff rules using the original committee's guidelines.

Glen Schmidt, chairman of the committee which drew up the rules, said the faculty faces a choice between being laid off using their own guidelines or simply being ousted in a crisis by the board of trustees.

Schmidt said the rules would strengthen job protection.

But Richard R. Lanese, president of the OSU chapter of the American Association of University Professors, rejected the rules as an attempt to undermine the concept of tenure.

He complained the rules break a longstanding precedent that professors are tenured with a university as a whole rather than with specific departments or programs.

Lanese also quarreled with the term "financial exigency," which would put layoffs into motion if the quality of academic programs is endangered.

Lanese warned that program quality is open to such broad interpretation that it could wrongfully be used to fire professors who are unpopular with administrators.
May 19, 1982

Proposed Rules on Financial Exigency

The attached document, submitted for consideration by the University Senate at its June 1, 1982, special meeting, is the third draft of proposed rules dealing with financial exigency. Draft I was circulated to the faculty on April 22, 1982. Following an open hearing on May 5 and receipt of written suggestions for improvements, the Select Rules Committee presented a second draft to Faculty Council. The present draft also incorporates many of the amendments approved at Council’s May 14 meeting; a few amendments, which the Committee has altered or left out, will be presented in original form at the June 1 meeting on behalf of Faculty Council.

Major changes in draft III, compared with the April 22 version, are as follows:

1. The present draft includes only the financial exigency portion of the proposed rules. It is the sense of the committee that existing rules and the proposals submitted herewith do not provide substantial protection against possible faculty terminations which may result from program elimination for academic reasons under conditions other than financial exigency. Proposed rules for such circumstances are being developed by the Committee and will be submitted for consideration in the near future.

2. Language clarifying the University's tenure commitment has been added.

3. The definition of financial exigency has been rewritten to embody the concept of "survival" as well as "excellence." The judgements required on implementing this definition are assigned to the University Fiscal Committee, which was formed by Senate action at its May meeting. The Fiscal Committee's membership includes a majority of faculty members, and a majority of these are elected by the Senate from a slate of nominees originating in Faculty Council.

4. Recommendations for or against a determination of financial exigency pursuant to the Fiscal Committee's report are made by the Senate.

5. The requirement that no tenured faculty members may be involuntarily terminated unless their entire department (school, division, etc.) is eliminated has been retained. The unit is called the "Tenure Initiating Unit (TIU)," and the definition is drawn to prevent interpretation as a place where tenure "resides."

6. When a portion of a department (school, division, etc.) is eliminated, faculty members in that TIU shall not be involuntarily terminated, without exception.
Draft of Proposed Rules
May 17, 1982
3335-5-03 Election of faculty and staff: tenure.

The board of trustees shall annually appoint the president and all employees of the university not in the classified civil service, subject to the laws of the state of Ohio, and in the case of regular faculty, to the rights and protection of tenure. Tenure IS A COMMITMENT BY THE UNIVERSITY AND may be earned by all teachers with regular faculty status subject to a probationary period.
Regular faculty status is defined in rule 3335-5-19 of the Administrative Code. THE PROTECTIONS OF TENURE AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM EXTEND TO ALL LEVELS OF FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY IN ACCORD WITH RULE 3335-5-01 AND ARE NOT RESTRICTED TO ACTIVITIES IDENTIFIED WITH SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONAL, RESEARCH OR PUBLIC SERVICE PROGRAMS. Tenure is lost by formal resignation, by retirement, or may be terminated by reason of proved incompetence or grave misconduct in accordance with rule 3335-5-04 of the Administrative Code, for causes set forth in rule 3335-5-02 of the Administrative Code, or UNDER THE CONDITIONS OF BONA FIDE FINANCIAL EXIGENCE, AS SPECIFIED IN RULE 3335-5-021 OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE CODE.

3335-5-021 Financial exigency.

(A) Definition. Financial exigency is an imminent financial crisis which seriously jeopardizes the ability of the university as a whole to survive as an institution of excellence in teaching, research, and public service. Projections of enrollment, of instructional subsidies, and of other sources of revenues must demonstrate that the shortage of funds will be both severe and persistent and cannot be alleviated by temporary or voluntary measures, as specified in (B)(2).

(B) Mechanism of determination.

(1) In the event of an imminent financial crisis, as announced and defined by the president to the university senate, the president will solicit the recommendations of the fiscal committee, as provided for under rule 3335-5-582 of the Administrative Code, to ascertain whether a determination of financial exigency is warranted.

(2) The fiscal committee, acting in accordance with rule 3335-5-582 of the Administrative Code, shall have the responsibility to:

(a) Review the budgetary documentation of the crisis, having full access to that documentation.
(C) Review of administration proposals for alleviating financial exigency.

(1) Upon determination of a state of financial exigency and upon receipt from the provost of proposals, prepared in consultation with the college faculties, for curtailment of academic programs to alleviate financial exigency, the council on academic affairs shall review the proposals.

(2) For the purpose of this review, the council is to be an advisory committee to the president and is to report the results of its review both to the president and to the university senate.

(3) The vice chairperson of the council shall act as chairperson of the council for the review of these proposals and for the submission of results to the president and to the university senate.

(4) In the conduct of its review, the council is authorized to:

(a) Obtain explanations of the proposals or provisions thereof;

(b) Request or initiate changes in the proposals and seek concurrence of appropriate administrators. In the event of non-concurrence, the council will note any points of disagreement.

(5) All proposals are to be reviewed both individually and as a coordinated set.

(6) In the review, the council shall:

(a) Consider alternatives to those proposals which would result in involuntary termination of tenured faculty members or regular faculty members in the probationary period;

(b) Determine that the proposals are consistent with established educational and academic policies of the university;

(c) Determine that there has been appropriate consultation with administrators, faculty, and students in the preparation of the proposals;

(d) Determine the extent to which the proposals consider principles of affirmative action.
(4) "Tenure initiating unit" (TIU) means the specific academic unit responsible for making the initial recommendation on a regular faculty member's tenure status as recorded on the university tenure audit list available at the office of academic affairs. For purposes of this definition, the university tenure audit list of March 12, 1982, shall be retained, except as subsequently modified in accord with rules 3335-5-14, 3335-3-25 through 3335-3-28, and 3335-5-48 of the Administrative Code.

(B) Involuntary termination of tenured faculty.

(1) Hiring of faculty during financial exigency. The university shall not appoint new faculty while terminating tenured faculty appointments because of financial exigency unless a serious distortion in academic programs would otherwise result.

(2) Preservation of tenure initiating unit. A tenured faculty member whose TIU is preserved shall not be involuntarily terminated because of the curtailment of academic programs to which the faculty member is assigned.

(3) Administrative restructuring of tenure initiating unit. A tenured faculty member whose TIU is restructured by an administrative reorganization (e.g., by consolidation or merger with other TIU's, or by dispersal into several TIU's) shall not be involuntarily terminated for that reason. The faculty member shall be transferred to the appropriate reorganized TIU in accordance with the provisions of (C)(4).

(4) Reinstitution of tenure initiating unit. If an eliminated TIU is substantively reinstated or established within a remaining TIU within five (5) years, the university shall offer to reappoint all terminated tenured faculty members at their previous ranks.

(5) Elimination of tenure initiating unit. A tenured faculty member whose TIU is scheduled for elimination shall not be involuntarily terminated for that reason until the reassignment provision of (C) and the economic incentives of (D) have been offered to all eligible faculty members in the TIU.

(6) Notice of termination. A termination of appointment because of the elimination of a tenure initiating unit shall become effective no sooner than one full appointment period following the expiration of the faculty member's current appointment.
curtailed shall not be assigned to a position in another TIU held by an untenured faculty member, or to a position held by an administrative and professional employee).

(6) Retraining of faculty. Where reassignment of a tenured faculty member according to the provisions of (B)(1), (C)(1), or (C)(2) would be facilitated by or contingent upon a period of retraining, the faculty member shall be eligible for a reassignment training leave.

(D) Economic incentives and retraining programs.

(1) Early retirement program. The university shall invoke the provisions of The Ohio State University early retirement program to facilitate the voluntary reduction of tenured faculty members in a curtailed academic program.

(2) Reassignment training leave program. The university shall invoke the provisions of a reassignment training leave program to facilitate reassignment of tenured faculty members to other programs or tenure initiating units.

(3) Other programs. The university shall invoke any other feasible methods to reduce by voluntary means the number of tenured faculty members in a curtailed academic program. Such methods could include a voluntary resignation program (e.g., a "buy-out" plan), among other possibilities.

3335-5-023 Appeal procedures for tenured faculty because of termination of appointments during financial exigency.

(A) Scope and Construction.

(1) A tenured faculty member who has received a notice of termination because of financial exigency shall have the right to a hearing before a faculty hearing panel.

(2) The responsibility for presenting the formal appeal and for responding to the hearing panel's requirements at all stages rests with the faculty member bringing the complaint ("the complainant").

(3) The determination of financial exigency or the decision to eliminate a tenure initiating unit shall not constitute grounds for an appeal.
(d) The person or persons responsible for the decision may be called upon by the hearing panel to demonstrate that the important and material evidence was considered.

(4) At the conclusion of the hearing, the hearing panel shall either dismiss the complaint or support the complaint. In either case, the panel shall record its findings in writing, providing specific responses to each charge made by the complainant, summarizing the evidence and rationale which led the panel to its decision. These findings shall be reported to the administrative officer of the tenure initiating unit, to the dean of the college in which the complainant is a member, to the provost, and to the complainant.

(5) The hearing panel shall recommend to the provost and to the president either that the complaint be dismissed or that corrective action be taken.

(6) Within thirty days of the receipt of the panel's decision, the provost shall respond in writing to the hearing panel and to the complainant stating what action has been recommended and the reasons therefor.

(7) Except for those documents received under the promise of confidentiality, all written documents and recorded testimony obtained by the hearing panel shall be made available to the complainant upon request.

(C) The president.

(1) After receipt of the hearing panel's recommendations under (B)(5) above, and the provost's recommendations under (B)(6), the president shall review the matter and take whatever action is deemed appropriate.

(2) All decisions of the president under this procedure shall be provided in writing to the hearing panel, the provost, and the complainant.

3335-5-48 Council on academic affairs.

(A) through (G) unchanged.

(H) Upon determination of a state of financial exigency, the council on academic affairs shall review the administration's proposals as provided under rule 3335-5-021 of the Administrative Code.

(I) "Current rule H."
New tenure draft passes; rules called a ‘milestone’

By Jim Destefani
Lantern staff writer 6-12-82

At a special meeting Tuesday, the University Senate approved the third draft of rules for termination of tenured faculty during financial exigency.

President Edward H. Jennings called the rules “a milestone in the history of the university and of education.” He said OSU attorneys will review the proposal before it is sent to the Board of Trustees for approval.

Financial exigency is defined as “an imminent financial crisis which seriously jeopardizes the ability of the university as a whole to survive as an institution of excellence.”

Jennings said he was pleased by faculty participation in all rulemaking processes.

Richard Lanese, president of the OSU chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), said the revised rules are “far stronger in protecting faculty and maintaining the quality of the university” than earlier versions.

AAUP objected to earlier versions of the rules, which implied that tenure resides in the “tenure evaluation unit,” or department, rather than the university as a whole. Lanese said this would undermine the job security and academic freedom tenure provides.

Members of the select faculty committee, which originally wrote the rules, said the tenure evaluation unit was meant to prevent designating individual faculty members for dismissal. The guidelines say no tenured faculty member may be dismissed unless the member’s tenure evaluation unit is eliminated.

The senate rejected all but three rule amendments. Five amendments approved by the faculty council but not incorporated into the third draft of rules also were rejected.

After nearly two hours of debate the senate approved the guidelines by a wide margin.

If an eliminated program is reinstated within three years, OSU must “offer to reappoint all terminated tenured faculty members at their previous ranks.” When dismissing tenured faculty, OSU must adhere to affirmative action guidelines.

Work on the rules began in 1980 at the request of Provost W. Ann Reynolds.
Senate recommends tenure rules

The University Senate in a special meeting June 1 approved a set of proposed rules for release of tenured faculty during financial exigency and forwarded the matter to the Board of Trustees with the recommendation that the rules be adopted.

"I think the rules might very well serve as a point of departure and a good model (for other universities)," commented Richard Lanese, president of the Ohio State chapter of the American Association of University Professors, after the voice vote by the senate.

President Jennings later echoed Lanese's comment: "The tenure release rules will be a model for the nation," Jennings said. While he hopes the rules will never be used, he said they "can work to preserve the great quality of this institution."

The president said after the vote that he will get a legal opinion on the rules before he takes them to the trustees. He doesn't expect the trustees to consider the rules before their July or September meetings.

The AAUP chapter had been quite critical of the initial versions of the proposed rules and had offered detailed suggestions for improvement, many of which were incorporated in later revisions.

Lanese said that he remains unconvinced of the need for the rules, but that the rules approved by the University Senate provided much better protection for tenured professors than earlier versions. "I think the rules we have here are better than I ever expected them to be," he added.

In its action on the proposed rules, the senate accepted only three of some 15 amendments offered.

The proposed rules deal only with release of tenured faculty during financial exigency. Earlier versions of the rules had included provisions for releasing tenured faculty as the result of academic considerations which mandate the elimination of a program of instruction.

The University Senate Steering Committee has voted to extend the life of the Select Rules Committee for the Termination of Tenured Faculty until the end of next autumn quarter. The committee will meet throughout the summer and fall to draft rules on release for academic reasons.

Meeting for the last time during the 1981-82 academic year, the University Senate June 5 tabled a proposal to convert the Division of Comparative Studies in the Humanities to the Center for Comparative Studies in the Humanities.

Terry Roark, associate provost for instruction, said the division's faculty supports the conversion. The motion was tabled, however, because one senator was unclear on the status of the division's tenured professors on regional campuses.

The Steering Committee of the University Senate offered a resolution commending President Jennings on his first year at Ohio State and expressing appreciation for his work on the difficult financial problems. The resolution was adopted by acclamation.

After the meeting, the Steering Committee met and elected Herb Asher, professor of political science, as committee chairman for 1982-83. He has been chairman of the senate's Legislative Affairs Committee this year.

The faculty members on the Steering Committee elected Richard F. Firestone, professor of chemistry, as chairman of the Faculty Council for 1982-83.
COLUMBUS, Ohio -- Rules to protect tenured faculty members during periods of financial exigency were adopted by the Ohio State University Board of Trustees on Friday (10/1).

The rules outline procedures and appeal processes to be followed if the university experiences severe budget problems and must eliminate academic programs and release tenured faculty members.

Tenure is a form of job protection granted faculty members in a peer review process after a probationary period, usually seven years. The principle of tenure is considered critical to academic freedom and faculty governance of universities.

The rules define financial exigency as "an imminent financial crisis which seriously jeopardizes the ability of the university as a whole to survive as an institution of excellence in teaching, research and public service.

"Projections of enrollment, of instructional subsidies, and of other sources of revenues must demonstrate that the shortage of funds will be both severe and persistent and cannot be alleviated by temporary or voluntary measures."

The trustees adopted the rules as recommended by the University Senate, which had endorsed the proposed measures.

- more -
June 1 following a lengthy review process on campus. The senate is composed of elected representatives of the faculty and student body and of administrators.

Glen Schmidt, chairman of the Select Rules Committee for the Termination of Tenured Faculty, outlined the development of the rules for the trustees. His committee, composed of faculty members and a student representative, drafted the rules.

Schmidt, professor and chairman of the department of dairy science, said the rules concentrate on setting limits to termination and provide protection to tenured faculty members from arbitrary termination which would undermine the principle of tenure.

The release of tenured faculty must be viewed as a "last resort" after other measures have failed to resolve the financial crisis, Schmidt said.

The development of the rules began in July 1981 when then Provost W. Ann Reynolds appointed a faculty committee to study the issue of terminating tenured faculty positions in a financial crisis. This committee's report last December provoked wide discussion among the faculty and became the basis for the rules drafted by the Schmidt's committee.
Tenured faculty get more job security in hard times

By Lynne Brungarth
Lantern staff writer
10-4-82

OSU's tenured faculty members will have greater job security in times of a financial crisis under new rules adopted Friday by the Board of Trustees.

The new rules outline the university's lengthy tenure procedures in the case of a financial exigency.

A financial exigency is defined in the new rules as "an imminent financial crisis that seriously jeopardizes the ability of the university as a whole to survive as an institution of excellence in teaching, research and public service. . . . The shortage of funds will be both severe and persistent and cannot be alleviated by temporary or voluntary measures."

The approved procedures include the addition of three new rules and amendments to two existing ones.

The first rule lists the criteria for determining the existence of a financial crisis, outlines a system of reviewing administrative proposals in times of a financial crisis and defines a financial crisis.

Under the new rule, the University Senate will have the power to determine the existence of a financial crisis after the senate consults the university fiscal committee.

Once the presence of a financial crisis is determined, the vice president of academic affairs will have the responsibility of coming up with plans on how to deal with the crisis. The vice president's proposals will then be reviewed by the council on academic affairs, who in turn must report the recommendations to the University Senate.

The second new rule outlines the protections of tenured faculty under a financial crisis.

Under the new rule, the university cannot appoint new faculty while terminating tenured faculty unless serious distortion in academic programs would otherwise result.

The rule also deals with the involuntary termination of tenured faculty, reassignment of tenured faculty members, retraining programs, and the establishment and procedures of a faculty hearing committee.

The final rule outlines the appeals procedures for tenured faculty released during a financial crisis.

Under the amendments, the trustees will now have the final say in appointing all faculty and staff members except those performing civil service duties. Previously, the rule held no appointment rights for the trustees.

Another amendment will give the Council on Academic Affairs the power to review the administration's proposals in a time of financial crisis, a power they previously did not hold.

The new rules were approved after a long process beginning in January 1981.

The drafting process began after former provost, W. Ann Reynolds, appointed an ad hoc committee to study the issue of tenure during financially hard times.

The ad hoc committee, with James C. Garland, acting vice president for research and graduate studies, as its chairman, provoked wide discussion among OSU faculty members.

Most of the discussion revolved around whether tenured faculty should be dismissed during a financial crisis and how the new rules should be drawn up.

