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APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE
CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR THE FISHER COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

I. PREAMBLE

This document sets forth criteria and procedures for appointment, promotion, tenure and rewards for faculty of the Fisher College of Business in the context of the mission of the college and the university. It is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty); procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Book 3 of the Policy and Procedures Handbook; published annually by the Office of Academic Affairs, and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the college, its departments and its faculty are subject. Should those rules and policies change, the college will follow the new rules and policies, updating this document in due course to reflect the changes.

This document is reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, on the appointment or reappointment of the dean. On those occasions the document, with any proposed revisions, is considered by the college faculty at the level of the tenure initiating unit (TIU). A vote is taken by the tenure track faculty of each TIU to determine whether its faculty is willing to operate under a college wide A, P&T document.

This document is approved by the Office of Academic Affairs prior to implementation. In approving this document, the Office of Academic Affairs accepts the stated criteria and procedures of the college and its academic departments and delegates to the college and its academic departments (TIUs) the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to university, college, and department missions.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 of the Administrative Code. In particular, all faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 and other standards specific to this college; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.

II. COLLEGE MISSION

The Fisher College of Business achieves recognized excellence in programs of teaching, research, and service. We are an international leader in research through the pursuit of cutting-edge inquiry impacting theory and practice. We are an international leader in education through the delivery of creative and innovative programs that produce highly valued professionals for the worldwide business community. Our educational and research programs provide innovative and valued service to the university, the state of Ohio, and the world by enhancing the effectiveness of business.

1 Rules of the University Faculty may be viewed on the OSU website at [www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php](http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php). Rules referenced in the text will be identified as Faculty Rules followed by a number such as 3335-6-0.
2 The Policy and Procedures Handbook of the Office of Academic Affairs can be found on the OSU website at [http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html](http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html)
We create a learning atmosphere that allows students, faculty, and staff to exceed their own performance expectations. Among top-ranked business schools we strive to be seen as “best in class” in our ability to respond to student professional and career needs and to customize and individualize the learning experiences for students at undergraduate, graduate, and executive education levels.

A high quality faculty committed to national and international leadership in the creation and dissemination of knowledge about the theory and practice of business is fundamental to realization of the college’s mission. The standards for promotion and tenure presented in this document contribute to the ability of the college to realize its mission. The promotion and tenure criteria defined in this document are intended to be guides rather than substitutes for professional judgment regarding faculty recommendations for promotion and tenure. These judgments have always been, and will always be, at the core of any promotion and tenure evaluation process.

III. APPOINTMENTS

A. CRITERIA

The college is committed to making only faculty appointments that improve the quality of the college. Important considerations include the individual’s record in teaching, research and service; the potential for professional growth in each of these areas; and the potential for interacting with colleagues and students in ways that will enhance their academic work and attract other outstanding faculty and students.

1. REGULAR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

An earned doctorate or equivalent degree is normally a minimum requirement for appointment to the regular tenure track faculty. There is one exception to this requirement that is recognized by the faculty, that being the possible appointment as dean of an accomplished business leader not having such a degree as dean, a position that requires the individual to be a member of the college’s tenured faculty.

a) Instructor - Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but requirements for the doctoral degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. When an instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment.

When an instructor receives the rank of assistant professor upon receipt of the doctoral degree, the tenure clock is set in motion. Service credit for time spent as an instructor does not count against the period of time during which tenure is evaluated unless the faculty member indicates in writing at the time of the promotion that he or she wishes such credit. This written request is forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs by the dean of the college so that the tenure review schedule may be adjusted accordingly. For further information see Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (B) (1).
b) **Assistant Professor** - Evidence of potential for high impact scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the department, the college and the profession is assessed in the weighing of the appointment decision. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory promotion and tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the faculty member’s department determines such a review to be appropriate.

c) **Associate Professor and Professor** - Appointment at a senior rank requires that the individual meet the college's criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at senior rank normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at senior rank is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a senior rank and approved for tenure, if appropriate, but the university will not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency.

2. **REGULAR CLINICAL TRACK FACULTY**

Appointment to the clinical faculty track in Fisher College reflects an assessment by its faculty that an individual has capabilities, skills, and achievements commensurate with the rank of the appointment. Regular clinical track faculty members are engaged primarily in instructional activities, in outreach, and in academic program leadership and support. Instructional activities include effective teaching of and interaction with students, the application of knowledge to practical problems, the development of teaching and other instructional materials or methodologies, and the development and leadership of academic programs.

Individuals appointed to the regular clinical track have relevant formal training and professional experience in their areas of expertise and a proven track record in: a) supervising students in a skills acquisition setting; b) working productively with leaders/managers of organizations in client relationships; c) classroom teaching; d) expanding understanding of organizational issues through preparation of written materials such as publishable case studies; and e) exemplifying and teaching the ethical standards of the profession. Persons appointed to the regular clinical track are: a) individuals holding a Ph.D. or equivalent degree in their field (e.g. doctorate in Business Administration [D.B.A.]) committed to and capable of exemplary performance in instructional activities; and/or b) individuals who possess strong applications experience not duplicative of tenure track faculty (e.g. highly regarded former business executives) who possess the ability to remain current in practice issues and are committed to impactful sharing of their understanding and experience with members of the Fisher community.

Appointment of regular clinical track faculty entails a three to five year contract. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to
regular clinical track faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the college wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see Faculty Rule 3335-7.

a) **Clinical Assistant Professor** - An earned doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree in his or her specialty or possession of strong applications-oriented experience not duplicative of tenure track faculty is a minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of clinical assistant professor.

b) **Clinical Associate Professor and Clinical Professor** - Appointment at the rank of clinical associate professor or clinical professor requires that the individual have an earned doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree in his/her specialty or possession of strong applications oriented experience not duplicative of tenure track faculty and meet, at a minimum, the college's criteria—in teaching, professional practice and other service—for promotion to these ranks.

3. **AUXILIARY FACULTY**

The appointment of all auxiliary faculty is decided by the department chair with the approval of the dean. Consistent with university policies, auxiliary appointments are made for no more than one year at a time.

a) **Adjunct Instructor, Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, and Adjunct Professor** - Adjunct titles are used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to regular faculty of equivalent rank, who provide significant, uncompensated service to the instructional and/or research programs of the university and who need a faculty title to perform that service. Adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of regular tenure track faculty.

b) **Lecturer and Senior Lecturer** - Appointment as lecturer or as senior lecturer is determined by the extent of prior teaching experience, the quality of that prior teaching experience, and the nature of the individual's academic credentials and work experience in the field in which the teaching is to occur. Lecturers and senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion.

c) **Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor with FTE below 50%, Compensated or Uncompensated** - The rank of auxiliary faculty with regular titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of regular tenure track faculty. Auxiliary faculty members with regular titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of regular tenure track faculty.

d) **Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor** - Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from a regular academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. Rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of regular tenure track faculty. Visiting faculty members
are not eligible for tenure or promotion. They may not be reappointed for more than three consecutive years at 100% FTE.

4. COURTESY APPOINTMENTS FOR REGULAR FACULTY

Occasionally the active academic involvement in one academic department by a regular faculty member from another Fisher department or the involvement in this college by a regular faculty member from another college at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in a department within this college. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course from time to time, or a combination of these. The decision to make a courtesy appointment rests with the faculty of the appropriate department within the college, with the approval of the dean. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

B. PROCEDURES

1. REGULAR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

A national/international search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be requested from the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must be consistent with the university policies set forth in the most recent update of **A Guide to Effective Searches**, [www.hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf](http://www.hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf).

Searches for tenure track faculty members proceed as follows:

a) The dean of the college provides approval for the department to commence a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, field of expertise, and ability to hire.

b) The department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the department.

c) The search committee:

---

3 See Volume 1 in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, [http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook/html](http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook/html) on the following topics:

- recruitment of regular tenure track, clinical track and research track faculty
- appointments at senior rank or with prior service credit
- hiring faculty from other institutions after April 30
- appointment of foreign nationals
- letters of offer
i. appoints a diversity advocate who is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants;

ii. develops a search announcement for internal posting in the university Personnel Postings through the Office of Human Resources Employment Services (www.hr.osu.edu/) and external advertising, subject to the approval of the department chair and the dean’s office. Announcements are no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications is stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search;

iii. develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must assure that at least one print (as opposed to on-line) advertisement appears in a location likely to be read by qualified potential applicants. U. S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their appointment to a tenure track position included an advertisement in a field-relevant nationally circulated print journal;

iv. screens applications and presents to the department faculty a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. If the faculty agrees with this judgment, on-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the department office. If the faculty does not agree, the department chair in consultation with the faculty determines the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, cancel the search for the time being).

d) On-campus interviews with candidates include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee; graduate students; the department chair; and the dean or designee. Generally all candidates make a presentation to the faculty on their research. In some cases candidates may be asked to teach a class – either an actual class or a mock instructional situation. All candidates interviewing for a particular position follow the same general interview format.

e) Following completion of on-campus interviews, the eligible voting faculty meet to discuss perceptions and preferences, and to vote on each candidate. A quorum for this meeting is two-thirds of the eligible faculty who are not on leave during the quarter the meeting is held. In order for a vote to be considered as supportive of extending an offer to a candidate, a simple majority of the votes cast must be positive. Abstentions are not votes. Absentee ballots are not permitted.

