The Review Process for A&P Educator Promotion

Administrative and Professional (A&P) promotion candidates will be reviewed by a committee comprised of their supervisor, respective assistant director(s), and the associate director. The committee will make a recommendation to the director of Extension. The director of Extension will make the final determination on promotion.

Candidates should use the outline (item 3 linked below) to prepare a narrative describing their performance in teaching, creative work, and service. In addition, candidates should submit letter of request for promotion to the associate director in the spring and provide peer and clientele names (with contact information) for evaluation feedback. This feedback will be solicited by a Qualtrics survey conducted via the associate director.

Evidence to be considered includes the following:

- Annual performance reviews conducted since date of hire or last promotion (whichever is more recent).
- Annual peer evaluation of teaching letters since date of hire or last promotion (whichever is more recent). See https://extension.osu.edu/policy-and-procedures-handbook/vi-promotion-and-tenure/peer-evaluation-teaching-faculty.
- Three-page personal narrative describing major accomplishments since last promotion. See Guide for Preparing Your A&P Narrative.
- A 360-degree assessment that includes feedback from the supervisor, peers, and clientele.

The associate director is responsible for collecting these materials and the overall management of the process.

Promotion to the next rank may be considered if the candidate meets specific minimum standards. These standards are listed below.

- Educator I is an entry-level position that requires a minimum of a bachelor’s degree.
- Educator II may be either an entry-level position for an individual with a master’s degree or a position to which an educator I may be promoted upon:
  - earning a master’s degree, and
  - achieving of a minimum overall rating of “Often Exceeds Expectations” each of the previous full three years.
- Educator III may be either an entry-level position for an individual with a master’s degree and more than 10 years of direct experience or a position to which an individual currently holding the position of educator II may be promoted upon:
  - achieving of a minimum overall rating of “Often Exceeds Expectations” each of the previous full three years as an educator II.
- Educator IV is a position to which an individual currently holding the position of educator III may be promoted upon:
  - achieving a minimum overall rating of “Often Exceeds Expectations” each of the previous full three years as an educator III.
The following timeline illustrates how the promotion process can occur over several calendar years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CY 1:</th>
<th>CY 2:</th>
<th>CY 3:</th>
<th>CYs 1-3:</th>
<th>CY 4:</th>
<th>CY 4:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extension programming performed</td>
<td>Prior year’s performance reviewed</td>
<td>Prior year’s performance reviewed</td>
<td>Master’s degree completed (if hired as A&amp;P I)</td>
<td>Prior year’s performance reviewed</td>
<td>Promotion application submitted in April, CY 4 (if minimum criteria met)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CY 5:</th>
<th>CY 6:</th>
<th>CY 7:</th>
<th>CY 8:</th>
<th>CY 9:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior year’s performance reviewed</td>
<td>First full year of performance at higher rank – prior year’s performance reviewed</td>
<td>Second year at higher rank – prior year’s performance reviewed</td>
<td>Third year at higher rank – prior year’s performance reviewed</td>
<td>Promotion application submitted in April, CY 9 (if minimum criteria met)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

360° Assessment: The candidate and committee will identify at least six potential colleagues and clientele as evaluators. Colleagues shall be Ohio State professionals who are well respected for their accomplishments and in a position to comment on the teaching, creative work, and service of the candidate. A majority must be solicited from individuals not suggested solely by the candidate. Candidates should not contact prospective evaluators regarding their promotion at any stage of the review process. The associate director will conduct the 360-degree assessment. All solicited assessment feedback received will be included in the reviewed material. Unsolicited letters of evaluation or letters of evaluation solicited by someone other than the associate director will not be included.

Assessment of the Case: The committee will meet to review the case. The supervisor will prepare a written assessment and recommendation to the associate director based on the committee’s decision. The associate director will notify the candidate in writing of the completion of the review and availability of these reports. The candidate shall have 10 calendar days to review a copy of these reports. If needed, candidates are advised to use the comment period to amend, correct, or otherwise comment on factual information or procedural matters. The committee may provide written responses to the candidate’s comments for inclusion. Only one iteration of comments is permitted.

Appeals Procedure: Ohio State University Extension strives to make decisions regarding promotion in accordance with the criteria and procedures outlined in this document and the current Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for Ohio State University Extension. If the candidate believes that a negative promotion decision has been made in violation of these guidelines and therefore alleges that it was made improperly, the candidate may appeal that decision. The educator can initiate the appeal by sending a letter to the associate director of Ohio State University Extension outlining the reasons for the improper evaluation. The letter of appeal should be submitted within a 30-day period. The director of operations of Ohio State University Extension will review the case and make the final determination.
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