A second committee, the Select Rules Committee for the Termination of Tenured Faculty, was formed for the purpose of writing the new rules.

The new rules were written after getting input from faculty hearings, University Senate, and the American Association of University Professors.

President Edward H. Jennings said, "The rules were distributed as widely as possible and contain a broad set of comments from the student body and faculty."

Jennings said he hopes the rules will never have to be used. "We hope this is the last time we ever see this document," he added.
Tenure

Student evaluations count toward eligibility

By Lynne Brungarth
antenn staff writer 10-14-82

Instructor evaluation forms may mean more to faculty members than students realize because the surveys are used for determining tenure as well as for self-evaluation.

Under university guidelines, a candidate eligible for tenure is judged on three criteria — teaching, research and service to the university.

In determining teaching effectiveness, student evaluations play a major role, said Heinz Floss, chairman of the Department of Chemistry.

"Teaching performance is hard to evaluate," he said, because there is little concrete evidence. Research or service standards are easier to judge, he added.

S. Earl Brown, dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, said, "All things are taken into consideration when deciding on whether a candidate should be granted tenure."

An unfavorable student evaluation alone would not be enough to deny a person tenure, he said.

The Office of Academic Affairs provides faculty members with forms for student evaluations, but allows instructors, if they wish, to devise their own.

According to Daniel Hughes, chairman of the Department of Anthropology, evaluations are filled out by graduate students who work closely with the candidate.

Faculty evaluations, along with the student critiques, are considered when granting tenure, Hughes said.

The faculty is the "bottom line" group in determining whether an individual meets the tenure criteria, he said.

"It is up to the faculty as a whole to act honestly and fairly as a review," he said.

According to the OSU faculty handbook, candidates are also measured by teaching publications, teaching awards and development of new instructional materials and techniques.
Board adopts rules to protect faculty during budget crisis

Rules to protect tenured faculty members during periods of financial exigency were adopted by the trustees.

The rules outline procedures and appeal processes to be followed if the University experiences severe budget problems and must eliminate academic programs and release tenured faculty members.

Tenure is a form of job protection granted faculty members in a peer review process after a probationary period, usually seven years. The principle of tenure is considered critical to academic freedom and faculty governance of universities.

The rules define financial exigency as "an imminent financial crisis which seriously jeopardizes the ability of the University as a whole to survive as an institution of excellence in teaching, research and public service."

"Projections of enrollment, of instructional subsidies, and of other sources of revenues must demonstrate that the shortage of funds will be both severe and persistent and cannot be alleviated by temporary or voluntary measures."

The trustees adopted the rules as recommended by the University Senate, which had endorsed the proposed measures on June 1 following a lengthy review process on campus. The senate is composed of elected representatives of the faculty and student body and of administrators.

Glen Schmidt, chairman of the Select Rules Committee or the Termination of Tenured Faculty, outlined the development of the rules for the trustees. His committee, composed of faculty members and a student representative, drafted the rules.

Schmidt, professor and chairman of the department of dairy science, said the rules concentrate on setting limits to termination and provide protection to tenured faculty members from arbitrary termination which would undermine the principle of tenure.

The release of tenured faculty must be viewed as a "last resort" after other measures have failed to resolve the financial crisis, Schmidt said.

The development of the rules began in July 1981 when then Provost W. Ann Reynolds appointed a faculty committee to study the issue of terminating tenured faculty positions in a financial crisis. This committee's report last December provoked wide discussion among the faculty and became the basis for the rules drafted by the Schmidt's committee.

subsequently approved by the Council on Student Affairs on Sept. 21

The code's major purpose continues to be to compile in one concise document all the basic rules, regulations and policies that govern student conduct. The code also delineates the disciplinary process and potential consequences of violations of the rules.

The changes in the code include:

- proscribed student conduct condensed from more than 40 items to 11 general rules, plus regulations regarding disruption.

- the statement on student rights recast in a University policy section.

- proscribed conduct no longer listed by severity of sanction. Greater flexibility is permitted in matching the appropriate sanction with the individual violation.

- the new student sexual harassment policy and anti-hazing policy.

The task force which drafted the new code was chaired by Joan Long, coordinator of student judicial programs.

The task force was composed of six students, a faculty member, three student services administrators, two other administrators and the University ombudsman.

The chairman of the Council on Student Affairs is Nester. The council is composed of nine students leaders and four faculty members. Mitchell Livingston, dean of student life, is a non-voting, ex-officio member.

Following their adoption of the rules, the trustees passed a resolution expressing their appreciation to the committees involved, the Faculty Council and the University Senate "for their diligence and thorough investigation and analysis in developing the rules."
Faculty women get advice on tenure, promotion

By Cheryl Pentella

Tenure track faculty women must play an active role in establishing professional identities within their departments and should not rely on their publications or their colleagues to speak for them, said Marilyn Waldman, associate professor of history and chairperson of comparative studies in the humanities.

Women faculty must be persistent in their efforts to inform associates of their research efforts, correct misinformation that may be generated, share articles and publications with senior colleagues and seek their advice, Waldman added. "It is important to take hold of the situation and find out how one becomes known and visible within your department."

Waldman joined two other senior faculty members May 6 for a workshop at the Ohio Union on tenure and promotion procedures for faculty women at Ohio State. The workshop was sponsored by the Council on Academic Excellence for Women.

A positive interpretation of a faculty member's scholarly endeavors may result from both formal and informal relations, with other faculty members, Waldman said. "Records do not speak for themselves and they can be presented in any light," she added.

Faculty members who do not make the effort to establish a professional image among their colleagues leave much to chance, Waldman explained. Vague and oftentimes erroneous impressions about their scholarly abilities can become the basis for characterizing those faculty members who fail to establish well-known identities.

Part of a professional image can be created by training to speak authoritatively in public. "It is extremely important that women become conscious of the need to develop a public speaking manner that demands attention and respect," Waldman added.

According to Joanne Stevenson, professor of nursing, women often get caught in the "compassion trap and workhorse trap." For example, they may do a significant amount of work on a committee where the credit goes only to the chairperson, accept "dead-end" orientation courses that demand a great deal of work and student time, or resign themselves to less research time than their male counterparts receive.

Stevenson advised women to insist upon a balance of course assignments that include upper level courses where interaction with graduate students can help them stay current on issues within their field and to negotiate for sufficient research time and research assistants.

While service activities provide opportunities to progress, Stevenson cautioned women to avoid "tedious, high work, low status committee assignments."

You need to pay your dues but you shouldn't still be paying those dues when you're 50 years old. Your committee assignments should increase in status," she said.

Women should not assume that goodness or hard work is its own reward, Stevenson added.

Rhonda Rivera, professor of law, also warned workshop participants to ignore the commonly held belief that rewards are automatically based on merit.

Rivera emphasized the importance of record-keeping throughout one's career, suggesting that teachers should request that accolades from students and positive feedback on speeches be put in writing and sent to deans and chairpersons.

"Document everything you do from the moment you arrive. Always show in writing where you have been and what you have done," she said.

Women should understand the official as well as unofficial policies and procedures that govern tenure in various departments. They should request detailed descriptions of the types and amount of research and public service that are significant in tenure decisions.

Rivera suggested that women find out what their colleagues have written in the last five years, the lengths of those publications, and the types of journals that command respect from their departments.

Most importantly, Rivera said, women must understand there is a distinction sometimes between values that make one a good human being and those that further one's career. While committee service may not be weighed heavily during tenure review, a person should not necessarily sacrifice activities that provide a strong sense of personal gratification.

Developing a support system by networking with women scholars outside of one's academic unit also can be helpful in developing a professional identity within a department.

Consistent record-keeping may help to secure tenure. But, if that fails, the records become the key to a strong legal defense which Rivera said is clearly the last resort.

"If you go to trial you will be labeled a trouble maker the rest of your life. Winning a lawsuit may be the death of your career," Rivera added.
Prof charges racism in denial of tenure

By Hamidah Abd-Hamid
Lantern staff writer

A Black Studies faculty member who has been denied tenure refused to sign an agreement that he will not file any claim against the university.

Nkem Nwankwo, assistant professor of Black Studies, said that he will take his case to court instead. "Irrespective of whether I win or lose, my purpose is to establish a principle that people can't get away with racism in this university," Nwankwo said.

Nwankwo said he has appealed to Provost Diethar Haenicke regarding the negative decision made by the dean of the College of Humanities.

"The Provost's demand is that he will not review the case unless I sign an agreement that no matter what (Haenicke's) decision (will be), I will not go to court," Nwankwo said.

Associate Provost David Boyne said that Haenicke can only review the tenure and promotion case on the basis of merit. Boyne said since Nwankwo is concerned with infringements of his civil rights, Nwankwo should register his complaints in writing to the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility and to the provost.

Nwankwo said he wants his promotion to associate professor with tenure granted because he has earned it. "Being denied tenure is equivalent to being fired, only that you are given a one-year notice," Nwankwo said. "I am prepared to go through with (the litigation), even after my contract expires in June 1988."

Nwankwo said he is also demanding monetary compensation "on the basis of denial of my civil rights plus the humiliation and degradation." He has to determine the amount with his lawyer, he said, but it probably will be more than $1 million.

"Dean (Michael) Riley denied me promotion and tenure against a strong and favorable recommendation from the Black Studies Department," Nwankwo said.

Michael Riley, dean of the College of Humanities, is on vacation. Acting Dean John Muste would not comment on the case.

Douglas Dougherty, Nwankwo's attorney, said, "Our position is that (Nwankwo) was qualified for promotion but it was not granted because of consideration of improper factors, and because they did not give due consideration to his achievements and reputation."

"Only if negotiations and university review processes fail, will we go ahead and file a civil suit based on violations of federal and state civil rights law — discrimination based on color, race and national origin," Dougherty said.
Suggestions are offered to tenure-seeking faculty

By Tracy Bradford

Taking charge of one's career and being professionally assertive was the advice recently given to a group composed largely of women faculty members seeking tenure, promotion, or tenure candidacy.

"You are responsible for your career," said Joanne Stevenson, chairperson of the Department of Lifespan Process.

Some women still believe that hard work alone will be rewarded...and that administrators are committed to putting people in assignments that will promote their (the faculty members') careers. But this doesn't hold true all of the time as administrators' primary responsibility is to make assignments that will best carry out the tasks of the department.

Stevenson, along with Francille Firebaugh, vice provost for international affairs, spoke at the Promotion and Tenure Workshop Oct. 25, sponsored by the Council on Academic Excellence for Women.

Stevenson addressed the crowd of about 50 women and six men on how to better prepare themselves for the tenure evaluation process, while Firebaugh spoke more about the review of tenure and promotion documentation by the various offices and committees that will make the tenure recommendations.

During the fourth year of regular service, each probationary faculty member's contributions in the areas of teaching, service and research are reviewed to determine if they meet departmental standards. In the sixth year, a review is conducted to determine whether or not tenure is likely to be recommended effective the eighth year.

"It is practically the most important decision we make at the University. It's at the very heart of our academic concerns," Firebaugh said.

Informal guidelines for women on tenure preparation and nomination are currently being reviewed by the Senate Committee on Women and Minorities. Firebaugh said

"We do believe we can improve what we offer for evaluation of teaching here at Ohio State. We want to improve the quality of the information we receive on a faculty member's teaching performance," she said.

In the area of service, Stevenson said women too often are behind the scenes doing much of the work and are given little credit.

"The chairman may be given the credit while the women on the committee doing much of the work may be known as et al," she said.

Women too often continue to be members of high work, low status committees for many years and may not try for positions on committees outside of their departments, said Stevenson.

In addition, she said women need access to the stimulation of graduate students and seminars on a continuing basis. They should not be content to spend many years teaching only lower division, undergraduate courses.

Stevenson stressed the fact that while women must "pay their dues," during the first couple of years at the University, they should not settle for the same positions and should make sure they receive credit for their talents and contributions.

"Do the lower level stuff...but have a career trajectory (that leads to more) graduate seminars, other committees...and to a broader University area," Stevenson said.

Stevenson stressed that tenure candidates must keep very detailed records of their activities, publications and noteworthy teaching assignments to prepare an accurate dossier. The dossier is the prime document reviewed by the candidate's department and then by the Office of Academic Affairs during the evaluation process.

Firebaugh said that candidates should evaluate facts and data before putting them into the dossier.

"Look at service work done outside the academic community and make sure it is relevant and will help you," she said.

Speaking at a Brownie meeting or teaching a CPR course for several years in a row, without moving up in the ranks, is outside work which Stevenson suggests should not be put into a dossier.

"Take out those that detract from the dossier because if left in, the important things may get lost," Stevenson said.

"What tips the scales in your favor is the scholarly work, publications and the presentation you have about it," she said adding that it should not detail the career of a sweet girl who's been pushed around year after year.

Publications are beneficial so that "when it comes time for you to be up for promotions, that your name will be known out there," Stevenson said.

Firebaugh added, "You are expected to get a national and international reputation."

Candidates also should negotiate for research time, and Stevenson warned. "Don't let anyone give you promises year after year without fulfilling them."

Some departments may stress one of the three areas more than another when evaluating candidates for tenure. Stevenson and Firebaugh said it is important to know the criteria of a candidate's department and to not take anything for granted.

"Seek advice and counseling. You must know what you should be working on," Firebaugh said, adding that the administration of each department should offer counsel in its annual reviews so that faculty members can get a more precise perspective about what is expected of them in order to be tenured.

"More denials are made at the college and departmental levels than at the Office of Academic Affairs," she said.

Anyone wishing to be placed on the mailing list of the council's newsletter, EXCEL, should write to John Sena. 136 Derby Hall.
Tenure tracks easy to trace in new ‘files’

A heap of paperwork has been eliminated by the Office of Academic Affairs.

The office used to keep records on faculty members’ tenure status in many, many file cabinets. Each status change or evaluation meant an additional piece of paper in the files.

Now, all tenure information is kept and updated in a computerized personnel database.

Originally, the personnel database contained limited information on the tenure status of faculty. Recently the program was altered to provide additional space for a tenure information ‘file.’

The added space made it possible to store specifics on an individual’s tenure status. The data include dates when initial appointments are made, mandatory reviews are due and tenure is granted.

After a faculty member has been at the University for four years, a formal review is conducted to determine if the individual will be approved as a candidate for tenure.

During the sixth year, the candidate is again reviewed. Following the review, he or she is either granted tenure or given a one-year terminal appointment.

Also, a faculty member may be non-renewed, based on review, at any time during the six-year probationary period.

‘Because the filing system is on-line, it can, and is, continuously updated,’ says David Boyne, associate provost for academic affairs administration.

For example, an untenured faculty member could be approved for a leave of absence without pay. The information is fed into the system, bringing the salary level to zero and stopping the ‘tenure clock.’

Each October, every college receives a copy of its section of a report of what is in the database. The college then can correct misinformation.

‘Even though the database is highly accurate, there may be something that is left out. It’s very important to have accurate records, especially during a faculty member’s probationary period,’ says Boyne.

The database also is used to compile a report for the entire University. The report can be broken down into sections by college and department, or by gender, ethnicity, tenure status or academic rank.

The reports often are used to determine how many men or women are faculty members. They also are used to monitor Ohio State’s progress in employment of minority faculty, for special studies, and by the University Senate reapportionment committee on women and minorities.

Deans, chairpersons or their administrative assistants have access to department or college databases via terminals. They are assigned personal passwords and security codes, says Boyne.
Senate gives OK to change in promotion, tenure rules

By Jeff Grabmeier

The University Senate on May 3 unanimously gave its approval to changes in two faculty rules governing promotion and tenure. The changes, which must be approved by the Board of Trustees, are attempts to correct for the rare possibility of injustice, according to senate members.

Under the proposed changes a nontenured faculty member can no longer be fired because of "changing standards of competence within a discipline."

The senate also approved a proposal that would provide fired faculty members with a written statement explaining how they failed to meet the criteria for promotion or tenure.

The proposals are important changes in the faculty rules, says John Blackburn, chairperson of the senate's Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

"We feel these changes would tighten up the promotion and tenure rules to correct for the rare possibility of injustice that could occur," says Blackburn, associate professor of finance.

The faculty rule on probationary service and duration of appointments now says that a nontenured faculty member can be fired for factors such as "changing standards of competence within a discipline, an assessment of inadequate performance or insufficient development" or other academic, financial or policy reasons.

Blackburn says his committee believed the "changing standards" clause should be dropped because of one case where a faculty member was fired using this reason, but without evidence to support a claim of changing standards.

However, Blackburn says, this reason for firing rarely exists. Academic disciplines usually do not evolve so quickly as to render a faculty member incompetent during his or her probationary period, he says.

The proposed rule alteration also ensures that newly appointed faculty members will be informed about when their renewal or tenure decisions will be made.

The senate also proposed modifications in a second faculty rule, which concerns standards of notice.

Under the alteration, faculty members whose appointments are not renewed must be told in writing the reasons that contributed to the decision.

The proposed modifications of the two rules "reaffirm the spirit of the rules and serve to reduce the possibility of arbitrary decisions concerning a faculty member's career," he says.

In other matters, the senate:

• Elected Greg Travalio, professor of law, to the Athletic Council.

• Reaffirmed its commitment to equal rights in support of Diversity Awareness and Appreciation Day, to be held the week of May 18.
Faculty can now bring university suits before jury

By Todd Whited
Lantern staff writer

The Ohio Supreme Court has ruled that OSU professors can sue the university when a jury is to decide on the outcome.

The 4-3 decision handed down July 22 says cases involving contract disputes with state entities can be handled in the Court of Common Pleas before a jury.

Prior to this decision, Ohio Court of Claims heard all lawsuits brought against state entities.

The advantage to having the trial in the Court of Common Pleas is that a jury will hear the case, whereas a trial heard in the Court of Claims is heard only by judges, said Michael Webb, press agent for Ohio Attorney General Anthony J. Celebreze.

Ohio State's charter says the university can be sued, and a former assistant professor of history of art took advantage of this clause.

Shirley Schwarz was an OSU staff member from 1976 to 1983. She was notified in 1982 that she would not be granted tenure and her employment would end, said Douglas Baker, Schwarz's attorney.

Schwarz filed suit against the Board of Trustees in August of 1983 saying it had breached her employment contract and denied her due process of law, Baker said.