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible voting faculty members vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. This vote may occur at the time of voting to extend an
offer or later once a dossier has been assembled and outside evaluation letters received. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. In both instances, a quorum is two-thirds of the eligible faculty who are not on leave and in order for a vote to be considered as supportive, a simple majority of the votes cast must be positive. Absentee ballots are not permitted.

In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the department chair may determine the rank ordering of the candidates. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the department chair and the dean. Potential appointment of a foreign national who lacks permanent residency should be discussed with the Office of International Affairs. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency status. The college and its departments will therefore be cautious in making such appointments and vigilant in assuring that the appointee seeks residency status promptly and diligently.

2. REGULAR CLINICAL TRACK FACULTY

Searches for regular clinical track faculty members generally proceed as for tenure track faculty members, a national/international search being strongly preferred to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates. Likewise, campus visits should be similar in structure to those used for regular tenure track positions, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the on-campus interview is on clinical/professional practice and classroom teaching rather than research. As per OAA policy, the dean can approve waiving a requirement for a national search for clinical track faculty if special circumstances warrant. This should however not be general practice.

3. AUXILIARY FACULTY

The appointment, review, and reappointment of auxiliary faculty is decided by the department chair with approval of the dean. All auxiliary appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Adjunct appointments may be renewed only when the uncompensated academic service for which the appointment was made continues.

4. COURTESY APPOINTMENTS FOR REGULAR FACULTY

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a regular faculty member from another Ohio State department. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to the department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the faculty, the department chair extends an offer of appointment. The department chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.
IV. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES

The college and its academic departments follow the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in Volume 2 in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook.

Annual reviews of faculty members are based on performance in teaching, research, and service as set forth in the college's policy on faculty duties and responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.

The documentation required for annual performance reviews is described Section V of this document. This material must be submitted to the department chair and to the dean’s office according to procedures and schedules established and communicated annually to faculty.

The department chair is required (per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35) to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

A. PROBATIONARY TENURE TRACK FACULTY

Every probationary tenure track faculty member is reviewed annually. In Fisher College, the annual review process for probationary tenure track faculty utilizes materials which faculty prepare for the compensation review process described below (see Section V. below), and takes into account the probationary faculty member’s academic and scholarly development over the duration they have been employed at Ohio State. Key steps in the annual review of probationary tenure track faculty include:

Probationary faculty members being reviewed submit a completed annual review form to their department chair and the dean’s office by the established and announced deadline. While the format of the review form may evolve over time, an example is found in Appendix A of this document.

Probationary faculty members being reviewed prepare a narrative (no longer than ten pages) that describes their research, teaching, and service record and plans.

All eligible faculty members in a department review the annual review forms and narratives of all probationary tenure track faculty in that department and discuss, with the department chair, the strengths and weaknesses of the record and plans.

The department chair prepares a written evaluation of the faculty member’s research, teaching and service record along with a recommendation to the dean about whether this person should be re-appointed. In some cases the eligible department faculty may wish to provide the faculty member with advice and feedback supplementing that communicated by the department chair. Such a letter is permissible for providing additional developmental feedback to the faculty member but is not part of the packet that progresses to the dean nor does it become part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure.
The department chair meets with the faculty member being reviewed to discuss the faculty’s evaluation of his/her record and plans and the department chair’s written evaluation and recommendation. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

The department chair’s written evaluation (along with the faculty member’s comments) is forwarded to the dean. The annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments).

The dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. If the decision is nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04) is invoked.

1. FOURTH-YEAR REVIEW

Beginning in the spring of the third year after a probationary tenure track faculty member is appointed, and continuing through the fourth year, each probationary tenure track faculty member goes through a mandatory fourth year review.

The purpose of the fourth year review is to provide a systematic mechanism through which the faculty member becomes aware of the department and college assessment of the quality and impact of his/her research, teaching, and service activities. This process is both developmental and evaluative in nature. Those whose record is likely to be inadequate for promotion and tenure in a timely manner should become aware of how their record falls short of these standards, and what needs to be done to address these limitations. In some circumstances, a fourth year review can lead to a decision to not extend the probationary appointment of the faculty member being reviewed. The fourth year review also gives faculty experience in the procedures used in the promotion and tenure review.

Regular tenure track faculty members undergoing fourth year review and mandatory promotion and tenure review are required to use OSU:Pro to generate their core dossier. (See https://pro.osu.edu).

The departmental faculty conduct the review of the candidate. The department chair attends the meeting. The review follows the same general procedures as outlined for mandatory tenure review with the exception that external evaluations are not part of the fourth year review process. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty members vote by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment. A quorum for conducting this type of vote is two-thirds of the eligible faculty members who are not on leave during autumn quarter.

a) For fourth year reviews, faculty voting options are:

i. re-appoint (the candidate’s record is currently evolving in ways worthy of reappointment) or
ii. terminate the appointment (the candidate’s record is currently evolving in ways that are inconsistent with promotion and tenure in an appropriate timeframe and it is very unlikely that weaknesses in this record can be addressed in a timely manner).

b) For faculty that vote to re-appoint a person going through a fourth year review, a specific evaluation of their progress towards promotion and tenure is also indicated on the ballot, using the following options:

i. on track for promotion and tenure (the candidate’s record is currently evolving in ways that are consistent with promotion and tenure in an appropriate timeframe);

ii. on track for promotion and tenure, with reservations (aspects of the candidate’s record are currently evolving in ways that are consistent with promotion and tenure in an appropriate timeframe, although there are some weaknesses in the record that will need to be addressed);

iii. off track for promotion and tenure (the candidate’s record is currently evolving in ways that are inconsistent with promotion and tenure in an appropriate timeframe, although it may be possible to address the weaknesses in this record in a timely manner).

A simple majority of “re-appoint” votes is necessary for the vote to be considered positive. Abstentions are not votes. Absentee voting is not permitted. A majority vote in favor of re-appointing a faculty member does not in any way imply that a faculty member either will, or will not, be promoted and tenured in an appropriate timeframe.

The department chair receives the ballots, records the vote, and receives a written assessment of the case from the departmental faculty. The department chair conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment and a statement as to the chair’s assessment of the faculty member’s progress toward promotion and tenure.

At the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review (beginning with the College Personnel Committee), regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal. In accordance with OAA guidelines, the decision of the dean is final in the case of fourth year reviews. Fourth year review dossiers are not submitted to OAA. Positive reviews do not need to be reported to OAA but non-renewal decisions are communicated via the “Report of Non-Renewal of Probationary Appointment of Regular Faculty” along with a copy of the non-renewal letter to the faculty member.

2. EXCLUSION OF TIME FROM THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD

Probationary tenure track faculty members may exclude up to a maximum of three years from their probationary period per the conditions and guidelines outlined in Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D). The Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook contains additional information on this topic.
B. TENURED FACULTY

Tenured faculty members are reviewed annually through the process described in Section V. (below). In addition, tenured full-time faculty members periodically receive a peer assessment of instructional effectiveness. In the annual review process the department chair meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review which will be included along with the chair’s evaluation in the faculty member’s personnel file.

C. REGULAR CLINICAL TRACK FACULTY

The annual review process for regular clinical track probationary and non probationary faculty is identical to that for tenure track probationary and tenured faculty respectively.

In the penultimate contract year of a regular clinical faculty member's appointment the department chair and the dean, upon consideration of the recommendation of the regular faculty, determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 are observed.

Positive recommendations by the TIU chair and college dean regarding reappointment are forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs for submission to the Board of Trustees for confirmation. Negative decisions are at the discretion of the dean and no report to OAA is required.

V. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS

A. CRITERIA

Fisher College seeks to support accomplishment of the college's mission by: (1) motivating and rewarding excellence in scholarly performance; (2) providing rewards to faculty making major contributions to priority areas of the college; and by (3) responding to market forces in order to retain high performing faculty.

Consistent with these goals, individual faculty member performance is evaluated in each of three areas -- scholarship, priority program contribution, and market equity. The college establishes distinct pools of annual increase funds for these three areas, distributing from each according to faculty performance. On occasion, one-time cash payments or other rewards, such as extra travel funds, are made to recognize contributions that warrant reward but do not justify permanent salary increases. Such rewards are considered at the time of annual salary recommendations.

1. SCHOLARLY PERFORMANCE

Scholarly performance in teaching, research, and service is judged according to department and college mission, with consideration given to a faculty member's specific balance of responsibilities. Performance is assessed annually, the time frame for assessing performance being primarily the past 36 months, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining
productivity. Faculty members with high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth are necessarily favored. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

Assessment of scholarly performance focuses on accomplishment and impact rather than activity. Performance norms are those judged appropriate and consistent with department and college aspirations and performance at high quality business schools of similar mission.

2. CONTRIBUTION TO PRIORITIES

To further development of the college, faculty must give attention to specific priority areas. These priorities generally are specific needs related to the academic programs of the college. While the priority areas will likely be fairly stable, some change over time is possible. Performance in academic programs or college initiatives not designated as priorities is assessed as part of scholarly performance. Performance over the preceding three years is evaluated. Performance norms are those judged appropriate and consistent with department and college aspirations and performance at high quality business schools of similar mission.

3. MARKET EQUITY

Competitive market conditions mandate that the college compensate its faculty at levels approximating what the individual could command at competitor institutions. In assessing market value the college pays particular attention to a faculty member’s criticality to the accomplishment of the college’s mission and to the individual’s vulnerability to the external market. Primary to determination of appropriate market rates is consideration of indicators of external market value. Examples of such indicators include: (a) high impact research programs; (b) interviews at other highly regarded schools; (c) offers to visit other schools; (d) seminars given at highly regarded schools; (e) frequent service as an evaluator of candidates for promotion at high quality schools; and (f) leadership positions in academic associations; and (g) editorships of major academic journals.

B. PROCEDURES

In terms of the division of salary adjustment funds across the three areas identified by this policy, scholarly performance will typically constitute no less than fifty percent of the salary adjustment pool while funds to address market equity will typically constitute no more than thirty-three percent of the salary adjustment pool. While adjustment in these percentages may be necessary, deviation from these general principles will be the exception.

1. SCHOLARLY PERFORMANCE

The filing of an annual report using the format mandated by the college is required of each faculty member. The information provided on the report is used to assess the faculty member’s scholarly performance, comprised of teaching, research, and service components. The department chair receives input from program chairs in evaluating teaching performance in an annual meeting held between the department chair, the program/priority chairs and the
senior associate dean. Unresolved differences between department and program chairs are handled by the senior associate dean.

The outcome of this process is categorization of each faculty member's scholarly performance as "substantially beyond the norm," "beyond the norm," "meeting the norm," or "below the norm." In each review cycle, the department chair is responsible for documenting and justifying the decisions reached, with college-wide consistency addressed through cross departmental review by the deans and the department chairs.

Faculty members in a given category are treated identically in terms of recommended salary percentage increases on this dimension. In the case of faculty members with actual salaries greater than assessed market value, any earned increase may be given as a one-time payment rather than as an increment in base salary.

2. CONTRIBUTIONS TO PRIORITIES

Chairs of priority program areas use the annual faculty report to evaluate individuals' contributions to their respective priority areas over the three year period under evaluation, and meet as a group to coordinate their assessments. Assessments are shared with the department chair during an annual meeting of program/priority chairs, the department chair, and the senior associate dean. The outcome is categorization of each faculty member's contributions as "substantially beyond the norm," "beyond the norm," "meeting the norm" or "not applicable." Unresolved differences are handled by the senior associate dean.

Faculty in a given performance category are treated identically in terms of recommended salary percentage increases on this dimension. In the case of faculty members with actual salaries greater than assessed market value, any earned increase may be given as a one-time payment rather than as an increment in base salary.

3. MARKET EQUITY

Big Ten/AACSB data are used to examine discipline and rank specific academic year salary norms. The department chair assesses each faculty member's relevant salary norm based on the indicators listed earlier. As a general rule, absent strong external market indicators (see indicators listed earlier), a median rating (50th percentile) is viewed as the maximum for faculty who have not maintained active research portfolios. Valuations above the 75th percentile level are relatively rare, requiring sustained high performance (e.g. a strong, consistent publication record in top journals) and significant evidence of outside market value.

The department chair communicates market assessments to the deans. The department chair also provides an assessment of faculty members' perceived market vulnerability and criticality to college mission. This information is used to establish priorities to be addressed through market equity funds. This judgment is the joint determination of the deans and the department chairs, with input as needed from program chairs.
Department chairs meet as a group with the dean and associate deans during the final stage of performance review process. This final college level review of faculty performance seeks to assure that performance is evaluated according to appropriate norms across the entire college faculty.

C. DOCUMENTATION

The primary evidence for determining appropriate salary adjustments is the annual report of activities required of each faculty member and an updated CV. The annual report documents the faculty member's performance and achievements in pursuit of excellence in teaching, research, and service and is assessed from the perspective of contribution to the stated mission of the department and Fisher College.

The required documentation (annual report and updated vita) must be delivered to the department office by the due date established annually by the college. Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation for an annual review at the required time will receive no salary increase in the year for which documentation was not provided, except in extenuating circumstances, and may not expect to recoup the foregone raise at a later time.

D. APPEALS

Appeals pertaining to performance and compensation decisions are addressed to the college Faculty Appeals and Investigations Committee. This committee investigates appeals within the framework of the college's compensation policy, making its report and recommendations to the dean.

VI. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW

A. CRITERIA

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the university enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, 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 accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

Teaching is defined as any activity that leads to the application of knowledge to practical problems, the education of students, and the development of teaching and other instructional materials or methodologies. The results of teaching can appear in a variety of forms, including classroom
teaching, one-on-one teaching, publishing text books, articles in refereed and non-refereed journals on teaching, cases, instructional software and videos, contributions to teaching seminars and workshops, publications in practice-oriented journals, and so forth.

**Research** is defined as activity leading to the production of new knowledge, new insights, creative synthesis of existing knowledge, and new methods. The results of research will most often appear as articles in peer-reviewed research journals. In some cases, they may appear as articles in non peer-reviewed research journals, chapters in books, as books, and occasionally in practice-oriented journals. Research activities can also be indicated by the editorship of important research journals, presentations at academic meetings, contributions to research seminars and workshops, and service on editorial boards of important research journals.

**Service** is defined as activities other than those defined as research or teaching that help maintain or improve the operations of a department, a program, the college as a whole, the university, and/or the profession. Service also includes meaningful and mutually beneficial collaborations with partners outside the academic community. Examples of service include, but are not limited to: attending departmental and college faculty meetings; advising students; contributing to student welfare through service on student-faculty committees; serving as an advisor to student organizations; involvement in the promotion and review process of faculty in the department or college; reviewing manuscripts submitted to journals and academic meetings; serving as an appointed or elected head of any academic group at the departmental, college, university level; serving as a leader or member of task forces or committees at the departmental, college, or university level; and departmental, program; college leadership roles; and serving on high profile community and government committees, task forces, and commissions; and service as an elected or appointed officer of academic or other professional organizations.

Faculty members at all ranks are expected to demonstrate professional collegiality as part of their service obligation. Collegiality includes, but is not limited to participating in meaningful and positive ways in the activities of the college and university, interacting with others in respectful ways, supporting the intellectual and professional development of colleagues, acting with integrity, and so forth.

Accepting service roles in a department, the college, or the university is a necessary but not sufficient condition for being judged to have demonstrated a rank-appropriate level of service. In addition, faculty members must be judged to have made appropriate contributions through their service activities. In general, making significant contributions in a few service roles will be valued more highly than making minor contributions in a large number of service roles.

**1. PROMOTION TO RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE**

The award of tenure is a commitment of lifetime employment. It is therefore essential to evaluate and judge the probability that faculty members, once tenured, will continue to develop professionally and contribute to the department's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university.

Every candidate is held to high standards in all aspects of performance. Accepting weakness in any aspect of performance in making a tenure decision is tantamount to deliberately
handicapping the ability of the department and college to perform and progress academically. A high standard of performance includes ethical professional conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics, [http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/issues/ethics/](http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/issues/ethics/).

Successful candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure must demonstrate that they have attained “potential for excellence” in research, and “achievement” in teaching. In addition, candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure must demonstrate “rank-appropriate service.” These attainment levels are described in greater detail below.

**a) Potential for Excellence in Research:** Faculty members are judged to demonstrate the potential for excellence in research when they are engaging in the kind of activities that can reasonably be expected to lead to excellence in research at an appropriately defined time in the future. To this end, for promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

i. published a body of work in high-quality peer-reviewed venues that is thematically focused, contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and is being favorably cited or otherwise showing evidence of influence on the work of others. Among the attributes of the work that are considered:

- quality and quantity; the rigor of the peer-review process and degree of dissemination of publication venues. Archival journal publications are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published research more than unpublished research, and original works more than edited works;

- impact and unique contribution to a line of inquiry;

ii. a developing national/international reputation in the candidate's field as evidenced by external evaluations, invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals, and a trend of positive citations in other researchers' publications;

iii. demonstrated a high degree of ethics in the conduct of research including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program and ethical treatment of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators.