Ohio State successfully filed to dismiss the case on the grounds that the Court of Common Pleas could not hear the case, since the case was brought against a state entity before a jury, he said.

Baker then appealed the case in February 1986 to the Ohio Court of Appeals, which reversed the decision.

Ohio State, in turn, appealed to the Ohio Supreme Court in March.

Schwarz argued that since she should have been granted tenure, which is a property right, the case should be heard in the common pleas court in front of a jury, Baker said.

He said Schwarz felt she should have been granted tenure because she worked the amount of time required.

Schwarz had worked as an assistant professor at another university for three years prior to coming to Ohio State, so Baker said her probationary period should have been reduced to four years.

The probationary period for a professor, or the time necessary for tenure, is usually seven years, he said.

"She should have been granted tenure by default. She exceeded her probationary period without receiving tenure," Baker said.

He said the Court of Common Pleas will hear the original case against the university, although he could not say when.

OSU attorneys were not available for comment.
Editor's note: The following list includes faculty members recommended for promotion and tenure beginning this autumn quarter by the Office of Academic Affairs. The list was approved by the Board of Trustees on May 5. The list is a note of congratulations from Myles Brand, vice president for academic affairs and provost.

The Office of Academic Affairs is pleased to announce the promotion and tenure appointments for the current academic year. The process by which promotion and tenure is earned is rigorous. The faculty members on the list have demonstrated excellence in their respective fields.

Carter V. Findley, History; Kenneth A. Foland, Geology and Mineralogy; James E. Gadek, Internal Medicine; Gordon K. Grigsby, English; Jean-Michel Guillermu, City and Regional Planning; C. Ronald Huff, Public Administration; Timothy S. Jost, Law; Gary L. Kinkel, Mechanical Engineering; Edsson L. Klingler, Cooperative Extension Service; Martha C. Maas, Music; G. Bruce Mainland, Philosophy; David C. Mindell, Food Science and Nutrition; Hajime Miyazaki, Economics; Melvin L. Moeschberger, Preventive Medicine; Robert C. MacCallum, Psychology; Joseph F. Plouffe, Internal Medicine; Sharon V. Redick, Home Economics Education; Karl C. Rubin, Mathematics; Lella J. Rupp, History; Floyd L. Schanbacher, Dairy Science; Robert Shay, Art; Rajendra Singh, Mechanical Engineering; Jean T. Snook, Human Nutrition and Food Management; Roy A. Stein, Zoology; Gisela M. Vitt, German; and Marilyn R. Waldman, History.

Promotion to Associate Professor

Lucy S. Caswell, University Libraries; Barbara H. Drake, Cooperative Extension Service; Catherine W. Kohn, Veterinary Clinical Sciences; Jacqueline E. LaMuth, Cooperative Extension Service; Larry D. Lotz, Cooperative Extension Service; Richard E. McLeod, Pediatrics; Albert R. Pugh, Cooperative Extension Service; Jeanne M. Rumburg, Cooperative Extension Service; Peggy H. Simmons, Cooperative Extension Service; Clara C. Spith, Cooperative Extension Service; Kenneth W. Theil, Veterinary Preventive Medicine; and Lane J. Wallace, Pharmacy.

Promotion to Associate Professor and Awarded Tenure

Stephen R. Acker, Communications; Melvin L. Adelman, Health, Physical Education and Recreation; Gary W. Bauer, Cooperative Extension Service; Steven J. Beck, Psychology; Karen A. Bell, Dance; Javier Beltman, Radiology; Elizabeth B. Bernhardt, Educational Theory and Practice; Marilyn J. Blackwell, German; Michael B. Bragg, Aeronautical and Astronautical Engineering; John T. Brandt, Pathology; Henry R. Busby, Mechanical Engineering; Marjorie A. Camisa, Educational Theory and Practice; Charles Camisa, Internal Medicine; Sueann Chanillo, Mathematics; Martha C. Cooper, Cooperative Extension Faculty of Marketing; Michael E. Davis, Animal Science; Kathleen K. Desmond, Art Education; Newark; Peter R. Dickson, Marketing; Susan W. Fisher, Entomology; Chad L. Friedman, Obstetrics and Gynecology; James Gallagher, Music; Cheryl M. Gaimon, Management Sciences; Barbara J. Haeger, History of Art; Richard P. Harnel, Jr., Surgery; John A. E. Hubbell, Veterinary Clinical Sciences;

Sheldon Kamien, Mathematics; Robert L. Kaufman, Sociology; Randall D. Knight, Physics; Yuji Kodama, Mathematics; Judith L. Korosick, Art Education; Vasilios Lambrinoudakis, Judaic and Near Eastern Languages and Literatures; Steven C. Loehr, Animal Science; Timothy J. Long, Computer and Information Science; John G. Lyon, Civil Engineering; William S. Marras, Industrial and Systems Engineering; Lawrence E. Mathes, Veterinary Pathobiology; Gary P. Maul, Industrial and Systems Engineering; Marcia P. Micielli, Management and Human Resources; Shigeru Miyagawa, East Asian Languages and Literatures; Richard J. Niklas, Agricultural Technical Institute; Berl Ray Oakley, Microbiology; Hayran A. Oz, Aeronautical and Astronautical Engineering; Hasan Pirikul, Accounting and Management Information Systems; Kottil W. Ramamohan, Psychology; Claire C. Robertson, History; Gregory S. Rose, Geography, Marion; Randolph A. Roth, History; Mary Ann D. Sagaria, Educational Policy and Leadership; Robert L. Sand, Social Work; Thomas A. Schwartz, Journalism; Michael L. Scott, Educational Theory and Practice; Philip B. Shaffer, Radiology; Junko Shigemitsu, Physics; Amy E. Shuman, English; Patrick S. Vaccaro, Surgery; Caroline C. Whitacre, Medical Microbiology and Immunology; and Nancy L. Zimpher, Educational Policy and Leadership.

Promotion to Assistant Professor and Awarded Tenure


Promotion to Assistant Professor and Approved for Tenure

Karen S. Brooks, Cooperative Extension Service; Boney W. Chirayath, Cooperative Extension Service; Nicola S. Eyrre, Cooperative Extension Service; Ruth Anne Foote, Cooperative Extension Service; Deborah A. Jones, Cooperative Extension Service; Jane M. McMaster, Cooperative Extension Service; Esheryl A. Nickles, Cooperative Extension Service; Susan R. Shockey, Cooperative Extension Service; Gregory P. Siek, Cooperative Extension Service; Jack W. Smith, Jr., Pathology; and Sharon H. Strouse, Cooperative Extension Service.

Faculty Approved for Tenure

W. Dietz Bauer, Agronomy; Blinnie E. Bowen, Agricultural Education; Pamela S. Braddock, University Libraries; Jeffrey J. Daniels, Geology and Mineralogy; Gary J. Fortland, Astronomy; Susan L. Hodson, Cooperative Extension Service; Merida L. Johns, SAMP; Sharon L. Mader, Cooperative Extension Service; H. Erdal Ozkan, Agricultural Engineering; Robert J. Precheur, Horticulture; Stanislav I. Rokhlin, Welding Engineering; Robert L. Romig, Agricultural Technical Institute; M. Robert Schloegel, Cooperative Extension Service; Anton F. Schenk, Geoeconomic Science and Surveying; Vicki J. Schwartz, Cooperative Extension Service; and Paul C. Stromberg, Veterinary Pathobiology.

Myles Brand
Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

1987-88 Promotion and Tenure Recommendations Approved by the Board of Trustees

Promotion to Professor

Charles M. Atkinson, Music; Gordon J. Aubrecht, Physics, Marion; Therese M. Bonin, Romance Languages and Literatures; J. Brooks Breeden, Landscape Architecture; Bunty C. Clark, Physics; James M. Falko, Internal Medicine;
Session to study promotion, tenure

By Patricia Mroczek

The promotion and tenure process will be examined at a workshop Oct. 8, sponsored by the Council on Academic Excellence for Women.

The 3-5 p.m. event will be in the Faculty Club and is free and open to all faculty. The workshop focuses primarily on the evaluation from assistant to associate professor.

Barbara Newman, associate provost for faculty recruitment and development, says the workshop fulfills one of the council’s main purposes — “to assist women students and faculty in achieving academic excellence.

“A key part of academic achievement is success in the promotion and tenure process,” Newman says. “The council wants to try to provide a setting where untenured faculty can raise questions and have them answered as they approach their own promotion and tenure decision.”

Four speakers will participate in a panel discussion, which will be moderated by Mary Ann Williams, associate professor of black studies. Panel speakers include David Boyne, associate provost; Katherine Burkman, professor of English; Joan Huber, dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences; and Bruce Walsh, professor of psychology and a member of the executive committee of the American Association of University Professors.

Newman says about 50 faculty attended the event last year. “Our goal is to increase participation so as many people as possible can have access to the information. There will be some opportunity to hear how people have handled challenges.”

Newman says even though Ohio State has the Big Ten’s highest percentage of women faculty at about 23 percent, “we certainly have room to improve.

“We’re hoping the workshop also will provide women and minority faculty with an opportunity to do some networking, which is an important part of retention at a large university. We want them to meet other scholars and find support for the work they are doing.”

For more information, call Jeanne Peebles at the Council on Academic Excellence for Women at 292-4577.
Committee advocates peers deciding tenure

By JEFF ALLISON
Lantern staff writer

A University Senate committee believes tenure and promotion decisions should be made by an individual's school or department and not by an administrator who may not be entirely familiar with the person's work.

The Committee on Academic Freedom will propose a rule to formalize the process of granting tenure and promotion at its next meeting of the Faculty Council, said Charles Smith, a professor of physiology and chair of the academic freedom committee.

Smith said recommendations and decisions on promotions should arise from one's peers, since they are most familiar with the candidate's work within the department.

Promotion decisions are also based partly on work outside the university, Smith said. A person's published work and memberships in scholarly organizations are also factors considered for promotion.

Smith said determining what importance is attached to these factors is a job for departmental peers, not for an administrator further up in the university hierarchy.

The department's recommendation should have the most influence upon a decision, Smith said. The proposed rule would standardize the process.

The different colleges and the university administration should only be involved to make sure that the process has been carried out correctly, he said.

David Boyne, associate provost for budget and personnel, said there is broad support for the proposal within the university. The rule would not preclude a review at the college and university level.
Tenure evaluation stresses teaching

By PATRICIA M. BANAS
Lantern staff writer

Faculty applying for tenure at Ohio State must document their teaching performances better than they have in the past.

Research and publication carried more weight in past consideration for tenure, said Tim Rhodus, assistant professor of horticulture. Now, faculty must also demonstrate teaching ability to be considered, he said.

Associate Provost David Boyne said candidates for tenure need to include evaluations of their teaching performances in their portfolios as well as information about the courses they have taught.

"One of the key points is that we're evaluating teaching," Boyne said. "We want to see work done with research, and the publication of that research, but we're also saying that it's important to do well in the classroom."

Boyne said a tenure review committee uses more than one source of information when judging a teacher's performance in the classroom.

"Students represent an important source of certain kinds of information about the teacher, and peers also are another important source of information about the instructor," he said.

Rhodus and Boyne spoke Thursday during a forum on teaching held by the OSU Center for Teaching Excellence in the Faculty Club. The forum was called, "Documenting Your Teaching for Promotion and Tenure."

The Teaching Evaluation and Improvement Task Force will report to the university spring quarter on the improvement and evaluation of teaching.
TO: Deans, Directors, and Department Chairpersons

FROM: David H. Boyne, Associate Provost

DATE: January 13, 1988

SUBJECT: Membership of University-Level Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee

The 1988 University-level Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee will be comprised of sixteen members, nine faculty members and seven members from administration. Provost Brand will chair the Committee.

The following individuals have accepted Provost Brand's invitation to serve on the Committee:

David Boyne
David Edwards
Howard Gauthier
Jack George
Glen Hoffsis
Jack Hollander
Roy Koenigsknecht
Joan Krauskopf
Joan Leitzel
Howard Marvel
Barbara Newman
Rosemary Platt
Richard Reuning
Glen Schmidt
Ron St. Pierre
John Stewart

Associate Provost
College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences
Associate Provost
College of Medicine
College of Veterinary Medicine
Vice President, Research and Graduate Studies
Dean, Graduate School
College of Law
Associate Provost
College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
Associate Provost
College of the Arts
College of Pharmacy
College of Agriculture
Associate Vice President for Health Services and Academic Affairs
College of Humanities

In 1987, the Committee had twelve members; the size of the Committee for 1988 has been increased by adding three faculty members and one member from the administration.

The period of intensive effort on the part of the Committee will begin in the latter part of January and extend through the middle of March.

jo

cc: Edward H. Jennings, President
Myles Brand, Provost
Tenure program poses problems

By Melissa Allison
Lantern staff writer

Most OSU professors have to wait six years before they know whether their jobs are permanent. After this probationary period, professors are either given or denied tenure, that guarantees them a permanent job at the university, said David Boyne, associate provost for academic affairs.

"Once we make that decision to tenure, that is a lifetime commitment to continue the employment," Boyne said.

But some OSU professors see problems in the tenure process.

"If a woman decides to have a baby, the tenure clock continues to tick," said Amy Shuman, an associate professor of English.

One solution would be for the university to allow professors an extension of the tenure decision if they decide to have children.

The American Association of University Professors, however, discourages this type of extension because the university might persuade people to take the extension option when they would rather not, Shuman said.

Another concern with the tenure track is being able to attract and afford young faculty members, said James Warmbrod, professor of agricultural education.

Some Big Ten schools have a lot of faculty moving into their 50s and 60s, Boyne said.

Ohio State's solution to this problem is early retirement incentives, Boyne said. The incentives mean the faculty will soon be younger, he said.

"On the average the incentive program made it possible for enough dollars to be freed up to pay off the five-year buy out (faculty who are retiring five years early) and still hire a new assistant professor to replace the retiring one," Boyne said.

Another problem with tenure is that a professor could slack off on his duties, but still keep his job.

Often a professor who feels his area of research has dried up will request to go on faculty professional leave, Boyne said.

Faculty professional leave means a professor takes a year to visit labs and other universities in his field to find a new area of research, while receiving partial pay.

A person who enters the tenure track at Ohio State is evaluated annually by the department's Committee on Promotion and Tenure.

Evaluations are based on teaching, research and service throughout the university, although emphasis on each category may vary within departments.

Student and peer evaluations determine a professor's teaching ability, Boyne said. A professor's colleagues may visit a lecture, review a syllabus and exams, and look at the candidate's grade distributions.

During the fourth year of a professor's probationary period, the department chairman sends a progress report to the dean of that college.

After the dean has reviewed the report, a recommendation is sent to the provost, who then takes it to the Board of Trustees.

The fourth-year review determines whether a professor is headed in the right direction, while the sixth-year review addresses whether tenure will be granted.

About 90 percent of those who come up for tenure receive it, Boyne said.
Tenure cases denied

Refused professors appeal through university network

By Melissa Allison
Lantern staff writer

Every year, about 16 OSU professors are sent a letter saying they did not receive tenure. If a professor does not get tenure, he or she can continue teaching at the university for only one more year.

"Being denied tenure is a traumatic experience," said William Protheroe, a professor of astronomy and member of the American Association of University Professors.

"It was more like an angry experience," said Kersten Schwan, an assistant professor of computer and information science who was denied tenure last year.

Schwan received a job offer from the Georgia Institute of Technology just four months after he entered the job market last year. The job will be a promotion for Schwan.

After six years of being reviewed, professors who are denied tenure can appeal the decision.

"I'm better off going somewhere where my credentials will be respected," said Ravi Sandhu, an assistant professor of computer and information science who was denied tenure last year and will not appeal.

"It was a very good experience," Schwan said. "There must have been some politics the provost didn't want to know about.

The department chairperson and other professors tried to appeal Schwan's case informally with the provost, but they did not get any concrete answers about the decision not to tenure, Schwan said.

"The provost didn't want to come clean to the department for some reason," Schwan said.

Schwan will begin teaching at Georgia Tech in the fall and will again once again wait six years for a tenure decision.

"I know of professors at the University of Michigan who didn't send their graduate students here because they can see something is wrong at Ohio State," Schwan said.

Most legal cases brought against the university regarding tenure deal with allegations of discrimination, said Larry Thompson, who handles the university's legal matters as a special assistant to President Edward H. Jennings.

"Most problems are handled internally first," Thompson said. He said about two legal cases involving tenure are brought each year.

"One reason few people appeal the tenure decisions is that complaints involving procedure, not the actual decision, are the only grounds for formal appeal within the university.

Another reason is the difficult and lengthy procedure involved in appealing.

The official university committee which deals with tenure appeals is the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, a University Senate standing committee of two students and six faculty members.

Although this committee cannot question the professional judgment of a department, it determines whether the correct procedure was followed, said Charles Smith, a professor of physiology and the committee's chairman.

Smith said professors come to this committee when they suspect improper evaluation or violation of their constitutional rights.

If the committee decides a complaint is legitimate, it is sent to the University Senate Faculty Hearing Committee.

Of 10 complaints heard by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility last year, four were sent on to the Hearing Committee, five are still pending and one was declared moot, Smith said.

Problems the committee often finds in the tenure process are improperly constituted committees at the department level, recommendations of a committee being ignored and evaluators of a professor's research who are not really his professional peers, Smith said.

"Regretfully, sometimes due process is not followed," Smith said.

After a case is passed to the Hearing Committee, it is reviewed by a panel of three members, said Arnold Shapiro, an associate professor of English and a member of the Hearing Committee.

If a violation of procedure is found by the Hearing Committee, the problem is taken to the provost, who takes it to the department, where the Committee on Promotion and Tenure is activated to re-examine the case, Shapiro said.

"We look at anything that could affect procedure, including discrimination," Shapiro said.

While the Hearing Committee deals with discrimination problems, Thompson said professors who feel they have been discriminated against can go to the Office of Affirmative Action for more direct help with that specific problem.

Finally, professors who are not sure they have a legitimate complaint or who want additional support in dealing with the university may go to the professors association.

While this association has no official authority at the university, it has the power of persuasion, said Charles Hoffmann, a professor of German and member of the association's Committee A.