Impact is the critical determinant of whether a candidate has attained the standard for promotion and tenure. The quality or ranking of the journal or other outlet in which the research is published is only one indicator of impact, although the expectation for promotion to associate professor is that the successful candidate’s work generally will appear in the top journals recognized by the individual’s academic department.

**b) Achievement in Teaching** - A faculty member is judged to have demonstrated achievement in teaching when he/she demonstrates consistently good classroom teaching and appropriately contributes to department/college teaching programs through engagement in curriculum development, participation on program policy and/or ad hoc committees,
involvement in student recruiting and student placement, and so forth. Indicators of good classroom teaching include:

i. good student evaluations relative to the appropriate comparison set;

ii. up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation;

iii. demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge;

iv. creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment;

v. appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process;

vi. treating students with respect and courtesy;

vii. improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and academic programs;

viii. service as an advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the department’s graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member’s area(s) of expertise.

c) Rank-Appropriate Service for Promotion to Associate Professor. Assistant professors should focus their internal service efforts on attending departmental and college faculty meetings; contributing to student welfare through service on student-faculty committees when assigned; membership on departmental committees and task forces and; occasionally, membership on college committees and task forces. Assistant professors should focus their external service efforts on activities that will facilitate their scholarly work, e.g. serving as a reviewer for high quality journals or academic association national or international conferences. As is true with faculty members of other ranks, assistant professors are expected to demonstrate professional collegiality as part of their service obligation. Indicators of collegiality include appropriate interaction with students, staff and faculty members in both verbal and written communications; attending, participating in and showing respect for others in departmental meetings and research seminars; and engaging appropriately with organizations and groups outside the college and in so doing contributing positively to the reputation of the college and university.

2. PROMOTION TO RANK OF PROFESSOR

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 establishes the following general criteria for promotion to the rank of professor:

Promotion to the rank of professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in teaching; has produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated leadership in service.
For promotion to professor, a faculty member is expected to be a role model for other faculty members, for students, and for the profession. Recognizing that there are a variety of ways through which senior faculty members can make lasting contributions, successful candidates for promotion to professor with tenure in the Fisher College of Business may follow one of two paths. For promotion to professor, candidates must demonstrate either:

Path #1) Excellence in research over the length of their career. Whereas the granting of tenure is based on potential for excellence, candidates for professor must demonstrate a substantial impact nationally and internationally on scholarship in their chosen field, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and increasing quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of an established national and international reputation in the field. In addition, candidates must also present a record of sustained achievement in teaching and rank appropriate service.

OR

Path #2) Excellence in teaching and service/outreach while also maintaining a sustained level of achievement in research. This path to promotion recognizes faculty who demonstrate sustained achievement in research and demonstrate critical contributions to Fisher College through sustained high quality teaching accomplishments and through a sustained record of impactful leadership in service activities, making a meaningful difference for the college and university. Given the nature of such promotions (i.e., contributions which tend to be more internal to the college and the university), a well established historical record of teaching and service contributions is particularly critical. It is anticipated that promotions through this path will be relatively infrequent relative to promotions under path 1.

Greater detail on these two paths follows below.

a) Path #1 - This primary path to promotion to professor with tenure requires demonstrated excellence in research, sustained achievement in teaching, and rank-appropriate service. Being the dominant path through which promotion to full professor is achieved its standards and criteria are described first:

i. Excellence in research - Publishing research articles in leading research journals is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for demonstrating excellence in research. Excellence in research is judged in terms of the importance and impact of the faculty member’s contributions. Publishing numerous papers, even in leading journals, does not, by itself, indicate that a person has demonstrated excellence in research in a field. Nor does writing several books indicate that a faculty member has reached this status. Only if these contributions have had a significant impact in a field can they be taken as indicators of excellence in research in that field. In judging the excellence of research activities, faculty need to ask themselves whether or not research in a person’s field would be significantly different if this person’s research activities had not occurred.

To be judged as demonstrating excellence in research, a faculty member must show that their work has had a significant impact on research in a field and that he or she has
established a national or international reputation in the field. Some indicators of significant impact in research include if this work:

- has successfully addressed fundamental questions in a field;
- has identified important new questions in a field;
- has helped shape the direction of research in a field;
- is known and respected by numerous leading scholars in a field, and it has influenced their thinking;
- is known and respected by leading scholars in other fields of work;
- has had a significant impact on management practice in a field.

ii. Sustained achievement in teaching - A faculty member is judged to have demonstrated sustained achievement in teaching when he/she demonstrates consistently good classroom teaching and appropriately contributes to the department/college teaching program through quality engagement in curriculum development, participation on program policy and/or ad hoc committees, involvement in student recruitment and placement, and so forth. Sustained achievement in teaching involves:

- consistently good or better student evaluations;
- up-to-date course content;
- a demonstrated ability to organize and present class material effectively;
- creativity in the use of various modes of instruction;
- engaged and respectful interaction with students across degree programs,
- appropriate and timely feedback to students;
- engagement in curriculum development;
- providing meaningful advisement services to students;
- documentable efforts to sustain and improve performance in teaching.

iii. Rank-appropriate service for promotion to professor - Senior faculty members engage in the full range of service activities including: attending departmental and college faculty meetings; advising students at all levels; contributing to student welfare through service on student-faculty committees; serving as an advisor to student organizations; involvement in the promotion and tenure review process of faculty in their department; membership and leadership on departmental committees and task forces; membership on college and university committees and task forces; and leadership on college and university committees and in specified faculty leadership roles. Senior faculty members are expected to demonstrate professional collegiality as part of their service. Indicators of collegiality include appropriately interacting with students, staff and faculty members in both verbal and written communications and engaging appropriately with organizations and groups outside the college, thereby contributing positively to the reputation of the college and university.

b) Path #2 - This path to promotion to full professor involves sustained achievement in research and a sustained long-term record of excellence in teaching and service. Its standards and criteria are further described below. This approach is not accessible through self
nomination; it is initiated through nomination by an academic department of the college (see section VI.B.3.a below for further information).

i. Excellence in teaching and service - Consistently good classroom teaching and consistently good senior faculty level service are necessary, but not sufficient, conditions for demonstrating excellence in this category. To be judged to demonstrate excellence in this category, the faculty member's work must show a sustained significant impact on the teaching and service accomplishments of the department and college analogous to the level of impact that is demonstrated by an individual who is judged to be excellent in research. Excellence is judged in terms of the importance and impact of contributions. Teaching numerous classes effectively does not necessarily indicate that a person has demonstrated excellence, nor does chairing multiple college committees, leading a professional organization, engaging in a great deal of one-on-one teaching, publishing textbooks, or receiving teaching awards. Only if a person's activities have had significant and lasting impact can they be possible indicators of excellence.

Faculty members will be required to document excellence in teaching and service. Evidence can include, but is not limited to:

• evidence that the teaching or service activity has had significant impact on other scholars and programs;

• evidence that the teaching or service activity made a significant contribution to courses, programs, or management practice;

• evidence that the teaching or service activity contribution was of broad in scope and impact;

• evidence that the teaching or service activity has significantly enhanced diversity efforts and accomplishments;

• evidence that the teaching or service activity has served the professional academic community in notable and remarkable ways such as leading to extraordinary accomplishment.

Documentation of a case for excellence in teaching and service should include, but not be limited to, evidence that the various accomplishments have made a real difference in academic programs and their standing; published books, articles, resource guides, programmatic materials and other documents which can be evaluated for quality and impact; and letters from professional colleagues, community members, executives and others who have been impacted by the contribution and who are in a position to judge its quality and impact.

ii. Sustained Achievement in Research - A faculty member is judged to have demonstrated sustained achievement in research when he/she demonstrates continued engagement in research activities such as authoring and co-authoring of research oriented publications, active participation in research seminars and research oriented academic
conferences, significant involvement in sponsored research, service on journal editorial boards, active engagement in facilitating the research work of Ph.D. students, and peer reviewing of manuscripts and promotion and tenure cases. Assessment of impact is the critical determinant on which sustained achievement should be judged. In the case of published work, the quality or ranking of the journal or other outlet in which the research is published is only one indicator of impact.

Faculty members will be required to submit copies of articles, books and other research documents, and a summary of their research activities indicating that they have maintained sustained achievement in research. Similar to research standards for other promotions, candidates must present evidence of both research activity and impact. As in other promotion reviews, letters from external evaluators will be solicited to evaluate the candidate’s research record and impact.

3. REGULAR CLINICAL TRACK FACULTY

For promotion to clinical associate professor a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and as a provider of effective student services; must have a documented high level of competence in professional practice; and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the department and college mission. Specific criteria in teaching and service/outreach for promotion to clinical associate professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Research activity is not expected.

For promotion to clinical professor a faculty member must have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching and professional practice; leadership in service to the department, college and profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice.