Committee A deals specifically with promotion and tenure matters, Hoffmann said.

Professors who come to Committee A for help do not have to be members of the association, Hoffmann said.

Committee A reviews tenure cases to determine whether a professor has a legitimate complaint, then either sends the professor to the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility or talks to the appropriate departmental chairperson or college dean, Hoffmann said.

"AAUP has a good reputation with central administration at Ohio State," Hoffmann said.

Committee A has no influence if the decision not to tenure was based on the judgment of the appropriate people and followed the correct procedure.

Committee A reviews 12-15 complaints each year regarding promotion and tenure, about half of which end up having substance, said William Protheroe, who was chairman of Committee A from 1976 to 1979 and 1981 to 1989.

"Usually it is a difference in perception as far as how the process took place," Protheroe said.

A department may publish its procedures regarding tenure and then violate its own procedures, Protheroe said.
Committee reviews conflicting tenure rules

By Mike Casey
Lantern staff writer

The University Senate Rules Committee accepted a report Thursday from a special committee assembled to pick one of two conflicting interpretations of current university rules. These rules could affect the status of tenured faculty.

The contents of the report "Committee on Where Tuition Resides" have not been released yet.

Nancy Rudd, secretary of the University Senate and professor of family resource planning, said the current rules are unclear about at what level of university administration instructors are guaranteed tenure.

In some parts, she said, the rules imply the university is the guarantor of tenure, and in others, they imply it is the faculty member's department or school - in which case the status of a member's tenure could be in doubt if his or her department or school is disbanded.

The University Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility must also accept the report for it to be considered by university administration, Rudd said.

The Rules Committee controls the approval of changes in university rules, said committee member Timothy P. Redman, assistant professor of English. He said the committee also can initiate changes in rules by itself, although the full senate must approve such changes.

The University Senate is the main faculty, student and administrative governing body of the university, which has the power to set educational policies or act on behalf of faculty, staff or student rights and responsibilities. It can also recommend changes in educational programs.

The Rules Committee also approved Senate passage of a measure increasing the Senate Hearing Committee from nine to twelve members, who will serve four-year terms.
Provost announces promotions, tenure

I am pleased to announce the names of those faculty members who were approved for promotion in academic rank, awarded tenure or approved for tenure at the June 2 and July 7 meetings of the Board of Trustees.

Promotion and tenure indicate recognition of a faculty member’s accomplishments in teaching, research or creative activity, and professional service. This recognition is the outcome of peer review at the department and college levels, input by peers in the same disciplines from outside the University, and review by the provost’s Advisory Committee.

In recent years, faculty members have been held to increasingly rigorous standards during the review process. The persons whose names are listed below have demonstrated their dedication and expertise in their disciplines as measured by these standards.

I offer my warmest congratulations to each of these individuals. They are deserving of the highest praise and respect of the entire University community. Ohio State will be strengthened by their continued commitment to this institution.

Frederick E. Hutchinson

Frederick E. Hutchinson
Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

Promoted to professor

Avner D. Ash, Mathematics; William A. Barlow, Electrical Engineering; Odeni Blum, Dance; John D. Bonagura, Veterinary Clinical Sciences; David M. Butler, Music; Moon-Shao-chung Chen Jr., Health, Physical Education and Recreation; Dennis J. Chew, Veterinary Clinical Sciences; William A. Clark, Materials Science; Jeremy Cohen, History; Alexander Dvin, Mathematics; Ulrich Gerlach, Mathematics; Janice K. Kiecolt-Glaser, Psychiatry; Michael R. Grever, Internal Medicine; Charles E. Grible, Slavic and East European Languages and Literatures; Richard P. Gunther, Political Science; David O. Hansen, Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology; Thomas F. Heck, University Libraries; Paul Jansma, Health, Physical Education and Recreation; Ciriayam Jayaprakash, Physics; Charles A. Klein, Electrical Engineering; Ronald E. Laymon, Philosophy; Michael E. Mangano, Food Science and Nutrition; Glenn W. Milligan, Management Sciences; William E. Murray, History; Jack Naglieri, Educational Services and Research; Marvin L. Olmstead, Veterinary Clinical Sciences; David E. Orin, Electrical Engineering; Michael D. Orlandy, Educational Services and Research; Terry F. Peterson, Psychology; James P. Phelan, English; WanSoo T. Rhe, Management Sciences; David A. Schilling, Management Sciences; Paul W. Seidler, Anthropology; Robert G. Sherdling, Veterinary Clinical Sciences; Sara L. Staas, Psychology; Richard H. Steckel, Economics; Robert J. Tierney, Educational Theory and Practice; Manjula B. Waldron, Engineering Graphics; Gifford Weary, Psychology; Paul A. Werber, Ophthalmology; and Charles Garfield Singer Williams, Romance Languages and Literatures.

Promoted to professor with tenure

Rattan Lai, Agronomy.

Promoted to associate professor

Hazel B. Benson, University Libraries; Shioe Chaturvedi, Civil Engineering; Alan R. Crockett, Art; Thomas F. DeMaris, Oriental Studies; William E. Henderson, Cooperative Extension; Ronald L. Overmyer, Cooperative Extension; Roland P. Pagliano, Restorative and Prosthetic Dentistry; Syed M-Tariq Rizvi, Mathematics; Rickie C. Scheid, Restorative and Prosthetic Dentistry; William C. Smith, Cooperative Extension; and Marilyn Spiegel, Cooperative Extension.

Promoted to associate professor and awarded tenure

Edward H. Adelson, Music; Tunc Altin, Mechanical Engineering; C. David Andereck, Physics; Jiwu Bai, Chemistry; Stephen J. Barkham, Linguistics; Stephen A. Bechtel, Engineering Mechanics; Gary E. Beckman, Marketing; Stephen J. Birchard, Veterinary Clinical Sciences; Michael T. Brady, University Libraries; Charles L. Brooks, Veterinary Pathobiology; Charles G. Brown, Preventive Medicine; John P. Bruno, Psychology; Stephen G. Cechetti, Economics; Daniel C. K. Chow, Law; Edward A. Copeland, Internal Medicine; Frank T. Coulton, Classics; Anthony W. Czarnecki, Chemistry; Tom Dannenberger, Agronomy; James F. Davis, Chemical Engineering; Paul M. Dorinsky, Internal Medicine; L. Stanley Durkin, Physics; Gary L. Ebersole, East Asian Languages and Literatures; Scott Falkenthal, Molecular Genetics; Stephen E. Feinberg, Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery; Bernd Fischer, German; Patricia J. Flowers, Music; Eric S. Fredin, Journalism; Evelyn B. Freeman, Educational Theory and Practice; Mark D. Fullerton, History of Art; Robert A. Gillespie, Music; Lindsey K. Grossman, Pediatrics; Fabian C. Hadipriono, Civil Engineering; Nicholas G. Hall, Management Sciences; Richard S. Harmed, Art; Brian D. Harper, Engineering Mechanics; Robert L. Heneman, Management and Human Resources; Thomas E. Hetherington, Zoology; Yoon-Lau Ho, Physics; Deborah A. Horrell, Art; Harvey T. Hubbard, Journalism; Scott H. Irwin, Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology; Randall W. Jackson, Geography; William M. Johnston, Restorative and Prosthetic Dentistry; Rebecca Kantor, Family Relations and Human Development; Curtin G. Kelley, Ophthalmology; Kathleen E. Kendrick, Microbiology; Martin F. Kenney, Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology; Stephen L. Mangum, Management and Human Resources; Nelson C. Mark, Economics; Gay Y. Miller, Veterinary Preventive Medicine; Raymond Montemayor, Psychology; Barry L. Nelson, Industrial and Systems Engineering; Philip T. Nowicki, Pediatrics; John G. Odom, Community Dentistry; Lynne E. Ohsone, Veterinary Physiology and Pharmacology; Kazue Oshi, Internal Medicine; Robert P. Page, Ophthalmology; Dennis A. Parker, Theatre; Joy L. Paz, Dairy Science; Peter V. Paul, Educational Services and Research; Stephen L. Pennak, Art; Ruth D. Peterson, Sociology; Patricia B. Reagin, Economics; Charles H. Reilly, Industrial and Systems Engineering; Nancy H. Rogers, Law; Duane W. Rollers, Classics; Sally V. Rudmann, Allied Medical Professions; John F. Sheridan, Oral Biology; William M. Sherman, Health, Physical Education and Recreation; John W. Simpson, Landscape Architecture; Daniel D. Smolek, Veterinary Clinical Sciences; R. Sooyakarn, Physics; Dona Sue Straley, University Libraries; Richard P. Swenson, Biochemistry; Michael D. Trudel, Speech and Hearing Science; Michael E. Wallace, Sociology; Maxey Lee Weilman, Veterinary Pathobiology; and Stephen Yuskovich, Electrical Engineering.

Promoted to assistant professor and approved for tenure

Joseph T. Barr, Optometry; Nanncye O’Hanlon, University Libraries; Carol E. Osborn, Allied Medical Professions; and Vicki L. Whited, Cooperative Extension.

Promoted to assistant professor

Kenneth R. Lafontaine, Cooperative Extension; Sharon L. Mader, Cooperative Extension; Karen S. Perry, Cooperative Extension; Hilary A. Sollers, Dental Hygiene; and Jane C. Warner, Cooperative Extension.

Approved for tenure

Michael G. Aman, Psychology; Kamran Barin, Electrical Engineering; James Bova, Radiology; Stephen M. Bratkovich, Cooperative Extension; Barry P. Cleaver, Educational Policy and Leadership; Irene Ingeborg Magnus-Delig, Slavic and East European Languages and Literatures; Robert M. DePhilip, Anatomy; Steven C. Drayer, Psychiatry; Richard J. Fini, Social Work; Julia F. Gay, Anatomy; Dennis W. Hall, Cooperative Extension; Ronald L. Jacobs, Educational Studies; Kathryn Jakes, Textiles and Clothing; Susan M. Krull, Health Sciences Library; Sylvia A. McCune, Food Science and Nutrition; Johannes Rognal, Psychology; Sudhi K. Saxby, Agricultural Engineering; Royce B. Thornton, Agricultural Technical Institute, Animal Industries; Andrew D. Ward, Agricultural Engineering; and Robert G. Yedavalli, Aeronautical and Astronautical Engineering.

Promoted to associate professor, regular clinical faculty

Julio O. Apol, Pediatrics; Daniel L. Cook, Pediatrics; Lacy Frese, Radiology; Neil J. Grovers, Pediatrics; Seth M. Kantor, Internal Medicine; and Herman A. Tolbert, Psychiatry.
Tenure status still a mystery

By Karen Brown
Lantern staff writer

It is a major part of the university system, yet few people know who is eligible for it or the detailed process required to get it. This complicated procedure is tenure — a much misunderstood status granted to members of the university faculty.

"Not all professors are eligible for tenure," Fred Smith, acting personnel research specialist at Ohio State.

Tenure may be earned by any teacher with regular faculty status.

According to the October 1984 OSU faculty handbook, regular faculty status does not include regular clinical, adjunct, clinical, visiting, lecture appointments or part-time service.

The only instructors exempt from the tenure status process are professors of health sciences. This group includes all those employed in medical, veterinary, and dental colleges, David Boyne, associate provost of academic affairs, said.

"They receive five-year appointments in lieu of tenure," Boyne said.

A formal review is conducted during the fourth year of a health science professor's service. Clinical faculty members are informed of appointment renewal status for an additional term during the fourth year review, he said.

Professors eligible for tenure must be nominated in order to obtain the status.

Nominations for promotion or tenure originate in the department or appropriate academic unit where the professor teaches, Boyne said.

"Nominations are based upon several things. Publications of peer review journals, research productivity, high teaching performance and curriculum development, to name a few," he said.

Any recommendation must have a comprehensive assessment of candidate qualifications. Politics do not play a part in candidate nominations, Boyne said.

Student evaluations, however, may be used as supporting evidence of outstanding teaching.

"They (student evaluations) play an important part in documenting the quality of teaching," Boyne said.

Once the department has agreed upon and submitted the nomination, it goes to the Provost, then the President and finally the Board of Trustees, who make the final decision, Smith said.

According to the faculty handbook, there are four teaching staff levels that are eligible for tenure.

Instructor must have a master's degree or equivalent and at least three years of graduate study or relevant professional experience. Before tenure is granted at the instructor level, a seven-year probationary period must be completed.

During the fourth year of the probationary term the candidate is told if they are eligible.

Assistant professors must fulfill the same requirements, with the added stipulation that a doctorate is required. They also have a seven-year probationary period before tenure is granted.

Associate professors follow a slightly different program for tenure appointment. An associate also must have a doctorate. However, only those appointed from outside Ohio State must serve the required three-year probationary period. A person promoted to associate professor from a lower rank at Ohio State will acquire tenure upon their promotion date.

The highest level of university tenure is the status of full professor. This, too, requires a doctorate. Tenure is automatic upon promotion or appointment to this regular faculty rank.

Although tenure is earned, the status can be terminated either by a change in position or because of proved incompetence or misconduct, Boyne said.

"Tenure can be removed if the individual is no longer capable of carrying out responsibility or if proved incompetent," he said. "If determined not competent, the person would be given a one year notice of termination of employment. It is a very serious matter."

Termination must go through the same ranks as tenure nomination. First, the college dean, then the Provost, the President and finally the Board of Trustees, Smith said.

Tenure is also removed if a tenured member of the regular faculty voluntarily agrees to change from full-time to part-time status, he said.

"Tenure status is lost unless there is an approved leave of absence," Smith said.

Contrary to the beliefs of many, tenure status does not offer the elected person special perquisites regarding their employment.

Bruce Zwilling, professor of Microbiology, has been tenured for two years. Tenure status does not offer any additional benefits besides job security, he said.

"Tenure offers a commitment to lifetime employment," Zwilling said.
Tenured faculty target of study

By Karen L. Brown
Lantern Staff Writer

A recent study of tenured university faculty concluded that the average college professor is a 47 year-old white male who earns $48,701 annually, including outside income, and spends about 46 hours a week on the job.

The study, conducted by the U.S. Education Department, examined 1333 full and part-time faculty members picked randomly. The results were summarized in the Feb. 7 issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education.

David Boyne, Assistant Provost of Academic Affairs, said the study results fit a majority of OSU professors.

A report completed in October 1989 revealed that minorities make up 10.1 percent of OSU’s faculty with males totalling 73 percent of all faculty, Boyne said.

OSU’s statistics on minorities and women match almost exactly the results of the U.S. Education Department study.

The study revealed that men make up 73 percent of all faculty at a four-year university, 81 percent at a private school, and 62 percent at a public two-year college. Of all part-time faculty, men make up 66 percent.

In order to accurately compare Ohio State to these statistics, a breakdown of eligible departments must be made.

According to the Senate Committee on Women and Minorities annual report to the University Senate, Ohio State is composed of 128 tenure granting departments. These departments are found within 14 colleges: the College of Law, Optometry, Pharmacy and Social Work. All university libraries, the Cooperative Extension Service, the Agricultural Technical Institute, and the regional campuses are also included.

Of these 128 units, 26 are composed of white faculty only with minority units totaling 16. Nine departments are composed of white, male faculty only.

The number of units with only one female faculty member is 24 with 15 (62 percent) of these departments completely lacking tenured female faculty.

Party departments have only one minority faculty member. This number is up from 38 units last year.

Of the total Hispanic faculty at Ohio State, 27 percent are located in one department (Spanish and Portuguese). Of all black faculty, 16 percent are located in the Department of Black Studies.

Karen L. Roehrig, chairperson of the Senate Committee on Women and Minorities, said she would like to see a more even distribution of women and minorities in OSU faculty.

A color blind and gender blind faculty would be ideal. Distribution based on the general population could help even out the differences, she said.

For instance, if 52 percent of the population is female and 48 percent male, then the faculty should also be 52 percent female and 48 percent male, Roehrig said.

According to Roehrig, Ohio State has been trying to recruit more women and minorities to its teaching staff.

"The university is trying a lot of different strategies to attract women and minorities... one of these is advertising.

The study also suggests an average salary of $48,701 for full-time faculty. According to this study, all men receive higher salaries than women colleagues at the same professional level.

Boyne agrees that OSU’s male faculty members generally earn more than women faculty members.

"On the average it is true that men earn more than women," he said. "However the difference in salary is not attributed to gender.

Boyne said if faculty members are compared by department, men and women with comparable years of service earn about the same salary.

The study also revealed that faculty in the departments of education and humanities on the average earn less money annually than other departments.

Michael Riley, Dean of the humanities department, said this is also true at Ohio State.

Members of the humanities faculty do earn less than those in business administration or engineering. It is a market demand situation. Value is put on what is done in the department, Riley said.

Boyne agrees with this statement. "It is a supply and demand situation among the academic departments," he said.

The study also revealed that faculty in the education and humanities departments are older than the average of 47 years for other faculty members.

Riley said humanities department faculty is not older than the average OSU faculty member’s age of 45. In fact, the age might be lower.

"It (the study) is not true as far as age goes. We are a pretty close fit for the average, perhaps somewhat lower," he said.

The study concluded that the average college professor spends 46 hours a week on the job with men spending 56 percent of their time teaching and women 61 percent.

"That sounds low to me," Boyne said. "The colleagues I know put more time into their jobs than that.

...
Professor sues Ohio State

By Holly Goodman
Lantern staff writer

Attorneys for Ohio State argued before the Ohio Supreme Court Tuesday that discrimination did not play a part in a 1984 decision not to promote a blind professor.
The case was brought by the Ohio Civil Rights Commission on behalf of Amy Zaharlick, an assistant professor of Anthropology who was denied tenure and promotion.

Zaharlick, who was later granted tenure, has been legally blind since birth.

In October 1984, she filed an affidavit with the Ohio Civil Rights Commission stating the University had handled her promotion unlawfully.

Ohio State lost the case in two earlier hearings, and appealed to the Supreme Court in February 1990.

Frederick M. Gittes, Zaharlick's attorney, told the court his client had been judged by a set of standards more difficult than the normal standards the department uses to review candidates for promotion.

After initially reviewing Zaharlick's work, Dean Earle Brown and the Faculty Review Committee had recommended to Provost Dietrich Haenel to offer tenured status to Zaharlick.

However, Brown resigned shortly after this recommendation and the new dean, Joan Huber, revoked Brown's recommendation.

Huber listed insufficient research productivity as the reason she did not concur with Brown's recommendation.

G. Ross Bridgman, one of the OSU attorneys, said the denial of promotion for Zaharlick was based on her failure to meet standards on the number of published works of research, and blindness had nothing to do with the decision, Bridgman said.

He said Zaharlick was even given an extended deadline on her work.

"There is no evidence of intentional discrimination," Bridgman said. "The only inability was her inability to work more quickly."

However, Gittes said there is no set number of published articles an employee must produce to be promoted, and some people were promoted without producing any published reference materials.

Zaharlick had produced five published reference materials at the time of the review and has produced five since that time, Gittes said. She was praised and recommended every step of the way.

Friends of the Court briefs were filed on behalf of Zaharlick by attorneys David H. Meade on behalf of several organizations concerned about the case.

The outcome of this case could decide if it is an employer's responsibility to reasonably accommodate a disabled employee and can set precedent for similar future cases.
Proposal offers service time exclusions

Concern grows for needs of "caregivers" in faculty

Ohio State is among universities where concern has grown about the lack of preparedness for the growing number of faculty members who care for small children, for those who care for seriously ill family members, and for those who become ill themselves.

In response, Frederick Hutchison, provost and senior vice president for academic affairs, appointed the Committee to Consider Exclusion of Time from the Probationary Period in January 1990.

After a year of consideration, the committee has made a recommendation for a new Faculty Rule establishing a policy that enables faculty to exclude up to two years of service during the six-year probationary period.

The university policy now requires tenure at the discretion of the faculty committee to complete a six-year probationary period. Their performance in teaching, conducting research and service is evaluated after five years.

Faculty are informed by their colleges in the fourth year of the probationary period whether they are candidates for promotion. If faculty are not candidates, their appointments are not renewed.

The proposed rule, which would allow faculty members to exclude a limited amount of service time without submitting a request for tenure, is intended to avoid imposing penalties on those who wish to care for family or personal matters which establish a family.

Exclusion of service time is already available to faculty members on unpaid leave of absence without pay. A faculty member could also obtain an exclusion by taking a part-time appointment. To do so would strain the financial means of most faculty members and would be impossible for single parents.

The opportunity for exclusion of service time is currently available to faculty members who are seriously ill or incapacitated.

By permitting exclusion of up to two years of service time within the probationary period for caring for seriously ill people, the university recognizes that increasing numbers of faculty must devote time to providing such care.

Candidate's health

Caring for one's own serious illness or injury while fulfilling teaching, research and service responsibilities places an enormous burden on a faculty member.

Ill health is especially difficult when it permits essentially full-time performance but precludes the extra scholarly effort that is necessary to warrant tenure. Serious health problems during the probationary period can affect faculty member's ability to establish a record that can support a favorable recommendation for tenure and promotion.

The opportunity for exclusion of up to two years of service time within the probationary period would ameliorate stresses suffered by a faculty member with a serious medical problem.

In addition, adoption of this policy allows the university to evaluate candidates for tenure and promotion on a record more reflective of scholarly potential rather than one foreclosed by serious illness or injury.

Conclusion

The proposed tenure period exclusion policy would enable The Ohio State University to:

- remain competitive with major universities in recruiting and retaining faculty;
- enhance faculty diversity;
- nurture the professional development of promising young scholars;
- and, to confirm its leadership role by becoming part of the national movement addressing the critical social issue of integrating work and care-giving responsibilities.

Recommendation

The committee recommends that The Ohio State University adopt the following proposed rule:

Faculty Rule 3355-47-041 Exclusion of Countable Years of Service from the Probationary Period for Child Care and Serious Illness

(A) One year of service may be excluded from the probationary period of an untenured regular faculty member after the birth or adoption of a child under six years of age. Each exclusion shall be granted to the request of a faculty member who must devote substantially to child care activities necessary if the faculty member is entitled to a maximum of two one-year extensions should more than one child be born or adopted during the period.

If both parents are untenured faculty members at Ohio State University, they are entitled to a maximum of one year between them if one child is born or adopted or two years if more than two children are born or adopted.

Exclusion of time from countable years of service during the probationary period is not consistent with a reduction in salary or benefits or appointment or upon taking an official leave of absence. Requests for excluding time from the probationary period shall be made by the faculty member to the department chair or division director. The request must be made within one year of the birth or adoption and prior to the beginning of the second year of the probationary period.

(B) Service time may be excluded from the probationary period at the request of a faculty member who must devote substantial time to the care of a seriously ill or incapacitated person. Such circumstances occur up to two years of service time may be excluded from the probationary period.

Requests for excluding time from the first year of the probationary period shall be made by the faculty member to the department chair or division director. The request must be made prior to the beginning of the second year of the probationary period.

(C) Service time may be excluded from the probationary period at the request of a faculty member who is disabled with a serious injury or illness. Up to two years of time may be excluded from the probationary period depending upon the nature and duration of the illness.

Requests for excluding time from the probationary period shall be made by the faculty member to the department chair or division director. The request must be made prior to the beginning of the second year of the probationary period.

(D) Under this rule, a maximum of two years of service may be excluded from the probationary period.

(E) Requests to exclude service time from the probationary period under (A) shall be reported to the dean or director and the provost.

Requests to exclude service time from the probationary period under (B) and (C) shall be reviewed by the department chair or division director with the advice of the unit's promotion and tenure committee. Recommendations for approval or disapproval under (B) and (C) shall be forwarded to the appropriate dean for final decision. Both the unit and college recommendations should be forwarded to the provost, whose decision shall be final.

Provost's Committee to Consider Exclusion of Time From the Probationary Period:

Joan M. Krauske, Chair, College of Law; William E. Claussen, Department of English; John D. McFadden, Department of Education; Susan W. Fisher, Department of Entomology; Susan M. Hartnett, Department of History; Richard R. Lane, Department of Preventive Medicine; Mary K. Marvel, School of Public Policy and Management; Fred Miller, Department of Agronomy; Edward A. Ray, Department of Economics; David H. Boyaz, Associate, Office of Academic Affairs.
Senate okays tenure exclusion rule

By Gemma McLuckie

The University Senate at its final meeting of the year June 1 adopted a rule changing tenure procedures, discussed a semester system and tabled a proposed resolution concerning the banning of homosexual students from the ROTC commissioning program.

The new rule enables untenured faculty to exclude one or two years of service from their probationary period if they must care for small children or seriously ill family members, or if they are ill themselves.

"The premise of this proposal is: most faculty who experience one or more of these circumstances also experience a reduction in their professional productivity, at least for a time," David Boyne, associate provost, told the senate.

The senate also authorized the provost to appoint a committee in four years to assess how the rule has been used.

A progress report from the Ad Hoc Calendar Committee provoked much debate over the wisdom of investing time and resources in a proposed switch to a semester system.

Christine B. Verzar, chairperson and professor of history of art, told the senate that the committee's preliminary findings indicated the need for a much more detailed review of the impact of a change from quarters to semesters or trimesters.

Richard P. Gunther, professor of political science, and others argued that the review itself would be "an imposition of tens of thousands of hours of work" on deans, directors and faculty.

The senate, however, voted down a motion to halt any more inquiry into a changeover. President Gee, who has in the past expressed his preference for the semester system, authorized the committee to go forward with its work.

The senators sent to committee a request from the Undergraduate Student Government for support of a resolution opposing the Reserve Officer Training Corps' discrimination against gay and lesbian students.

Sen. Terry L. Nienhouse, professor of military science, pointed out that discrimination is "not a simple issue that can be taken care of in a simple vote." Admission to the ROTC program, which commissions military officers, is limited on the basis of sexual preference, but is not against federal or state laws, he said.

Gary Schwartz of USG said the ROTC policy violates the University's non-discrimination policy.

However, Frederick Hutchinson, senior vice president for academic affairs and provost, said courses in the military science academic program in which ROTC is housed are open to all students. "We have been assured there is not discrimination," he said.

The proposed resolution will be considered by a University Senate committee and reported on next autumn.

The next senate meeting will be held Sept. 28.
Board promotes or grants tenure to 276

A total of 276 faculty were promoted or granted tenure by the Board of Trustees in June and July. Congratulations are in order, notes Frederick Hutchinson, senior vice president for academic affairs and provost. Those who received career advancements were subjected to rigorous peer reviews of their teaching, research or creative activities, and service, he adds.

The following is a list of congratulations from Hutchinson and a list of those who were approved for promotion and tenure.

I am pleased to announce the names of those faculty members who were approved for promotion in academic rank, awarded tenure, or approved for tenure at the June 7 and July 12 meetings of the Board of Trustees.

Promotion and tenure indicate recognition of a faculty member’s accomplishments in teaching, research or creative activity, and professional service. This recognition is the outcome of peer review at the department and college levels, input by peers in the same discipline from outside the university, and review by the Provost’s Advisory Committee.

In recent years, faculty members have been held to increasingly rigorous standards during the review process. The professors whose names are listed below have demonstrated their dedication and expertise in their disciplines as measured by these standards.

I offer my warmest congratulations to each of these individuals. They are deserving of the highest praise and respect of the entire University community. Ohio State will be strengthened by their continued commitment to this institution.

Promotion to professor
Barbara Andersen, Psychology; Gary A. Anderson, Agricultural Technical Institute; Robert W. Backoff, Public Policy and Management; James R. Bartholomew, History; W.C. Benton, Management Sciences; Robert A. Bernstein, Psychiatry; Jacqueline C. Bresnahan, Cell Biology, Neurology and Anatomy; Robert E. Burnkrant, Marketing; Howard Crane, History of Art; John T. Davis, Classics; Donald K. Dean, Biochemistry; Stephen P. DiBartola, Veterinary Clinical Science; Michael Filipner, Statistics; Rosanne W. Fortner, Natural Resources; David O. Frantz, English; Clyde Goad, Geodetic Science and Surveying;

David Gross, Mathematics; Barbara Groesbeck, History of Art; Jason Hsu, Statistics; Lisa Kaiser, English; Laurence V. Madden, Plant Pathology; Stephen A. McCaffery, Economics; Sandra McCormick, Educational Theory and Practice; James Morgarien, History of Art; P. David Myrowitz, Surgery;

John A. Negrelius, Cell Biology, Neurology and Anatomy; Shirley O. Bryant, Research and Development; Fusun Ozgur, Electrical Engineering; Prabhakar H. Pathak, Electrical Engineering; Bradley Peterson, Astronomy; Hassan Pirouk, Accounting and Management Information Systems; Dwight A. Powell, Pediatrics;

Yasuko Rikichi, Veterinary Pathobiology; Paul G. Robinson, Music; Richard C. Rogers, Physiology; Marcus H. Sandver, Management and Human Resources; Sudhir K. Sastri, Agricultural Engineering; Anton F. Schoen, Geoecology and Surveying; Stewart D. Shapiro, Philosophy; Keith L. Smith, Cooperative Extension Service; Kathleen S. Stone, Life Span Process;

Kambiz Vatal, Mechanical Engineering; I. Phillip Young, Educational Policy and Leadership; and Nancy Zimpher, Educational Policy and Leadership.

Promotion to associate professor
Diane Almendinger, Art; Kathryn Chanoweth, Cooperative Extension Service; Lewis Claman, Dentistry; Betty Cleaver, Educational Policy and Leadership; Garry E. Gibbons, Cooperative Extension Service; Beverly Gordon, Educational Policy and Leadership; Ron Jacobs, Educational Studies; Randolph E. James, Cooperative Extension Service, Annamaria A. Zahracki, Anthropology; and Carl R. Zuleau, Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology.

Promotion to associate professor with tenure
John H. Bailey, Restorative and Prosthetic Dentistry; Edwin S. Bair, Geological Sciences; William Batstone, Classics; Philip Blinkley, Internal Medicine; David Bisaro, Molecular Genetics; Kim L. Boyer, Electrical Engineering; James K. Bracken, University Libraries; Martin Cafhey, Chemistry; Donna A. Cantelo, Surgery; Sanford N. Caut-Ashmead, Law; K.C. Chan, Finance; William R. Childs, History; Jing-Ming Chu, Internal Medicine; Charles J. Dietsch, Microbiology; Michael L. Day, Animal Science; Maurice L. Eastridge, Dairy Science;

R. Thomas George, Human Nutrition and Food Management; J. Benjamin Gianni, Architecture; Laura Gingerich, School of Music; Yacov Guezennec, Mechanical Engineering; Linda L. Harlow, French and Italian; Karen Harper, Social Work; S. Kent Harrison, Agronomy;

Mitchell L. Henny, Surgery; Raul Herrera, Engineering Graphics; Janet Hickman, Educational Theory and Practice; Marilyn Johnston, Educational Theory and Practice; Katherine B. Jones, School of Music; Kay Bea Jones, Architecture; Gregory Judasins, Judica and Near Eastern Languages and Literatures; Fumuki K. Khan, Electrical Engineering; Peter O. King, Philosophy; John Kassel, Neurology; Ashok K. Krishnamurthy, Electrical Engineering; Lauren J. Krivo, Sociology; Jon Krociss, Psychology;

Christiane Lauefer, French and Italian; James Lantz, Social Work; Dik Lun Lee, Computer and Information Science; David A. Lipton, University Libraries; Warren D. Lo, Pediatrics; Linda M. Lobao, Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology; Francois A. Lofaro, Finance;

Karen M. Manci, Agricultural Engineering; William M. Masters, Zoology; E. L. McCoy, Ag Sciences; Shirley O. Bryant, Research and Development; and Anthony P. Young, Pharmacy.

Promotion to adjunct associate professor
Tara T. Van Toai, Agromony, Alan Escowitz, Pharmacy; and Mac A. Stewart, Educational Policy and Leadership.

Promotion to professor of clinical medicine
Wilhelm H. Weddington, Family Medicine.

Promotion to associate professor of clinical medicine
Daniel J. Martin, Psychiatry; Randy R. Miller, Pediatrics; Rick E. Ricer, Family Medicine; and Howard A. Wierman, Emergency Medicine.

Promotion to clinical professor
Robert J. Murphy, Preventive Medicine, and James F. Quilty, Pediatrics.

Promotion to clinical associate professor
Gary E. Barnett, Pathology; Jeffrey G. Bell, Obstetrics and Gynecology; Jack B. Boons, Otolaryngology; Herbert A. Bronstein, Internal Medicine; Robert E. Falcone, Surgery; Ralph D. Lach, Internal Medicine; Mano J. Marcon, Pathology; Eugene S. May, Internal Medicine; Ambrose Ng, Pathology; Niranjana T. Shah, Pathology; Barry T. Shannon, Pathology; and Larry Vandekreeg, Family Medicine.

Promotion to clinical assistant professor
Gerald L. Cable, Pharmacy; Ronald L. Clowson, Dentistry; Evan W. Dixon, Internal Medicine; Martin R. Glammorde, Pharmacy; Harry L. Graber, Internal Medicine; Cheryl L. Long, Dentistry; and David R. Neger, Internal Medicine.

Reappointment to professor of clinical medicine
Neena Kapoor, Pediatrics.

Reappointment to associate professor of clinical medicine
Susan C. Benes, Ophthalmology; and Wilhelm H. Weddington, Family Medicine.

Reappointment to assistant professor of clinical medicine
David L. Anglin, Pediatrics; Lorraine R. Birkovich, Internal Medicine; Juan M. Bowen, Internal Medicine; Anthony J. Celacico, Pediatrics; Eric G. Handler, Pediatrics; William E. Maher, Internal Medicine; Mary E. Mortensen, Pediatrics; and Arthur E. Pellegrini, Pathology; Richard S. Peters, Jr., Radiology; Mahankal B. Rao, Internal Medicine; Robert T. Sickles, Family Medicine; Douglas B. Van Fossen, Internal Medicine; and Sharon E. Washington, Internal Medicine.
Current tenure criteria may change

By Kim Merlack
Lantern Staff Writer

In October, OSU President E. Gordon Gee proposed a major change to the traditional "publish or perish" criteria used to determine tenure at Ohio State.

Traditionally, faculty members who wanted to be tenured have faced the requirement to publish a steady stream of either books or articles in professional journals.

Tenure is a kind of job security given to faculty members which protects them in times of cutbacks.

Gee said the expanding world of technology and information demands a questioning and reevaluation of the current process, which he called too narrow of a measure of productivity.

Lucia Dunn, professor of economics, said Gee's proposal is appropriate.

"There are many areas of study that aren't geared toward writing articles or books but that have valid accomplishments which should be considered," Dunn said.

Lee Becker, professor of journalism, said in an area where publication is the primary method of scholarship, the current criteria used for tenure selection is adequate.

"The peer review process, which lies behind publication, is a very important one," Becker said. "And I'm not anxious about the fact that we restrict our decisions to published material."

However, Becker also stressed that if a field is one where something other than publication is appropriate, then it is important to recognize that people produce creative materials differently.

Victor Rentel, associate dean of education, said Gee's idea has already been implemented by the College of Education.

Rentel said candidates for tenure in the college produce a dossier containing all types of examples of their teaching, which give convincing evidence of the candidate's ability.

"Most people were well on their way to compiling such evidence as early as Summer Quarter," Rentel said.

Gee also proposed limiting the number of items submitted to a tenure board to the best three to five.

Dunn again agreed with Gee and said the university needs to stop counting and concentrate on the quality of submissions.

"Normally the hard problems don't get good coverage because people are pressed for quantity, not quality. We are wasting time publishing worthless stuff," she said.

Dunn said publication rates can vary.

"Someone from economics may have one or two articles published per year while a candidate in chemistry might have one or two dozen articles a year," she said. "This limit on materials will have everyone starting from the same point."

Focusing on numbers is not what Becker thinks every committee does. He is also concerned with the significance and impact of pieces, the quality of the journals they are in and whether or not they break new ground.

"There is not a heavy emphasis on numbers, certainly not to the exclusion of quality," Becker said.
Task Force Proposed to Consider Faculty Rewards

Trustees held a discussion about faculty rewards during the Educational Affairs Committee meeting preceding the board meeting. According to Nancy M. Rudd, associate provost, the Office of Academic Affairs is proposing the establishment of a task force on faculty rewards. The task force would review the current system and make recommendations regarding general criteria for appointment, tenure, promotion, and other rewards that are applicable across disciplines.