Given the mission they serve, high quality performance in classroom teaching is expected of all clinical faculty. However, by itself, exceptional classroom teaching is not sufficient for promotion through the clinical track ranks. Additional indicators of significant achievement in instruction and instructional support activities relevant to promotion decisions include:

a) highly visible and successful leadership in multiple teaching activities in the college;

b) developing important new approaches to teaching;

c) adopting teaching innovations developed elsewhere and successfully implementing these innovations at Fisher;

d) developing or leading development of integrated offerings/curriculum that contributes to Fisher being nationally recognized among the best in the world;

e) being nationally or internationally known at benchmark and better institutions for shaping the direction of teaching;

f) receiving national or international awards and recognitions for contributions to teaching or education;

g) conducting high-profile “train-the-trainer” programs that attract external faculty to the college;
h) developing teaching programs and materials that serve as a major draw for new students and companies coming to Fisher;
i) developing long-term working relationships with highly visible companies, trade and professional associations, and other related organizations;
j) working to significantly enhance and support diversity in the college;
k) successful leadership of academic programs that enhance the reputation of the college.

Achieving a record worthy of consideration for promotion does not rest on documenting activities consistent with a fixed number of items from this list, nor is this list to be viewed as all inclusive. Final determination of whether a promotion standard has been reached rests with the evaluative bodies involved in promotion and annual review processes and is a matter of individual and collective professional judgment.

B. PROCEDURES

The college's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are intended to be consistent with those set forth in rule 3335-6-04 of the University Faculty Rules and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook. Information on accessing these documents is found in Appendix B of this document.

As set forth in University Faculty Rules, candidates for promotion and tenure or for promotion are reviewed at four levels: the eligible faculty in the candidate’s tenure initiating unit (TIU), the chair of the candidate’s TIU, the dean of the college, and the executive vice president and provost of the university. The dean of the college has a standing faculty promotion and tenure committee which is advisory to the dean. In Fisher College this committee is the College Personnel Committee (CPC).

1. CANDIDATE RESPONSIBILITIES

a) Complete the required dossier. Candidates are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist (highlighting in this document indicates updated information).

While all components of the dossier are important, candidates are counseled to pay particular attention to the research statement in their dossier. The research statement should be forward looking and provide those involved in the review process with a vision as to the nature and importance of the candidate’s research, its trajectory and where it is likely to head in the future. A core purpose of the document, particularly in the case of promotion and tenure reviews, is to convey to those reviewing the case a sense of why the topics, the results to date, and that which will occur in the future warrant the sizeable institutional investment that promotion and tenure entails.

Candidates are required to complete the core dossier using the university’s OSU:Pro program. Dossier requirements are outlined in Appendix C.
b) Define the field of work. The candidate must define his/her field of work for his/her activities and accomplishments are assessed within that context. The college currently recognizes thirteen fields of work: Accounting, Business Law, Decision Sciences, Entrepreneurship, Finance, Human Resources, International Business, Logistics, Management Information Systems, Marketing, Operations Management, Organizational Behavior, and Strategy. The college recognizes that this list may not fully describe all the fields of work that are relevant in the study of the theory and practice of business. For example, newly developed fields of work and inter-disciplinary fields of work may not be included in this list. With this in mind, candidates can choose to define their own field of work (within the guidelines provided below). The candidate’s statement and the department’s action with regard to the proposed field of work should be communicated to the Dean no later than when the department chair conveys the list of suggested letter writers to the Dean for approval.

Self-defined fields of work must meet the same quality standards as each of the twelve fields of work currently recognized by the college: they must be broad-based, widely recognized, and they cannot be a sub-field of any one of the twelve fields currently recognized by the college. To be used in a review process, three-fourths of the eligible faculty members in a department must agree that a faculty member’s self-defined field of work meets the defined standard. The determination must be made prior to the beginning of the review process, and prior to the seeking of external letters (in reviews for which such letters are required).

If a faculty member’s self-defined field of work does not meet these criteria it cannot be used as the basis of evaluation and a faculty member must choose from among the twelve fields of work currently recognized by the college.

c) Select external evaluators. In reviews requiring external evaluations, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators (generally around 12 in number) developed by the department faculty. The candidate may add up to three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names. The department chair decides whether removal is justified. No more than one-half of the external evaluations may be from evaluators selected by the candidate.

d) Be aware of the opportunity to review and respond to the departmental promotion and tenure review report and/or the department chair’s recommendation letter within the ten day period set aside for this purpose. The university provides forms for such comments and also provides forms for a candidate to decline comment. It is required that whichever form is appropriate be completed for each review level and included in the dossier materials submitted to OAA.

2. DEPARTMENT CHAIR RESPONSIBILITIES

a) Verify the prospective candidate’s residency status. Faculty members who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure will not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency will not be considered for promotion.
b) Assure that the department’s promotion and tenure voting eligible faculty members meet and vote on whether it is appropriate for faculty members seeking non-mandatory review to proceed. In order for any non-mandatory review to proceed, a majority of those eligible to vote on the request must vote affirmatively. Voting on whether a non-mandatory review moves forward should not be viewed as holding any inference as to the final disposition of the review. The promotion and tenure voting eligible faculty may not deny a tenured faculty member a formal review for promotion more than three consecutive years.

c) Work with the assigned CPC representative to assist and guide the candidate in preparing a complete case for promotion.

d) Remove any member of the department faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review. A conflict of interest exists when an otherwise voting eligible faculty member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some way on the candidate’s services, has a close professional relationship with the candidate (dissertation advisor) or has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an objective review of the candidate’s work is not possible. Generally, faculty members who have collaborated with a candidate on at least 50% of the candidate’s published work since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of that candidate.

e) Assemble, in the case of an external hire involving the granting of tenure, the required information and provide a written explanation of how an external candidate’s record meets Fisher’s promotion and tenure criteria. This information must be provided before a formal vote is taken in the departmental promotion and tenure review meeting.

f) A number of department chair responsibilities have specific deadlines as to when these must be accomplished:

i. Late Spring

b) Work with the candidate and all appropriate parties to assemble the required elements of a complete and effective promotion dossier.

c) Solicit external evaluations from outside experts suggested by the department promotion and tenure voting-eligible faculty members and the candidate. (See section VI.B.6)

ii. Summer through early autumn:

• Provide candidates with advice and counsel. Along with the designated D-POD, the chair of the department serves as an advisor to the candidate on the development of the core dossier, reviews the candidate’s dossier for completeness, accuracy, and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and works with the candidate to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
iii. Autumn Quarter

- Determine, along with the assigned CPC representative and the D-POD, that the dossier is complete and effective.

- See that copies of the complete dossier and all other appropriate documents are copied and distributed to all appropriate parties at least one week in advance of the department’s promotion and tenure meeting in which the case will be discussed.

- Provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate upon receipt of the voting faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation. This letter, addressed to the dean, provides the department chair’s evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the record of the candidate being reviewed for promotion and tenure or promotion. The letter concludes by recommending whether or not the faculty member being reviewed should be promoted and tenured or promoted. The department chair uses the same voting categories used by the faculty in the departmental promotion and tenure review meeting. The chair may or may not respond to issues and concerns raised in the departmental promotion and tenure review meeting and report. This letter is completed by the established deadline. A copy of this letter is given to all eligible faculty in the department.

- Provide the person being reviewed a copy of both the finalized departmental promotion and tenure review report and a copy of the department chair’s recommendation letter by the established deadline.

- Meet with the department promotion and tenure voting eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to its recommendation.

- Inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments. The candidate’s response is attached to the departmental promotion and tenure review report and department chair’s recommendation letter, and a copy is placed in the personnel file of the person being reviewed.

- Provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier. The department chair and/or the author of the departmental promotion and tenure review report may write a reply to a faculty member’s response and is encouraged to do so if procedural problems that might reasonably have affected the outcome of a review are alleged. This response will also be attached to the departmental promotion and tenure review report and department chair’s recommendation letter and included in the personnel file of a faculty member being reviewed. Only one round of the comments process relative to the departmental level review is permitted.
• Forward the completed dossier to the college office by the established deadline, except in the case of auxiliary faculty for whom the department chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases.

3. DEPARTMENT FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES

In Fisher College, eligibility for voting on the tenure and/or promotion of tenure-track faculty is defined as all tenured department faculty members of higher rank than the candidate. The eligible voting faculty pertinent to making recommendation on the re-appointment, contract renewal, and promotion of regular clinical-track faculty consists of all tenured faculty members and non-probationary regular clinical-track faculty members of higher rank than the candidate.

By university faculty rule the department chair, associate deans, college dean, vice provosts, provost, and president may not be members of a department's promotion and tenure voting eligible faculty. The department chair may attend and manage meetings at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and may respond to questions, but may not vote.