Rudd cited issues such as a lack of consistency between current procedures and faculty rules, an apparent lack of involvement by many faculty in tenure and promotion matters in many departments, inadequate documentation of teaching in many departments, and inconsistency between the Ohio public records law and Ohio State's policy on confidentiality of letters of evaluation.

She noted that she envisions the task force reviewing the faculty rules and the Office of Academic Affairs procedural guidelines for tenure and promotion decisions; laws, such as the Ohio Open Records Act; and the definition of scholarly activity.

In addition, the task force would consider the appropriate general criteria for the awarding of tenure and for promotion and consider what mixture of uniformity of criteria and local variation is optimal to assure that Ohio State as a whole, as well as individual disciplines, can achieve the highest possible quality. Related issues beyond the scope of the committee's charge would be identified for further study.
OAA group to review faculty reward system

Panel to find common ground for giving promotion, tenure

By Tom Spring

The Office of Academic Affairs is proposing a University committee to review the policies and processes used to reward faculty with promotion and tenure. A proposal has been distributed to the Board of Trustees, deans, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, and the Senate Steering Committee for discussion and comment.

According to Nancy Rudd, associate provost, the exact list of issues the group would tackle has not been finalized. Whatever is decided, she said, a review of the promotion and tenure system "is an essential component of the restructuring and refocusing process now under way because the system fundamentally affects the quality of the faculty."

The committee could consider the general criteria for the awarding of tenure and for promotion. She said, including what mix of uniform criteria and local variation achieves the highest possible quality for Ohio State as a whole, as well as for individual disciplines.

In addition the committee would conduct a review of the current procedures and faculty rules governing promotion and tenure to determine whether they best provide for fair and appropriate decisions.

Related issues beyond the scope of the committee's charge would be identified for further study, Rudd said.

The group would make recommendations by the end of 1993-94 to Richard Sisson, senior vice president for academic affairs and provost. Any recommendations that Sisson accepts would be considered in 1994-95 by the University Senate and the Board of Trustees. Implementation would begin in 1995-96.

Rudd discussed the proposal Nov. 5 with members of the Education Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.
System of rewards need review

By Tom Roebuck
Lantern staff writer

Associate Provost for Academic Affairs Nancy M. Rudd announced a proposal Friday to a Board of Trustees committee to establish a task force to review the faculty rewards system.

"Not in current memory has anyone engaged in such a review," Rudd said at the meeting of the Educational Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.

"An anticipated outcome of the proposed review will be recommendations regarding general criteria for appointment, tenure, promotion and other rewards that are applicable across disciplines," Rudd wrote in a memo to the committee.

"Some of the issues...include a lack of involvement by faculty in tenure and promotion matters in many departments, inadequate documentation of teaching in many departments, and inconsistency between the Ohio public records law and the university's policy on confidentiality of letters of evaluation obtained during tenure and promotion reviews," Rudd wrote.

Rudd said good teaching skills by faculty are sometimes not recorded because of poor documentation. This could hurt a faculty member's chances of receiving tenure or a promotion, she said.

Rudd, who will chair the task force, said it will issue a report with recommendations to Vice President for Academic Affairs Richard Sisson by the end of Spring Quarter.

At the same meeting, Sisson said proposals on restructuring from college deans are due Feb. 1.

Earlier this quarter, Sisson distributed a draft copy of a restructuring report to deans and department chairs. He told the committee the final draft of his statement is currently being distributed.

"The reallocation plan is to be of two parts. First, deans will be asked to submit plans to redirect within the college 7 percent of their fiscal year 1995 general funds budgets. Second, for the long term, deans should identify another 7 percent to be reinvested differentially within their colleges over four years beginning in fiscal year 1996," Sisson wrote in his report.
OSU teacher's lawsuit could be far-reaching

Faculty evaluations claimed at stake

By Alan D. Miller
Dispatch Higher Education Reporter

A public records case awaiting action by the Ohio Supreme Court could shake the hallowed halls of higher education.

Robert M. Duncan, a former state senator, filed suit against OSU in April seeking access to tenures and promotion files of about 6000 professors.

"Under Ohio law, they are public records and should be available to anyone who asks," he says.

OSU is vigorously fighting to keep the records sealed, contending that peer reviewers will be less than candid in evaluating a professor's performance if they know their review letters will be made public.

"They are the only way to determine if a faculty member is doing a good job," says Charles J. Ping, president of OSU.

The issue has been raised annually for years on campus, and never has been resolved. In court, OSU contends that the files should be sealed.

For two years, OSU attorneys wrote in response to James's suit.

"It has wide and far-reaching implications for the Ohio State University and all Ohio public colleges and universities."

Not at Ohio University at Athens, said Acting Provost David Stewart, Tenure and promotion files are open there, based on a case involving the University of Pennsylvania.

"We've operated under the assumption they are open," Stewart said. "We do not solicit letters from outside evaluators, with any promise of confidentiality."

That is not to say OU officials are happy with that system. Before he left office Thursday, OU President Charles J. Ping said he prefers that the files be sealed.

"The issue has been raised annually for years on campus, and never has been resolved," said Howard Gauthier, executive associate to the chancellor of the university.
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Ohio Board of Regents and formerly a tenured professor at OSU.

"Even Ohio State's general counsel and vice president for legal affairs, former federal judge Robert M. Duncan, admits that the law does not specifically say the records may be kept confidential."

"I don't think there is a specific exception contained in the statute," Duncan said. "We are relying on what we think the legislature intended and what is reasonable. We are trying to persuade the Supreme Court that such data is not subject to the open-records law."

But Gauthier said, "Ninety percent of the information in those files could easily be made public. The real issue tends to focus on letters by colleagues, both within and outside the university."

"Evaluators fear they could be sued if someone sees the file and feels that the evaluator's letter was responsible for the professor not getting tenure, thus damaging his or her career."

Decisions on whether a university grants tenure, basically guaranteeing a job for life, are based largely on evaluations by fellow professors.

Reached at his Columbus home, James declined to discuss the case. James, 46, a teacher at Ohio State for six years, is paid $37,344 a year.

In court documents, James said he was notified in January that he had been denied tenure. He asked for an explanation.

"The answer, as I recall, was that my teaching and service were adequate, but my scholarship was inadequate, meaning publications in this was the word that was used, but my scholarship was inadequate, meaning publications in this case," he said in a deposition.

He sought to appeal the tenure decision and indicated he wanted to see the tenure and promotion files of other professors within the Department of Geological Sciences in order to formulate his appeal.

The request was denied. So he asked again at a higher level and expanded the request to include the files of professors within the College of Mathematics and Physical Sciences."

Eventually, he expanded the request to include access to files of all professors given tenure by Ohio State during the past three years.

Two days before he filed suit with the Supreme Court, James was hand-delivered a letter from Steven J. McDonald, OSU associate legal counsel.

In denying James' request, McDonald pointed to a section of Ohio law that allows law enforcement agencies to keep confidential "information provided by an information source or witness to whom confidentiality has been reasonably promised."

McDonald advised James. "The documents that you seek could not help you in any appeal, and the extraordinary burden that you seek to impose upon us would serve no useful purpose."
Tenure process to be questioned in court

By Taehyun Kim
Lantern staff writer

Ohio State might not be able to continue its confidential tenure review process if it cannot prove the process is exempt from Ohio's open records law.

William Calvin James, an assistant professor in the Department of Geological Sciences, has appealed to the Ohio Supreme Court a request to learn the names of those who evaluated his unsuccessful request for tenure. In his lawsuit, James said he believes the university might use the tenure and promotion process "as a way of curtailing employment of the faculty in times of economic hardship, thus saving money and balancing budgets."

A trial court and an appeals court have rejected the lawsuit, filed April 21. The lawsuit names James C. Garland, dean of the College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences; Nancy M. Rudd, associate provost; and Ohio State University. James seeks access to his file and the files of 600 other faculty members to gain insight into how tenure is granted and denied, court documents say.

The college denied James tenure, despite a 13-to-3 vote in favor by the faculty and a recommendation by the department, James said in court documents. When contacted by telephone, James declined comment on the ongoing case. The university has refused to reveal the names of those who evaluated James' tenure application. The names were marked out in black ink on tenure files turned over to James upon his request.

Further, the university refused to release an evaluation letter by the tenure committee's chairperson.

"It is important to know the names of evaluators because different weights may have been assigned to them during the evaluation process," James said in court documents.

James later expanded his file request to include documents from the department for the last six years and from the college for the last three years. He also requested all other promotion and tenure files from the university for the last three years.

But OSU President E. Gordon Gee said releasing information such as that requested by James might harm the tenure process.

"If the promotion and tenure files of Ohio's public colleges and universities are required to be produced for inspection by anyone for any reason or no reason . . . they will be severely prejudiced in their ability to attract and retain the best scholars," Gee said.

"External evaluators often have some professional or personal relationship with the candidate . . . ." See Tenure/Page Two

The possibility for embarrassment or prejudice if comments attributed to the evaluator become a matter of casual public availability is . . . a matter of grave and genuine concern," Gee said.

The university's position is that it was not the intent of the General Assembly to require that confidential materials of this nature be made public," said Robert M. Duncan, vice president and general counsel in the Office of Legal Affairs.

"I am certain that academic freedom is under threat because public information is released to the public," said Thomas Hudson, an Ohio University trustee and a professor in Ohio University's Department of Mass Communication.

The university currently reviews faculty members' tenure and promotion applications based on a candidate's performance in research, student service and quality of teaching.

The university relies heavily on the results of peer-review processes, because tenure decisions in universities are made by colleagues.

The review process involves sending evaluation forms and sample plans of the candidate's work, to faculty of higher rank at other major research universities.

Tenure review is a subjective process that cannot be measured in certain standards. By the same reason, it might be manipulated in many ways if not made open to public scrutiny, James said.

The university's guidelines for tenure and promotion indicate that the confidentiality of evaluators is not exempt from the public records law, James said.

"We shouldn't be surprised to see that person attempt to get an access to that information," Hudson said. "If that is public information by the definition, then he should have it."

"It is the law and it was the law," although employees of Ohio are not comfortable with the open record law, he said.

"If President Gee is concerned that Ohio State is being mistreated, then perhaps he needs to alter the law," Hudson said.

The real issue in this case is whether the privacy protection provision in Ohio's open record law is applicable to university tenure files, said Mark Goodman, an executive director of The Student Press Law Center in Washington, D.C.

The number of cases on the issue of access to personnel files has increased, and most of those who are seeking access are winning, Goodman said.

State agencies include any state-supported institution of higher education.

Public records include any records that are kept by public offices, except medical and adoption records, and student information not released with the written consent of the student, according to the Ohio Revised Code.
Supreme court opens faculty files

University argued that suit threatens academic freedom

The Ohio Supreme Court ruled on Aug. 31 that promotion and tenure records at Ohio State and other state-supported colleges and universities are public documents.

The court voted unanimously to grant a writ of mandamus, which is an order compelling Ohio State to make its tenure records open to public inspection.

Steve McDonald, an attorney in the Office of Legal Affairs, said an appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court is not likely. Provost Richard Sisson was not available for comment.

In *James v. Ohio State University*, the court said that promotion and tenure records maintained by the University are public records subject to disclosure by state law.

The action was brought by William Calvin James, assistant professor of geological sciences, who had been denied tenure. He had asked for copies of the records for all faculty who had been considered for promotion during the last three years and geological sciences faculty for the last six years.

Ohio State officials estimated that responding to James’s request would generate 60,000 pages of documents. It also would require the University, as a professional obligation, to notify the 600 faculty members whose files would be disclosed and some 6,000 evaluators across the country who provided evaluations with expectations of confidentiality.

Ohio State argued that disclosing the records would infringe its constitutionally protected right to academic freedom and unnecessarily undermine the University’s peer review-based tenure system.

However, the court wasn’t convinced. In the opinion, written by Justice Craig Wright, the court called Ohio State’s claim “remote and attenuated,” adding: “It seems the antithesis of academic freedom to maintain secret files upon which promotion and tenure decisions are made, unavailable even to the person who is the subject of the evaluation.”

Traditionally, when a faculty member is being considered for tenure, departments ask outside experts to evaluate the candidate’s work.

Wright cited U.S. Supreme Court Justice Harry A. Blackmun, who wrote in *University of Pennsylvania v. EEOC* that future evaluators “may simply ground their evaluations in specific examples and illustrations in order to deflect potential claims of bias or unfairness.”

The Ohio Supreme Court said that even if justices had thought disclosing the documents to the public diminished the integrity of the promotion and tenure process, the question is a public policy issue, not one for the court.

The court noted that the Ohio General Assembly already decided which records are to be closed by listing “very narrow, specific exceptions to the public records statute” in the Ohio Revised Code.

Before filing the suit, James sought access to and copies of his promotion and tenure records, including the letter of evaluation by the department chairperson, all materials in James’s fourth-year promotion and tenure files, promotion and tenure files compiled by the Department of Geological Sciences during the last six years and those files compiled by the College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences for the last three years.

James Garland, dean of the College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences, responded by allowing James to inspect and copy his own promotion and tenure files, including confidential peer review letters.

Information identifying the author was to be removed unless the author consented to the release. The dean refused James’s request for copies of files of other faculty members, according to a brief filed by attorney Kathleen M. Trafford on behalf of Ohio State.

Ohio State contended in its brief that because of the nature of the peer review process, which involves individual subjective evaluations, comparisons to the decisions of other faculty members aren’t measurable. Thus, the files of other faculty members were not relevant to the decision not to award tenure to James.

Ohio State contended an evaluator is the equivalent of “an information source or witness to whom confidentiality has been reasonably promised” under state law.

The court said, however, that the Ohio Revised Code limits application of that phrase to confidential law enforcement investigatory records.

It cited Ohio State’s “Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Procedures at the Department, College, and University Levels,” which states that while University policy is to “maintain confidentiality, within the limits of law, regarding access to all letters of evaluation … these materials are not exempted from the Ohio Public Records Act at this time. Prospective external evaluators should be informed of both these facts.”

In practice, the letters have been kept as confidential as possible.

James acted as his own attorney. Trafford is an attorney with the law firm of Porter, Wright, Morris & Arthur.
Provost presents advancements

The Office of Academic Affairs is pleased to present the names of those colleagues who were promoted in academic rank and/or awarded tenure.

Faculty promoted to full professor
- Michael Barton, Geological Sciences; L. Mark Berliner, Statistics; Maritza C. Cooper, Marketing; Fernando G. Cosio, Internal Medicine; Daniel L. Cox, Physics; Stephen F. Dale, History; James F. Davis, Chemical Engineering; Luciano F. Farina, French and Italian; Lawrence L. Gabel, Family Medicine; Koukei Ishii, Mechanical Engineering; David L. Johnson, Natural Resources; Richard G. Lembach, Ophthalmology; Steven C. Loehr, Animal Science; Nelson C. Mark, Economics; Lawrence E. Mathes, Veterinary Pathobiology; Chi-Hsiang Menq, Mechanical Engineering; Gary W. Mullins, Natural Resources; Haikady N. Nagaraja, Statistics; Maria H. Neff, Psychiatry; William I. Noz, Statistics; M. L. Ophe-Mazo, Music; Hayran A. Oz, Aeronautical and Astronautical Engineering; Umit S. Ozkan, Chemical Engineering; Roger A. Page, Psychology; Lima; Anil K. Pradhan, Astronomy; James M. Pyne, Music; Stephen M. Reed, Veterinary Clinical Sciences; Richard L. Roth, Art; Andrej Rotter, Pharmacology; Mohammad Samimi, Mechanical Engineering; Benjamin R. Stinner, Entomology; Evan R. Sugarbaker, Physics; Lonnie G. Thompson, Geological Sciences; and Andrew D. Ward, Agricultural Engineering.

Faculty promoted to associate professor with tenure
- Javad Abdalkhani, Mathematics; Luma; Robert A. Agunga, Agricultural Education; Greg M. Allenby, Marketing; Peter M. Andersen, Materials Science and Engineering; Mirbash D. Asir, Mathematics; Deborah L. Bainer, Educational Theory and Practice, Mansfield; Richard L. Bianci, Music; Richard A. Bradley, Zoology; Marion; Joseph E. Brandesky, Theatre, Lima; C. A. Breetenberger, Biochemistry; Denise E. Bronson, Social Work; Larry C. Brown, Agricultural Engineering; Philip C. Brown, History; Arthur H. Burgheles, Medical Biochemistry;
- Xiaomei Chen, East Asian Languages and Literatures; Sam C. Colacini, III, Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation; Lucia H. Covigian, Spanish and Portuguese; David W. Covey, Dentistry; James W. DeWille, Veterinary Pathobiology; Marcia Dickson, English; Marion; Kathy M. Fagan, English; Joseph Galron, University Libraries; Jacqueline J. Gargus, Architecture; Terry L. Gustafson, Chemistry; Curtis P. Hauptvedt, Marketing; Cheryd M. Heesch, Physiology; Michelle R. Herdon, Chemistry; James W. Hoekstra, Emergency Medicine; Raymond F. Jezerinica, Zoology; Nora J. Johnston, Classics; Lorraine M. Justice, Industrial Design; Douglas A. Kniss, Obstetrics and Gynecology; Joseph A. Krzyzek, Biophysics; Gregory P. Lafayhas, Physics; Michael D. Larmore, Veterinary Pathobiology; David Landis, Bergen, School of Public Policy and Management; Frederick T. L. Leong, Psychology; Robert D. Levine, Linguistics; Alan S. Li, Surgery, General; Daniel R. Marin, Emergency Medicine; James J. Masters, Marketing; Jonathan E. Mayhew, Spanish and Portuguese; Edwin A. McGlumphy Jr., Restorative Prosthetic; Mary A. McLaughlin, Veterinary Clinical Sciences; Carolyn J. Merry, Civil Engineering; Linda M. Miezewski, English; Waldead A. Muhanna, Accounting and Management Information Systems; Norris S. Nahman Jr., Internal Medicine; Minatoku Nakayama, East Asian Languages and Literatures; Kurt Novak, Geodetic Science and Surveying;
- Hiyad Ozbay, Electrical Engineering; Emil M. Opremcak, Ophthalmology; Caroline M. Palmer, Psychology; Jordan B. Pollack, Computer and Information Science; David L. Porretta, School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation; Richard C. Pratt, Agronomy;
- Terefich H. Rawal, Chemistry; Craig Roberts, Linguistics; Theresa Rogers, Educational Theory and Practice; Susan K. Roth, Industrial Design; Pamela J. Salsbery, Community, Parent-Child and Psychiatric Nursing; Keiko K. Samimy, Educational Studies; Pauline P. Schmidt, Optometry; Kristen Sellgren, Astronomy; Stephanie J. Shaw, History; Allison A. Snow, Plant Biology; Anna O. Soter, Educational Studies; Randall C. Starling, Internal Medicine; Robert L. Stephens Jr., Physiology; William W. Tschek, Philonamy; Hanumantha R. Unnava. Marketing; Torrence P. Walker, Physics; M. Gauglack Wiesnigs, Surgery; David A. Wilkie, Veterinary Clinical Sciences; Randall T. Wood, Agricultural Engineering; Mohamed F. Yousif, Mathematics, Lima; and Joseph T. Zeidman, Near Eastern, Judaic and Hellenic Languages and Literatures.

Faculty promoted to associate professor
- Pamela S. Bradigan, University Libraries; Jeanie A. Clement, Community, Parent-Child and Psychiatric Nursing; Maureen H. Donovan, University Libraries; and Marsha J. Hamilton, University Libraries.

Faculty promoted to assistant professor and tenure
- Sherry L. Edwards, University Libraries; Mansfield; Jeffrey C. Fisher, University Extension; Cynthia R. Hoover, University Extension; Bruce A. Leach, University Libraries; Larry A. Nye, University Extension; and Marguerite C. Weibel, University Libraries.

Faculty promoted to assistant professor
- Susan M. Krall, University Libraries; Judith A. Villard, University Extension; and Susan M. Zies, University Extension.

Faculty approved for tenure
- Stephen L. Boyles, Animal Science; Joan E. Cashin, History; Gilbert J. Greene, Social Work; Saragault R. Lynch, University Libraries; David W. Snively, University Extension; Kunio Takeyama, Medical Biochemistry; and Paul L. Vaghy, Medical Biochemistry.

Clinical faculty promoted to professor
- Herbert J. Rogove, Internal Medicine.

Clinical faculty promoted to associate professor
- Kevin L. Alexander, Optometry; Richard A. Kern, Pediatrics; Susan L. Koletar, Internal Medicine; Lawrence E. Leguine, Internal Medicine; William E. Maher, Internal Medicine; Robert A. Murden, Internal Medicine; Robert R. Ostrum, Surgery; Evelyn E. Pintz, Internal Medicine; and Joseph Sulmack, Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation.

Clinical faculty promoted to assistant professor
- Michael E. Chester, Optometry; Jeffrey A. Myers, Optometry; Barbara L. Oglesbee, Veterinary Clinical Sciences; Stephen Richards, Internal Medicine; and Mark L. Smith, Optometry.
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News Summary: Page A3

"Our outstanding teachers get awards and some pay raises. But when shoved against the wall, it's the research that's central."
A psychologist, with tenure, at Ohio State University: A16

"We view failure to comply with regulations for the protection of human subjects as a failure of our educational effort." An official of the National Institutes of Health, on action taken against the University of Virginia: A29

"It's a company in the right business at the right time." A stockbroker, on DeVry Inc., which runs the DeVry Institute of Technology: A35

"With the demise of the Soviet Union, increasingly the U.S. is the only show in town." The director of the Institute of United States Studies at the University of London: A40

"For this government, education is really a priority, with a true commitment from the President. There will be radical changes in education." Brazil's Minister of Education: A42

"Behavior that anywhere else would be classified as alcohol abuse now is not only acceptable but actually the norm on many campuses." Three researchers at the Harvard School of Public Health: B1

"Federal historians, as well as our colleagues in academe, are the people who make the Dan Ratners and Connie Chang of the world sound intelligent." The former historian of the U.S. House of Representatives: A52

New Light on Tenure

A court ruling opens confidential files at Ohio State U.

Page A16

"Ambassador of goodwill"; turned down

Experiments worked; got tenure
Personal & Professional

Lifting the Cloak of Secrecy From Tenure

Court order results in unprecedented access to files at Ohio State U.

By Douglas Lederman and Carolyn J. Mooney

Bernard Rosen compares tenure decisions today to grading on a curve when "you have all honors students."

Nancy M. Rudd: “We want to make sure we’re tenuring an individual who’s going to have a long and productive career.”
Ohio State University considers dozens of scholars for tenure every year. In academic 1993-94 it awarded academe’s stamp of approval to a bird-song biolo-
gist, a band leader, a poet, a big-hang physicist, and many others.
Among those it rejected were a folklorist with a slim publishing record, a historian whose book manuscript had been attacked, and a microbiologist who had failed to seek grant support.

Until recently, decisions about whether these scholars deserved tenure—and, in effect, jobs for life—would have been confidential. But the cloak of secrecy was lifted at Ohio State last August, when an Ohio Supreme Court ruling allowed unprecedented access to tenure and promo-
tion documents at the state’s public colleges.
The opening of so many files so quickly has left some Ohio academics anxious and angry. (See story on Page A10.) But it has also opened a window into what is one of the most significant—and most mysterious—features of American higher education.
The Chronicle recently examined all 48 tenure cases decided by the Ohio State University Board of the Arts and Sciences. Thirteen of these candidates were initially denied tenure; but two have appealed success-
sively, one received tenure after a second review, and two others are awaiting a second review, which will come in June.

The documents—and interviews with nearly 50 scholars and officials—reveal a winnowing process that strikes most people at Ohio State as careful and fair. They also reveal a process that appears to reinforce enduring aca-
demic notions about what makes a good scholar and a good university.

HAND-WRINGING AND HEARTACHE
Recent talk in the academy about the need to broaden the definition of scholarship and to better reward teaching did not appear to greatly influence most cases at Ohio State last year. Tenure panels gave particular scrutiny to the number of publications; the reputation of journals, press-
es, and outside evaluators; and the amount of grant money received.

In almost every negative tenure case, inadequate re-
search was cited as the major reason. Although tenure committees stressed the significant amount of a candidate’s classroom performance—more so than in the past, many agreed—no candidate was denied tenure solely because of inadequate teaching.

Ohio State’s tenure process reflected many other issues that arise daily in the academy—the push for prestige, the role one’s race plays, and the ideological tensions that can divide scholars.

In the tenure case, faculty panels and administrators picked apart the candidate’s record of research, teaching, and campus service to determine who deserved to pass academe’s biggest milestone.

"When we grant tenure, we’re in effect granting lifetime employment," says Nancy M. Rudd, vice-provost for aca-
demic policy and personnel. "So, in making that mono-
mental decision, we want to make sure we’re rewarding an individual who’s going to have a long and productive care-
ner.

"The tenure process can be as painful as it is painstaking, with a lot of hand-wringing and heartache, and emotionally hard work. It involves agonizing waits, tough judgment calls, and brutally frank discussions of a scholar’s talent. Until now, glimpses into the process have been rare and fleeting. Most candidates have not been allowed to read their files in entirety, or told how their closest colleagues voted (al-
though a lively academic grapevine may tip off professors in some disciplines).

Many cases took twists and turns: "There was the ‘bril-
liant’ rhetorician who hadn’t lived up to his potential. The historian whose outside reviews were glowing, e.g./epi for one that almost killed his candidacy. The academic who had stopped the tenure clock to raise her two young children. The rising star who was wooed by another university.

All their stories are told in the tenure files.

RESEARCH, TEACHING, AND SERVICE
The process that culminates in a sixth-year tenure re-
view at Ohio State begins with the hiring of an assistant professor. The goal is to hire someone who will make important scholarly contributions, teach effectively, and take part in the academic community both at the university and nationwide. Annual evaluations are followed by a fourth-year review, after which candidates are either deemed to be on track for tenure or encouraged to leave.

"Let’s face it: If someone is not on the path to tenure, the tenure committee is the first to ask, ‘Is that person making the depart-
ment see that at year three or four, and the parting is amicable,’" says Randolph B. Ripley, dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences.

The summary judgment of the sixth year, candidates compile a dossier that includes a résumé of all teaching, scholarly, and service activities, as well as evaluations of their teach-
ing by students and colleagues. The department then seeks as many as 10 peer-review letters from scholars outside Ohio State, including some who know the candidate per-
sonally and others who do not.

Candidates next face a barrage of reviews: first by the department’s promotion-and-tenure committee and sometimes also by all tenured members; then by the chairper-
son; the collegewide tenure committee; the dean; the uni-
versitywide tenure panel; and, finally, the provost. Until this year, any two negative evaluations automatically killed a tenure bid. No, to ensure fairness, virtually every candidate goes on to the universitywide panel.

The provost, John R. Sisson, can overturn that panel’s decision, as he did in two of the 48 cases (both times in the candidate’s favor). Candidates rejected by the provost may appeal to a faculty committee, but the provost has the final say on appeals, too.

POLITICS, RACE, AND MONEY
The tenure review involves a weighing of diverse fac-
 tors. Research, teaching, and service are the big three, but politics, race, and money also can influence a case.

Ohio State, like many large universities, is under pres-
sure to show that it values teaching. In theory, the main campus gives equal weight to teaching and research. (Teaching carries more weight on the regional campuses: See story on Page A22.) But its administrators acknowled-
ge that at a major doctoral university like Ohio State, research money is critical.

That’s true in part because research brings institutions prestige and federal grant money.

What’s more, scholarship helps good teachers stay vital, says John O. Riedl, dean of Ohio State’s Mansfield cam-
pus. "If a person does not keep up with his field and goes brain-dead on me, he’s not going to be much of a teacher."

Hence the first notice: familiar to many in academe—to emerge from the tenure documents: A mediocre teacher with outstanding research is far more likely to get tenure than a terrible teacher with hackluster scholarship.

Teaching can hurt you, “but it can’t save you,” says Gregory P. Laffan, a physicist who received tenure.

"The bottom line is that teaching has to be only accept-
able. "says Frederick T. Leong, a psychologist who was also awarded tenure. "There’s stuff done to show the pub-
lc that we are making efforts. Our outstanding teachers get awards and grants when they get tenured."

And, for scientists, the grant support. Aldis Darzins’s colleagues in the microbiology department rated him an "outstanding" undergraduate teacher. His research pro-
gram in microbial genetics was seen as extremely promis-
ing. But he had made a risky decision several years earlier: He would work hard in the laboratory and hold off on seek-
ging major grant support.

"I thought, why should I go through the hassle of applying time after time and getting turned down? When I can be in the laboratory doing the work and getting the publica-
tions out there?" he says.

His annual reviews urged Mr. Darzins to apply for fed-
eral grants, but he toiled in the lab. By tenure time he had published two papers in respected jour-
als, with results that his chairman called "intriguing" and "novel."

But the strategy proved fatal. "His decision not to apply for federal funds while he was in the School of Molecular Sciences from the major federal funding agencies cannot be overlooked nor condemned," the chairman, John N. Reese, wrote in opposing Mr. Dar-
zins for tenure.

The university, hoping to return to academic, now works for a biotechnology company. His response to the notion that teaching is as important as research in the tenure process: "That’s bull."

A DISTINCT PURPOSE FOR EACH STAGE
Each stage of the tenure process is designed to serve a distinct purpose. The departmental vote is crucial, be-
cause colleagues can best judge a candidate’s day-to-day performance. Another axiom: A candidate who is narrow-
ly approved at the departmental level can expect greater scrutiny at higher stages.

Sometimes, departments split over politics or personal-
ities. The Spanish-and-Portuguese department voted 8 to 4 to endorse Lucia H. Costigan for tenure. Her chair-
man, who supported her, attributed the split to a "Europeanist bias" against Latin-American literature. Ms. Costigan’s specialty. She later got tenure.

The college-level and universitywide reviews are intend-
ed to ensure that a department’s decision isn’t biased—one way or the other. Those panels know less about a candi-
date’s field, which gives way to another axiom: Outside-
review letters get more weight as the process proceeds.

A collegewide panel can step back and see a candidate in a way a department can’t, says David O. Frantz, who was acting dean of the College of Humanities last year. "It’s when the department’s opinion is in variance with the outside letters that you begin to have trouble. You can have weak departments."

Perhaps the toughest cases are those in which some-
one’s research doesn’t measure up to his or her potential. (See story on Page A23.) A breachthrough could come any day—but hasn’t yet. "We hope, we cross our fingers, we take a chance," says Gary L. Floyd, dean of the College of Biological Sciences.

Not all fields analyze laboratory results; publications, citations, or book reviews to gauge the work of scholars. The tenure dossier of Richard L. Blatt, an associate band in the School of Music, included a list of perfor-
mances he had directed. A conductor at another college praised him by writing, "Except for an overzealous trom-
bone, this is a very satisfying rendition of Jacob’s work."

A single negative review nearly nixed the tenure bid of Philip C. Brown, a historian. His book about land systems in early modern Japan was praised by all but one of the outside reviewers. James McClain, a Brown University historian, questioned his conclusions and sources. (In his book, Mr. Brown himself had challenged Mr. McClain’s work.)

Mr. Brown’s case was strongly endorsed until it reached the universitywide committee, which voted 5 to 4 to reject

Continued on Following Page
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him. A vote of the meeting states that Mr. McClain's letter, while not totally negative, "expressed sufficient reservations to sway the opinions of those voting no."

In a letter to the provost, Michael J. Hogan, the history- department chairman, wrote: "My own suspicion is that McClain is here defending his own work against Phil.'s." The provost reversed the decision—he won't why— and Mr. Brown now has tenure.

Mr. Brown says he never knew his case was in jeopardy. Says Mr. McClain: "It would be a mistake to play up personal criticisms of each other's work."

Mary E. Carroll got tenure last, but she almost didn't. For that, and her peers blame internal politics.

The communications department unaminously supported her, but she was rejected by Dean Ripley and by the tenure panel of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Both found her research lacking.

Ms. Carroll's colleagues, however, believed that she was a victim of the dean's desire to shrink the department and redirect its research goals. She appealed to a special faculty panel, which said that by discussing the restructuring plan in relation to her case, Dean Ripley had inappropriately professed his view. It also found that her candidacy had been damaged by disagreements between the college and the department over research direction and criteria for tenure.

Some members of the faculty panel asked me, "Does some- one have a grudge against you?" says Ms. Garrett. The provost granted her tenure on appeal.

Racism was a factor in several of the tenure cases. There were four faculty members of color whose tenure petition was denied. It was found that their candidacy had been damaged by disagreements between the college and the department over race and affirmative-action concerns weighed heavily in the three of the decisions. All three candidates were turned down, but one is awaiting a second review. (See story on Page A19.)

A HANDFUL OF BRILLIANT SCHOLARS

For every tenure case that hit a snag, there were several that encountered little opposition. The 48 candidates included a handful of brilliant scholars who sailed through the process (see story on Page A22). A few other candidates whose cases were close calls, and the ones who were rejected. But there were also many solid academic citizens—committed professors who were strong, though not necessarily exceptional, in all three areas.

Take Mineharu Nakayama, an associate professor of East Asian Languages and Literature. Mr. Frantz, then the humanities dean and now a professor of English, noted in his review that while Mr. Nakayama's work was never described as brilliant, it was "uniformly well regarded as solid, thorough, and substantial."

"The dean wrote that Mr. Nakayama would "prove a valuable colleague and University citizen"—in part be- cause of his "remarkable service and his ability to transcend departmental politics."

"In what was a very factionalized department," the dean wrote, "the successfully nego-
tiated among the various groups (China vs. Japan, old vs.
young, male vs. female, those with spouses in the depart-
ment vs. those without partners) . . . and managed to help
keep the Japanese program moving."

ATTACKS ON THE TENURE SYSTEM

Academe's tenure system dates to 1915, when the American Association of University Professors issued its first man- ners linking academic freedom and job security. A professor with a tenure contract can be fired only for "cause," such as wrongdoing or incompetence; or if a program is eliminated; or if an institution faces a financial crisis. But even then the dismissal of a tenured professor can be a long, nasty, and expensive process. It is also a rare one.

Lately, more critics have questioned whether the tenure system needs to be overhauled or even scrapped. But ten- ure advocates who may indirectly attacks on tenure are more like-
ly. They worry that the proportion of faculty members who hold jobs outside the tenure system has grown. Nearly half of all professors held such jobs in 1987, although the propor-
tion was much smaller at research universities like O.S.U.

They also worry that faculty jobs are coming under more scrutiny. In Ohio, legislators recently adopted a law re-
quiring public universities at state institutions to spend more time in the classroom.

Ohio State remains committed to tenure, but its officials say they are open to ways to improve the process. They are trying to toughen the fourth-year reviews (at which the vast majority of assistant professors usually pass muster), and to find more-innovative ways to evaluate teaching.

"WE MAKE A PRETTY GOOD SALAMI"

"Do you like salami?"

Mr. Riedl, dean of the Manfesfiel campus, interrupts a discussion about tenure with that question. "There's an analogy here," he says. "The product is very tasty, but you don't want to see everything that goes into it—the sows' ears and the like."

"By and large, we make a pretty good salami."

Though many unsuccessful candidates and some other critics disagree, most people at Ohio State believe that the tenure process generally works well. The vast majority of candidates for tenure get it, and appeals and legal challenges are relatively rare. I have occasionally seen the system fail," says James C. Garland, dean of the College of Mathematics and Physi-

cal Sciences, who is an Ohio State veteran of 25 years. "But when it has failed, it has failed in the direction of leniency."

That's a hard sell to those turned down, especially since Ohio State's criteria for tenure have grown tougher in the last decade. That's because of a tight job market and a push to raise standards.

"It's as if you're graying on a curve, and now that you have all honors students, you're still giving the same percentage of failing grades," says Bernard Rosen, an associate professor of philosophy. As an officer of Ohio State's A.A.U.P. chapter, he advises candidates on tenure ap-
peals.

Some senior professors admit that they might not be tenured if they were considered today. But they say the stricter criteria are offset by the fact that junior professors are relieved from certain teaching and committee duties and are given more research money. Some Ohio State administrators, including Dean Ripley, believe that the tenure criteria should be tougher still.