The responsibilities of the department promotion and tenure voting eligible faculty members under the leadership of the department chair are as follows:

a) Each spring, consider requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. In this same setting the promotion voting eligible faculty members discuss whether any faculty member in the department should be considered for possible promotion under “Path 2” criteria. A majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed. Similarly a majority of those eligible to vote must vote affirmatively for a “Path 2” review to proceed. In the case of a vote favoring full consideration of a “Path 2” promotion case, the department chair must gain the buy-in and permission of the would-be candidate before the process can proceed.

i. In the case of a non-mandatory review request by an assistant professor for promotion to the rank of associate professor or a path 1 non-mandatory review request, the committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and the required documentation for a full review. Lack of the required documentation is sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.

ii. A tenured faculty member who requests and is denied a promotion review for three consecutive years must be granted the review in the fourth year per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04. If the three denials are based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the fourth year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.

iii. Consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policy, only faculty members who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non-mandatory tenure review. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or
permanent residency are not to be considered for promotion.

iv. A decision to permit a review in no way commits faculty members, the department chair, or any other party to make a positive recommendation during the review itself.

Many responsibilities of the department promotion and tenure voting eligible faculty have specific deadlines as to when they must take place:

b) Spring:

i. Select from among its members a department Procedures Oversight Designee (D-POD) by April 1. A detailed description of the role of the D-POD is found in Appendix D of this document.

ii. Suggest names of appropriate external evaluators to the department chair (See Section VI.B.6).

c) Autumn

i. Hold a promotion and tenure meeting no later than the fourth week of the fall term. Under the direction of the department chair, the promotion and tenure voting eligible faculty undertake the review and analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, research and service consistent with the standards set forth in this document. Prior to the promotion and tenure meeting the department chair, the D-POD, and the assigned CPC representative review the dossier to ensure that it meets all requirements and is ready for distribution to all eligible faculty. Copies of the verified promotion and tenure review documents and copies of all external review letters received are distributed to all eligible faculty members in the department in sufficient time to prepare for the meeting (normally no later than one week prior to each promotion and tenure review meeting in the department).

Each eligible faculty member in the department is expected to read and evaluate the contents of all documents. The department chair coordinates with the faculty in scheduling a meeting for the eligible faculty members to discuss the record of the person being reviewed, making every effort to schedule it at a time when all eligible faculty members can be present (but no later than the last day of the 4th week of fall term). The person being reviewed does not attend this meeting.

The first agenda item in this meeting, which is run by the department chair, is the election of one of the eligible faculty members present (other than the D-POD or the department chair) to author the departmental P&T review report. If more than one person is being reviewed, a different eligible faculty member present can be elected to author each separate departmental P&T review report.

The role of the author of the departmental promotion and tenure review report, in addition to participating in the discussion as a member of the faculty, is to take careful notes of the discussion in order to write the departmental P&T review report. This individual will also
most generally represent the department in presenting the case to the CPC (see below). The role of the departmental D-POD is to assure that the department’s process follows departmental, college, and university guidelines and is fair and unbiased. If the D-POD observes any significant deviations from these guidelines, he/she submits a report to the department chair and to the dean.

The promotion and tenure voting eligible faculty should evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the record of the person(s) being evaluated. Discussion should be open and frank and focus on whether or not a candidate’s research, teaching, and service activities meet the criteria for promotion and tenure described in this document. The department chair should not make substantive contributions to this discussion given that he/she has an independent opportunity to state views in the department chair’s written evaluation and recommendation to the dean which accompanies the faculty’s evaluation and recommendation document. Among other matters the faculty should discuss each of the individual papers sent to the reviewers. The department discussion of the candidate’s research should not be limited to referencing the letter writers’ opinions about the papers. The discussion should be an independent assessment of those papers by the promotion and tenure voting eligible faculty. Similarly, the evaluation of teaching should not be limited to only SEI’s, but also include other dimensions listed in the AP&T document.

After all faculty members at the departmental promotion and tenure review meeting (including the assigned CPC representative) feel satisfied that both the strengths and weaknesses of a person’s record have been thoroughly discussed and evaluated, a formal vote is taken. The official outcome of the vote is that determined by simple majority rules. This vote must use the appropriate ballot presented in Appendix E of this document.

ii. Produce a departmental promotion and tenure review report: Upon completion of its deliberations, a departmental promotion and tenure review report is authored and, along with the completed ballots, is forwarded to the department chair. The departmental promotion and tenure review report summarizes the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s record, providing an in-depth analysis of the case as discussed in the departmental promotion and tenure review meeting. This report also describes the outcome of the vote of the eligible faculty members taken at this meeting.

An initial draft of the report is completed by the faculty member assigned that task in the department P&T meeting. The draft report is distributed by its author to all eligible faculty members in the department no more than one week after the conclusion of the departmental promotion and tenure review meeting. The department chair also receives a copy. All promotion and tenure voting eligible faculty members that attended the department promotion and tenure review meeting where a case was discussed can suggest revisions to the report draft and have one week to do so. The department chair does not suggest substantive revisions to the department promotion and tenure review report draft. Any disagreements about the content of the report must be resolved, with the aid of the department chair if necessary, no later than one week after the report draft is first distributed to the eligible faculty who attended the departmental promotion and tenure review meeting. Once the department promotion and tenure review report is finalized, its
author distributes it to all eligible faculty in the department and to the department chair by the established deadline.

Eligible faculty members who were unable to attend the departmental promotion and tenure review meeting are not allowed to make comments on the departmental promotion and tenure review report draft because they were not part of the discussion at the meeting (although they do receive copies of both the departmental promotion and tenure review report drafts and their revisions). In order to be able to vote on a case, an eligible faculty member must attend the departmental promotion and tenure review meeting where that case was discussed (i.e., no voting by proxy). Since the departmental promotion and tenure review report discusses both the strengths and weaknesses of a candidate’s record, no additional reports from members of the department are necessary, and none will be accepted in subsequent stages of the review process.

iii. Provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier. The author of the departmental promotion and tenure review report may write a reply to a faculty member’s response and is encouraged to do so if procedural problems that might reasonably have affected the outcome of a review are alleged. This response will also be attached to the departmental promotion and tenure review report and department chair’s recommendation letter and included in the personnel file of a faculty member being reviewed.

iv. Present the case to the College Personnel Committee. A senior faculty member from the department (typically the author of the department’s P&T review report) presents the case to the CPC at the beginning of its deliberations. The department representative summarizes the strengths and weaknesses of the case as seen through the eyes of the department faculty and responds to any CPC questions regarding norms in the particular field/discipline.

4. COLLEGE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (CPC) RESPONSIBILITIES

a) Elect a chair in its first meeting of the year. In this same meeting, one CPC member is assigned to each candidate’s case to act as CPC representative for that case.

b) Serve as the CPC representative on assigned cases.

For each fourth year review, tenure review, promotion review, and any external hire at a tenured rank, a member of the CPC is designated as the CPC representative for the case. The roles of the CPC representative are:

i. To work with the candidate and the department chair to provide guidance to the candidate regarding the documentation and presentation of the case. To perform this role, the CPC representative will meet with the candidate, the department chair, and the chair of the department P&T committee as necessary to assure that the candidate understands the process and that the process is followed;
ii. To monitor the progress of the case to assure compliance with the procedures described in this document;

iii. To ensure that the department’s discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s record (comprised of all three elements—research; teaching; service is open, frank, and complete and focuses on a determination of impact. In this effort the CPC representative’s role is not to participate in the substance of the discussion but to observe and encourage a complete discussion. This includes posing process questions to the department faculty to ensure that the department has addressed how the candidate has or has not met the criteria associated with the rank sought by the candidate as outlined in the A, P&T document.

iv. To verify that the votes are correctly counted, that process follows departmental, college and university guidelines, and that the meeting is conducted in a fair and unbiased manner.

v. To serve as a resource to the CPC on the case as a result of having been present at the department P&T committee meetings. Any concerns as to the thoroughness or appropriateness of the departmental discussion should previously have been expressed to the department chair. These issues may possibly cause the CPC to invite the department chair and the D-POD to meet with the CPC to discuss the case and to elaborate on the departmental discussion.

The CPC representative attends all meetings in which substantive discussions of the case are held, including the department promotion and tenure review meeting. The CPC representative receives all draft copies of vita and candidate reports and the final copy of the department promotion and tenure review report.

c) Review thoroughly and objectively each candidate's dossier (except those involving a candidate from the CPC member's home department) in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed. The materials to be reviewed consist of the candidate's promotion and tenure review document, letters from external scholars, the departmental promotion and tenure review report, the department chair's recommendation letter, any responses written by the faculty member being reviewed, and any replies written to those responses.

d) Hold candidate review meetings in a timely fashion. For each case to be reviewed, once members of the CPC receive and read the documentation associated with a case, the chair schedules a meeting to discuss the case (the meeting being held no later than the last day of November). The first agenda item in this meeting is the election of one of the CPC members present to author the CPC report and another member of the CPC to serve as the CPC Procedures Oversight Designee (C-POD). If more than one person is being reviewed at a particular meeting, more than one CPC member present can be elected to author separate CPC reports, and different CPC members present can be elected as the C-POD for different cases.