"I'M STILL STRUGGLING"

Does having tenure make a difference? Not everyone who made it is convinced.

"I'm still doing what I was doing before," says Caroline A. Breitenberger, a biochemist who was awarded tenure after appealing a negative decision. "I'm still struggling to get out those manuscripts, teaching the same courses, try-
ing to get those grants."

Mr. Lafortune, the physicist, says he feels freer to do research that may not yield grants and results.

Marcia Dickson, who teaches English on the Mar-

ion campus, is willing to take her chances in an academy without tenure. "But if tenure is the credential. I want it."

"One thing that last year's crop of tenure candidates agree on. They're glad the process is over."

After Mr. Dickson was awarded tenure, she got angry.

"I was furious because of the effort and the chunk of my life it took—the not knowing, the scrutiny, the pressure to publish, the pressure to be everything to everyone."

William W. Tushcke, a philosopher who had been denied tenure at the University of Michigan, celebrated with friends when he got it at Ohio State. "A toast was raised, and I braided a sigh of relief," he says. "It's such a long process."

Ms. Breitenberger's husband sent roses to her laborato-
ry.

Will Unlocking the Files Disrupt the Process?

By Douglas Lederman

COLUMBUS, OHIO—The Ohio State University linguistics department asked him to evaluate the work of Craig Roberts, an assistant professor, last fall. Mr. Carlson, the chairman of the linguistics department at the University of Rochester, wrote a thoughtful letter recommending Mr. Roberts for promotion. But in doing so, he bluntly compared her with other top linguists, saying she was on a par with some, not quite as good as others. The letter— And that officials find most helpful in the tenure process, for it pinpointed Ms. Roberts's standing in her field. (O.S.U. gave her tenure.)

But if the university now asked Mr. Carlson to assess another candidate— in the wake of last August's Ohio Supreme Court ruling on the tenure process, a University of Ottawa public records under state law—he might very well say No.

"At the very least, I'd probably write a very different kind of letter," filled with code words, he says. "A critical letter could do a lot of damage to collegiality in a relatively small field like linguistics. I work with these people."

Views like Mr. Carlson's confirm the fears of Ohio State officials. They have predicted that the court ruling would chill the candor and usefulness of tenure reviews, and that the promotion process would be disrupted severely if faculty members—capitalizing on the state's open-records law—rummaged through their own files and those of their peers. But so far, at least, the impact seems to have been minimal. Since the court decision, a few external reviewers—Ohio State cannot say precise-
ly how many—have declined to write let-
ters, citing the new policy. Others with-
drew their evaluations they had submitted before the court ruled. A handful of tenure candidates, seeing their chances dimmed by the changes, have submitted de-
cisions in their cases, have inspected their own files or those of others. "Sure, it has disrupted the age-old proc-
ess somewhat," says Susan L. Josephs, associate dean of Ohio State's College of Business. "But it has been unduly dispres-
ive, and has it led to poor judgments? I don't think so. I don't think it has."
W. Calvin James, who used to see his tenure files: "I felt the process had been secret too long, and I thought something should be done about it."

he got access to his file, he had a new job at the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency. "My emotions were spent," he says. He did not pursue the case.

Still, he thinks he made a valuable contribution. "It makes the whole system a little less secretive. It will make administrators more likely to be held accountable for their decisions."

John O. Reid, an Ohio State administrator for 20 years, believes openness will hurt the tenure system, not help it. "This poor guy is dependent on a lot of people giving their best-informed judgment, and writing the truth," he says. "If they have to worry not only about whether this information is true, but how it's going to look in The Chronicle, it's going to make this process less reliable.

So far, evidence of any such worry is hard to come by. Although the court made its ruling after most external reviews had been solicited for the 1994-95 tenure cycle, Ohio State urged department heads to tell letter writers about the policy change. Masanori Hashimoto, the chairman of the economics department, says two reviewers, "recanted evaluations—one negative, one positive. But reports from other departments suggest that few academics followed suit.

MOST GHIOSE NOT TO LOOK

People like Martin J. Medhurst are more typical. In 1993, the professor of speech communication at Texas A&M University wrote a letter about James F. Darsey, a tenure candidate at Ohio State. Mr. Medhurst called Mr. Darsey "darn smart" but questioned whether he had published enough to warrant tenure at a research university like Ohio State.

"When I wrote that letter, I presumed that what I was writing would stand the light of day if it became public," he says. The letter said nothing "that I wouldn't be willing to say in public."

Still, Mr. Medhurst thinks that tenure records should stay private. "People ultimately have to have faith in the system," he says.

Most people at Ohio State share Mr. Medhurst's faith. The vast majority of successful candidates for tenure last year—as well as most candidates who were not told not to see their files, saying they preferred to look ahead, not back. "Life is short, and I've got a ton to do," says Gregory F. Lafiya, who was tenured in physics. "If things had turned out differently, I might have gone and looked."

But others say that opening up the tenure process goes a long way toward making sure that abuse is not a natural subsystem. One assistant professor who did not get tenure this year seized on the new access by poring over the dossiers of four men who did get tenure in her college. She says she found evidence of unequal treatment, and plans to fight her rejection internally and, if that fails, in the courts.

"Before this law, I wouldn't have known how I was evaluated and how others were evaluated, and I wouldn't have seen the inconsistencies," says the scholar, who requested anonymity. "It gave me the information I needed to know I had grounds to challenge."

'NOT THE END OF THE WORLD'

If Ohio State officials want to see what the new openness will bring, they need not look far. Tenure files have been open to faculty members for years at most of Ohio's public colleges.

"Ohio State is doing what we essentially did a long time ago," says John Burns, legal counsel at Ohio University, where tenure files have been open to the faculty upon request for a much longer time. "It's not the end of the world." Ohio's policy has a catch, however: If a professor asks to see a colleague's file, the university alerts the person whose file is to be viewed. That often deters the seeker, says Mr. Burns. While officials here learn to live with the open-records law, they are also doing all they can to get out from under it. The Interuniversity Council, which represents Ohio's public colleges, is lobbying state lawmakers to exempt tenure files, patent applications, and four other kinds of university records from the laws. Their odds of success are seen as slim.

The Ohio State Faculty at a Glance

The Ohio State University employed 3,146 full-time faculty members who had tenure or were on the tenure track as of November 1, 1994. Of those, 73.7 percent had tenure. As of spring 1994, the university also had 403 lecturers who held jobs outside the tenure system. Most worked part time. The figures cover faculty members at the main and regional campuses, the cooperative-extension service, the Agricultural Technical Institute, and the libraries.

Characteristics of Full-Time Faculty Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,146</td>
<td>2,343</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full professor</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By racial and ethnic group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2,773</td>
<td>2,067</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race unknown</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status of the Arts and Sciences Faculty Members Who Were Up for Tenure in 1993-94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of members</th>
<th>Number awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In the five years people received tenure during the regular process, two white female professors went for tenure in appeal, were denied after a second review and were out of tenure, and one black and one Asian female professor by applying in a second review in June

SOURCE: Ohio State University

Wrestling With the Issue of Race

IN THE TENURE PROCESS, as in so many other settings today, the subject of race confounds.

Nowhere was that clearer than in the case of Felecia Jones Ross, one of three black female assistant professors whom Ohio State considered for tenure in the arts and sciences in academic 1993-94. The School of Journalism's tenure committee endorsed Ms. Ross's promotion to associate professor, citing her "solid" teaching and service and "acceptable" scholarship. The school would struggle to replace Ms. Ross—it's only black faculty member—if she did not get tenure, the panel cautioned. The school's director supported her, too.

The tenure panel of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, which advises the dean, next reviewed Ms. Ross's case. According to the minutes of the meeting, the need to consider merit and affirmative action "left committee members uncertain regarding how the two components should be weighted." They voted not to tenure Ms. Ross.

NATIONAL ACCREDITING REVIEW

Randall B. Rippley, the college's dean, saw the equation differently. "Promoting someone purely because of a personal attribute would be unacceptable," said his letter to the provost supporting Ms. Ross. "Taking account of the special dimension of professional contributions to cultural and ethnic diversity is, on the other hand, squarely within the values of the college." Dean Rippley's letter also warned that the journalism school soon would be reviewed by a national accrediting group, which closely monitors the diversity of faculties.

He didn't sway the committee that advises the provost on tenure, however. It voted 5 to 3 to reject Ms. Ross, citing "thiness" in her research record.

But in January, the provost awarded her a rare seventh-year review, granted when a candidate shows promise but lacks the credentials for promotion at tenure time. The case will be decided in June.

'AMBASSADOR OF GOODWILL'

Race also mattered in the case of Carol S. Taylor, who taught English at Ohio State's regional campus in Mansfield. She was hired partly with funds set aside for affirmative action. At the only black professor the campus had ever had, she often was pressed into service as what she calls Mansfield's "ambassador of goodwill": advising black students, reaching out to local black groups, and helping to build a scholarship fund for minority students.

John O. Reid, dean and director of the Mansfield campus, wore a special serenity on affirmative action into the unusually long seven-page letter he wrote about Ms. Taylor's tenure case.

It was entirely appropriate, he argued, for Ohio State to create a position for an able black candidate like Ms. Taylor, and to go to "unusual lengths"—including extra research support and teaching-load reductions—to help her succeed.

The university would be wrong to promote a black professor who fell short of its standards, Mr. Reid wrote.

Losing Ms. Taylor as a role model and mentor would be "a blow to affirmative action." Ms. Taylor had said, but tenuring her if she were unqualified "would deliver an even greater blow, for it would send a message that minority faculty cannot be

Continued On Page A31
One Professor’s Tenure Odyssey at Ohio State University

Caroline A. Breitenberger received her Ph.D. in chemistry in 1981 from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Her scholarly work is in plant molecular biology. She held a postdoctoral appointment at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology before joining Ohio State’s faculty in 1986. Her major appointment is in the biochemistry department; she also has an unpaid position in the molecular-genetics department. Both departments evaluated her for tenure. Ms. Breitenberger was considered in her seventh year—later than most tenure candidates—because she “stopped the tenure clock” for two years to care for two young children.

September/October 1993
Ms. Breitenberger prepares a formal tenure dossier that documents her teaching, research, and service activities. The half-inch-thick file includes a résumé and summaries of student evaluations. Added to it are peer-review letters from eight scholars outside the university.

“...Overall, Caroline Breitenberger [ms.] would appear to have been a bit slow in getting her research program established and off the ground. After a long lag, papers have started to appear in the last two years, yet thus far there is no major paper or research accomplishment, published or unpublished, that has resulted from her program. The work on chloroplast RFLPs has successfully passed the routine stage of preparation and is now in isolation and characterization, but where it will lead beyond that is not at all clear from her package...”

—Excerpt from an outside reviewer’s letter

November 1993
The biochemistry department’s promotion and tenure committee takes a secret ballot and recommends tenure by an 8-3 vote.

“...Both internal and external reviewers noted a significant lag between the date of her arrival at Ohio State (1986) and her first publications from work here (1990). This lag is seen as being due to a combination of three factors: the time taken for the nurture of two infant children (for which the tenure clock was stopped for two years), the time required by most new faculty to organize a research laboratory, and extra time required because of the unusual technical difficulty of the area in which she chose to work. The majority of the committee feels that outstanding teaching and public service, coupled with good research to date, and the promise of better to come, merit promotion and tenure...”

—Excerpt from report by biochemistry department’s promotion and tenure panel

January 1994
The dean recommends tenure in a letter to the provost.

“This is clearly a case where the faculty member demonstrates such strength in teaching, service, research expertise, and research potential that it also convinces her colleagues of her long-term success. One additional way to acknowledge her research potential is to note that she currently has 8 different grant proposals, ranging in dollar amounts from $40,000 to $495,000 submitted to outside agencies...”

—Excerpt from letter to the provost by biological-sciences dean

February 1994
The universitywide promotion and tenure committee votes 9-0 against granting Ms. Breitenberger tenure. It cites the candidate’s slow start in developing a research program.

March 1994
The chairman of the biochemistry department recommends tenure in a letter to the dean of the College of Biological Sciences.

“...Ms. Breitenberger’s research program in the area of organellar protein biogenesis is promising, but it is not yet fully established...”

—Excerpt from letter to the dean

January 1994
The universitywide promotion and tenure committee recommends tenure in a report to the dean. The vote is 4-2.

“...Dr. Breitenberger has established a research program in an important area, namely, organellar protein biogenesis. However, the committee was concerned that the committee was concerned about the slow start...”

—Excerpt from committee report

Compiled by Carolyn J. Mooney
Steering: Faculty to know why recommendations reversed

By Gemma McLuckie

Faculty who have made recommendations concerning promotion and tenure of their colleagues should be told in writing why administrators or promotion and tenure committees have not accepted their recommendations, a University Senate committee says.

And the entire tenure and promotion appeals process should be reviewed, says the Steering Committee.

The call for changes results from the case of an associate professor with tenure who was not promoted to professor last year.

While refusing to open an investigation, "Steering believes that this case has raised serious questions about the appeals process," Jane Fraser, chair of Steering, told Senate March 2.

"The open records law and the increasing use of (the appeals process) also point out the need to re-examine this part of the Faculty Rules," she said.

Decisions about faculty appointments, reappointments, promotion, tenure or nonrenewals are governed by Faculty Rules Chapter 47. The process of approval or denial begins with the faculty in academic departments, then moves through college- and University-level committees, and eventually to the Office of Academic Affairs. In some cases, the president is called upon to make a ruling.

Next month, the Senate will consider a proposal that administrators and decision-making bodies accept faculty recommendations "unless they are not supported by the evidence presented regarding how the candidate meets the standards established in faculty rule 3335-47-02 and other standards specific to the academic unit and discipline." If their recommendations are overruled, then faculty would get a written explanation.

"These sentences will not and should not prevent administrators from making decisions different from those made by faculty review, but do require that such contrary decisions be based on the evidence presented and do require that such decisions be explained," Fraser said.

Promotion and tenure standards and practices have been under scrutiny for two years, led by Nancy M. Rudd, vice provost. The Rules Committee expects to present proposed revisions in Faculty Rules Chapter 47 to Senate during spring quarter.

Steering now has asked the Rules Committee to begin a review of the appeals process outlined in Faculty Rules Chapter 5.

In business, Senate voted down a proposal to change its meetings from Saturday mornings to Thursday afternoons.

Senators raised several objections to a late-afternoon meeting, including: interference with teaching or attending classes; conflicts with other meetings; and limited time to complete business, which might lead to scheduling more meetings. Those in favor of changing the day said Saturday meetings conflict with some religious beliefs, and force administrators and faculty traveling on University business to be absent.

The Senate approved two name changes: the Department of Agricultural Engineering to the Department of Food, Agricultural and Biological Engineering; and the merged departments of Family Resource Management and Textiles and Clothing to the Department of Consumer and Textile Science.

University Senate will meet at 9 a.m. April 6 in 103 Kottman Hall.
Senate rejects investigation bid

By Gemma McLuckie

There will be no investigation of the denial of promotion to a faculty member last year. But the case has led to a call to review the Faculty Rule concerning appeals, and to a proposal to form an ethics committee.

The University Senate voted May 4 against forming a special committee to investigate whether the administration was fair and followed University procedures when it did not accept an appeals panel’s recommendation.

In letters and at the meeting, senators who spoke out against the motion said they feared it would set a precedent of having the entire Senate dealing with individual appeals. Others said the appeals process itself should be looked at, not the individual case.

Gerald Winer, professor of psychology, made the motion to investigate. He had been a member of the Faculty Hearing Committee that first recommended the appeal be heard.

He argued that the individual was equally as important as the process. The fear of setting precedent was “nonsense,” he said, because Senate would soon set up constraints against hearing individual cases. The idea of only reviewing the Faculty Rule concerning appeals, he said, “is based on the assumption that it is acceptable to sacrifice people in favor of process.”

According to a handout from Winer, a faculty member’s application for promotion was denied by his dean. The associate professor appealed. A Faculty Hearing panel found that a document criticizing the candidate, which the dean reportedly had promised to destroy, had instead been read by the college tenure and promotion committee. The hearing panel recommended a de novo review, without the damaging document. The de novo panel voted 12-0 in favor of the promotion. Richard Sisson, senior vice president for academic affairs and provost, still turned it down. President Gee also denied the candidate’s promotion.

In March, Winer took the case to the Senate, making a motion to investigate. In April, Senate committees and individuals made recommendations on wording, which Winer incorporated into the motion voted on last Saturday.

“Faculty governance is alive and well,” Gee said after the vote. “I admire the fact that the motion was made.”

After the meeting Winer said, “If an ethics committee is formed in two years, even in five years, I will consider that some measure of success.” However, he expressed pessimism that the committee would ever see light of day.
Revised rules reflect new faculty reward structure

By Tom Spring

The Board of Trustees on May 3 accepted amendments to the faculty rules governing promotion and tenure.

A new faculty reward structure is reflected in the amendments to the Rules of the University Faculty, reported Richard Sisson, senior vice president for academic affairs; Nancy Rudd, vice provost; and Sebastian Knowles, associate professor of English, in the Educational Affairs Committee.

The revised rules require each department, school and college to prepare a document that explains its academic mission and then establishes criteria for appointments, promotion and tenure that are appropriate to the mission.

"The revised rules reflect a substantial paradigm shift in how the university thinks about faculty roles and rewards," Rudd said. "They put Ohio State at the forefront of major universities in acting on the growing concern that faculty roles in research universities have become overly rigid."

According to Knowles, the new rules acknowledge that the diversity of missions, programs and faculty roles across the University require a variety of reward structures and that the decisions are best done at the department and college level.

By not expecting every academic unit to operate according to a single reward structure model, departments and colleges will have more freedom to examine their missions and expectations for faculty and the relative weights that should be given to teaching, research, service and other activities.

Knowles said that departments could have several different models. Faculty could choose to follow a particular model for an entire career or move among models within the constraints of the needs of the department.

In addition, trustees rescinded rules pertaining to abolished positions and use of "academic faculty" as a unit of a college. Another revision directs the president to give substantial weight to faculty recommendations in reaching a decision about recommendations for reappointment of chairs and directors.