The C-POD ensures that the CPC’s process follows university and college guidelines and is fair and unbiased. If the C-POD observes any significant deviations from these guidelines,
he/she submits a report to the dean of the college. Details of POD responsibilities are presented in Appendix D.

With all of the appropriate documents in hand, consideration of the case at the CPC meeting begins with a representative from the candidate’s department presenting the case to the CPC. The department representative will be a senior faculty member from the department and typically will be the author of the department's P&T review report. The department representative summarizes the strengths and weaknesses of the case as seen through the eyes of the department faculty and responds to any CPC questions regarding norms in the particular field/discipline. Since the CPC representative assigned to the case was also present at the department meeting, that individual also shares impressions based on the department representative’s presentation. The department representative is excused at the end of his/her presentation. The CPC then proceeds with its discussion. The department representative remains available to the CPC through the remainder of its meeting in case further questions arise warranting the representative being re-called to the meeting.

CPC members from the same academic department as the candidate do not attend, vote or otherwise involve themselves in the CPC process.

CPC discussion focuses on the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s research, teaching, and service and outreach activities, and whether these activities meet the criteria for promotion and tenure or promotion described in this document. CPC discussions should be based solely on the documents generated through the promotion and tenure review process and discussion in the meetings described here. The meeting concludes with a formal written vote.

Efforts to influence CPC discussions of individual cases through e-mail, memos, conversations, or other formal or informal means outside the procedures described in this document are considered a serious breach of professional ethics and are considered unacceptable.

e) Participate fully in the discussion of each case in which involved (all cases except those involving a candidate from the CPC member’s home department), having the best interest of the college in mind, and cast his or her vote (which is advisory to the dean) with that perspective in mind. A quorum for the CPC to conduct business is two-thirds of its eligible membership. A simple majority of yes and no votes must be yes for a vote to be considered positive. Abstentions are not votes. Absentee voting is not permitted.

i. Produce a CPC report to the dean on each case. The CPC member elected as the author of the CPC report writes a report shortly after the CPC meeting is adjourned. This report summarizes the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s record as discussed at the CPC meeting and reports the vote of the CPC. Drafts of this report are passed among members of the CPC who were present for the discussion of a particular case for comment. In cases where the CPC feels that it would be helpful to meet with the dean to discuss a case prior to completing its finalized report, such a meeting will take place assuming that the dean is amenable. When such a meeting occurs all reasonable effort will be made to schedule the meeting such that all CPC members can attend. Once the CPC report is finalized, it is included in the dossier materials submitted to the dean by the chair of the
CPC. This report will generally not be longer than ten pages. The CPC report should be completed no later than the last day of the fall quarter.

ii. Review the college’s AP&T document annually and recommend any proposed revisions to the dean and to the college Executive Committee. Any substantive changes must be considered revisions to the A, P&T document and affirmed through established process.

5. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DEAN

All the documents generated through the promotion and tenure review process, including the CPC report, are received by the dean. These documents are all advisory to the dean.

The dean makes a final recommendation concerning the promotion and tenure or promotion of the candidate and forwards this recommendation, in the form of a letter, to the person being reviewed, the author of the departmental promotion and tenure review report, the department chair, the chair and vice-chair of the CPC, the author of the CPC report, and the Office of Academic Affairs (as part of the official dossier by the annually determined deadline).

In accordance with university regulations, candidates have ten days to write a response to the CPC report and the dean’s recommendation letter. This response is forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs and a copy is placed in the faculty member’s file. The author of the CPC report and/or the dean may write a reply to a faculty member’s response to the CPC report and/or the dean’s recommendation letter and are encouraged to do so if procedural problems that might reasonably have affected the outcome of a review are alleged. This response will also be attached to the CPC report and dean’s recommendation letter and included in the personnel file of the faculty member being reviewed.

Upon notification of the final disposition of a case, the dean should inform all college faculty members of the outcome.

6. EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS

External evaluations of research and scholarly activity are obtained for all promotion reviews in which research must be assessed. In the case of candidates for promotion to professor via Path 2, consideration should be given to including those with knowledge of the candidate’s teaching and service accomplishments among the letter writers. This should, however, not be done at the exclusion of external evaluation of research accomplishments. External evaluations of research and scholarly activity are not obtained for faculty members on the regular clinical track unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of research. Any decision to seek external evaluations for a faculty member on the clinical track will be made by the dean after consulting with the candidate and the department chair.

A minimum of five credible evaluations must be obtained. A credible evaluation:

a) Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's research (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former
academic advisor or post doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. Evaluations will normally only be solicited from full professors at highly regarded academic institutions. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.

b) Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory.

Since it is impossible to control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, at least twice as many letters are sought as are required, and they are solicited no later than the end of the spring term prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

As described earlier, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the department promotion and tenure voting eligible faculty, the department chair, and the candidate. Outside reviewers must be senior in rank to the person being evaluated and must be distinguished scholars who are able to evaluate the quality and impact of the faculty member's activities. The faculty member can eliminate up to two names from this list of potential outside reviewers. In addition, the faculty member is invited to augment this list with the names of no more than three leading scholars who meet the criteria for objective, credible evaluators. The finalized list must be approved by the dean's office.

Once the final list of outside evaluators is identified, all of them are contacted by the department chair and asked if they would be willing to serve as an external reviewer for a promotion and tenure case. The request follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format, provided at http://oaa.osu.edu/sampleddocuments.html. Those that agree to serve as an external reviewer receive a cover letter explaining the promotion and tenure criteria and process at the Fisher College of Business (sample letter templates are found in Appendix F of this document) and a copy of sections one, two, three, four, five, and seven of the promotion and tenure review document. Letters to outside reviewers are sent to later than the last day of spring term.

Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 requires that no more than one-half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. The department chair makes every reasonable effort to obtain at least one letter from someone suggested by the faculty member. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor the college requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

Under no circumstances may a candidate or any member of the faculty solicit external evaluations or initiate contact in any way with external evaluators for any purpose related to the promotion review. If an external evaluator should initiate contact with the candidate regarding the review, the candidate must inform the evaluator that such communication is inappropriate and report the occurrence to the department chair and to the dean, who will
decide what, if any, action is warranted. It is in the candidate's self-interest to assure that there is no ethical or procedural lapse, or the appearance of such a lapse, in the course of the review process.

All solicited external evaluation letters that are received must be included in the dossier. Letters must be signed (pdf versions with signature are acceptable). E-mails are not sufficient. If concerns arise about any of the letters received, these concerns may be addressed in the department's written evaluations or brought to the attention of the Office of Academic Affairs for advice.

7. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION OF EXTERNAL CANDIDATES.

a) The criteria described for evaluating internal candidates for promotion and tenure and promotion also apply to external candidates. All external candidates must demonstrate rank-appropriate levels of research, teaching, and service/outreach.

The only significant differences between the evaluation of internal and external candidates has to do with the level of required documentation. External candidates are not required to submit all the syllabi they have used to teach classes, nor are they required to develop a complete dossier in accordance with Ohio State regulations. They and the department chairman are required to submit all other promotion and tenure documentation. This includes:

i. An updated resume;

ii. At least five letters from professionally qualified reviewers;

iii. Examples of research activities;

iv. An explanation of how these research activities meet FCOB promotion and tenure criteria for their prospective rank;

v. Examples of teaching activities including indicators of quality classroom teaching, use of classroom materials by other individuals, textbooks written and adoption information, cases written and adoption information, and any other indicators of teaching accomplishments;

vi. An explanation of how these teaching activities meet FCOB promotion and tenure criteria for their prospective rank;

vii. Examples of service activities and accomplishments.

Department chairs are responsible for assembling the required information and writing explanations about how an external candidate’s record meets Fisher’s promotion and tenure criteria. The promotion and tenure document for external candidates must be prepared before formal votes are taken in the departmental promotion and tenure review meeting.
b) All of the steps and procedures described for evaluating internal candidates apply to external candidates:

i. The appropriate number of outside letters must be obtained from outside evaluators;

ii. There must be a formal departmental promotion and tenure review meeting, with a formal vote on the candidate. A member of the faculty attending this meeting is appointed/elected to prepare a departmental promotion and tenure review report;

iii. The department chair prepares a separate recommendation letter;

iv. These materials, along with the appropriate supporting documentation, are forwarded to the CPC for their evaluation;

v. The dean receives all documents and reports from department and CPC reviews and prepares a separate recommendation letter.

8. PROCEDURES IF NEW INFORMATION ABOUT A CANDIDATE’S CASE BECOMES AVAILABLE

Sometimes events occur that could materially change the information in the promotion and tenure review document after the document is originally submitted. For example, submitted papers may be accepted, accepted papers may be published, awards may be won, and so forth. The faculty member being reviewed can, if he/she desires, update the promotion and tenure document with this new information. This is done by notifying the department chair that new information is available. The department chair then verifies the accuracy of this new information. If it is verified, the promotion and tenure review document is revised. However, the revised document must still conform to the standards presented in Appendix C.

If information regarding new accomplishments becomes available before a case leaves the department but after the eligible faculty has voted, the question of reconsidering a case in light of the new information can be posed immediately. If this information becomes available after a case has left the department, the department chair, CPC, dean, or other deliberative body may return the case to the department. In either case, following review of the new information (which need not take place in a meeting), the eligible faculty in a department take a preliminary vote to determine whether or not to re-vote the case. This preliminary vote takes the form of a ballot asking each eligible faculty member in a department to indicate whether the new information might change his or her vote.

If at least one person indicates that his or her vote might change, the faculty meets to discuss the case with the new information and re-vote. The originally generated departmental promotion and tenure review report is then amended to reflect the content of the reconsideration and the new vote. In this situation, the previously generated report remains in the dossier. In any reconsideration, the candidates retain the right to comment on the (revised) departmental promotion and tenure review report. Replies to these responses can also be written and are included in a faculty member’s personnel file, as described earlier.
After reconsideration in the department, the case proceeds to the next stage in the review process either for initial consideration or reconsideration. If that group or individual has previously considered the case, they also follow this two-step process: (1) vote to see if the new information might change at least one person's vote and, if so, (2) meet to re-discuss and re-vote the case.

**C. DOCUMENTATION**

Every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. While the department promotion and tenure committee chair and the department chair make reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier.

A complete outline of required documentation can be found in APPENDIX C.

**VII. APPEALS**

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05.

Disagreement with a negative decision is not grounds for appeal. In pursuing an appeal, the faculty member is required to document the failure of one or more parties to follow written policies and procedures during the review process.

**VIII. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS**

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a Seventh Year Review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year (mandatory tenure) review.
IX. Support and Affirmation by Fisher College Affiliated TIUs

University rule states that “each tenure initiating unit is responsible for establishing criteria for appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure” and that “each tenure initiating unit shall have an appointments, promotion and tenure document” (3335-6-02). Through TIU based voting, the five TIUs constituting the Fisher College of Business agree that this document will constitute the AP&T document under which each department will operate until otherwise decided. The TIUs of Fisher College supported the adoption of this document as their AP&T document by the votes indicated below on the dates indicated.

Department of Accounting and MIS: February 18, 2011

Department of Finance: February 8, 2011

Department of Management and Human Resources: January 28, 2011

Department of Management Sciences: January 6, 2011

Department of Marketing and Logistics: January 13, 2011
APPENDIX A

Faculty Annual Reviews

Although the format and/or means for collecting the information required for the annual reports submitted by faculty may vary, the fundamental information requested will remain largely as reflected in the following outline. In addition to the annual report, an updated CV is required as part of the faculty annual review documentation.

I. Classroom Teaching
II. Academic Advising, Independent Studies, Directed Student Learning
III. Non-Degree or Non-Credit Instruction
IV. Other Student Services
V. Publications – including bibliographic information in proper formatting
VI. Presentations
VII. Sponsored Research, Grants and Contracts
VIII. Research Currently in Progress
IX. Service
   a. Department
   b. College
   c. University
   d. Professional
X. Consulting Activities
XI. Awards and Honors
XII. Faculty Development Activities
XIII. International Travel
XIV. Professional Memberships
XV. Contributions to College “Priority Program Areas”
APPENDIX B

Accessing Annual OAA Updates and University Rules
APPENDIX B

Procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews are updated annually by the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA). These guidelines are also applicable for 4th year review candidates. Faculty will be alerted when these guidelines are released (usually in May or June) and will be directed to the appropriate website.


In addition, Chapter 3335-6 of the Rules of the University Faculty contains important information on the promotion and tenure process. There are nine rules within Chapter 3335-6. These are found on the web site of the Board of Trustees: [http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/index.php](http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/index.php)
APPENDIX C

Dossier Elements and Requirements

C-1  Dossier Requirements for Fourth Year Reviews
C-2  Dossier Requirements for Promotion & Tenure Review
C-3  Dossier Requirements for Promotion to Full – Path 1
C-4  Dossier Requirements for Promotion to Full – Path 2
APPENDIX C-1

CORE DOSSIER ELEMENTS AND REQUIREMENTS – 4th Year Reviews

The following elements comprise the materials referred to as the dossier for 4th Year Review candidates. See Appendix D for a description of the assistance available to you from your department Procedures Oversight Designee (D-POD) and department chair. The D-POD selected by your department and your department chair should be consulted in time for their assistance prior to the August 1 deadline for submission.

1. Original Dossier Checklist signed by the candidate (this OSU form will be provided to the candidate by the associate dean’s office).

2. Updated Curriculum Vita

3. Core dossier completed in OSU:Pro

4. A statement of your area(s) of research and a description of research activities since hire. Your statement should include your assessment of how your research activities show progress toward the college standards for promotion to associate professor with tenure. This information should be recorded in the research section of the core dossier completed in OSU:Pro.
   a. No more than six examples of research activities

5. A statement of your teaching activities since hire including your assessment of how these activities indicate your progress toward the college standards for promotion to associate professor with tenure. This information should be recorded in the teaching section of the core dossier completed in OSU:Pro.
   a. A copy of syllabi for all courses taught since hire
   b. SEIs from all courses taught since hire

6. A brief statement of service activities since hire to be included under the service section of the OSU:Pro core dossier.

The following items will be added to the dossier at the department and college level.

1. All annual performance reviews since hire

2. Peer Assessment of Teaching report(s)
APPENDIX C-2

CORE DOSSIER ELEMENTS AND REQUIREMENTS – Promotion & Tenure Review

The following elements comprise the materials referred to as the dossier for promotion & tenure. See Appendix D for a description of the assistance available to you from your department Procedures Oversight Designee (D-POD) and department chair. The D-POD selected by your department and your department chair should be consulted in time for their assistance prior to the June 1 deadline for submission.

1. Original Dossier Checklist signed by candidate (this OSU form will be provided to the candidate by the associate dean’s office).

2. Updated Curriculum Vita

3. Core dossier completed in OSU:Pro

4. A statement on your area(s) of research and research activities including your assessment of how these activities meet the standards for potential for excellence in research found in Section VI.A of the college A, P&T document. This information should be recorded in the research section of the core dossier completed in OSU:Pro. In addition, provide no more than six examples of research activities.

5. A statement of your teaching activities and philosophy including your assessment of how these activities indicate achievement in teaching as outlined in Section VI.A of the college A, P&T document. This information should be recorded in the teaching section of the core dossier completed in OSU:Pro. In addition, provide:
   a. Syllabi from courses taught since hire or last five years, whichever is less;
   b. SEIs from all courses taught since hire or last five years, whichever is less.

6. Indications of rank appropriate service are noted by completing the service section of the core dossier completed in OSU:Pro.

7. Candidates have 10 days to provide comments or decline to comment on reports and or recommendation letters generated at each level of review. The OSU form for this purpose will be provided to you by the department or associate dean’s office. Complete and return to the appropriate office for inclusion in the dossier.

The following items will be added to the dossier at the department and college level:

1. Completed comment forms from both the TIU and college level reviews;
2. Annual performance reviews from the past five years;

3. Peer Assessment of Teaching report(s);

4. At least five letters from external reviewers; no more than half being from reviewers suggested by the candidate. A cover sheet indicating the qualifications of each letter writer will be completed by the department and placed on top of the corresponding letter. A summary of responding and non-responding external evaluators will also be completed and included by the department.
APPENDIX C-3

CORE DOSSIER ELEMENTS AND REQUIREMENTS – Promotion Review; Path 1

The following elements comprise the materials referred to as the dossier for Path 1 promotion review. See Appendix D for a description of the assistance available to you from your department Procedures Oversight Designee (D-POD) and department chair. The D-POD selected by your department and your department chair should be consulted in time for their assistance prior to the June 1 deadline for submission.

1. Original Dossier Checklist signed by the candidate. This OSU form will be provided to the candidate by the associate dean’s office.

2. Updated Curriculum Vita

3. Core dossier completed in OSU:Pro

4. A statement on your area(s) of research and research activities including a statement indicating how these activities meet the standards for excellence in research found in section IV.A(2) of the college A, P&T document. This information should be recorded in the research section of the core dossier completed in OSU:Pro. In addition, provide no more than six examples of research activities.

5. A statement of your teaching activities and philosophy including your assessment of how these activities indicate sustained achievement in teaching as outlined in section IV.A(2) of the college A, P&T document. This information should be recorded in the teaching section of the core dossier completed in OSU:Pro. In addition, provide:
   a. Syllabi from all courses taught in the past five years or since the last P&T review, whichever is less;
   b. SEIs from all courses taught in the past five years or since the last P&T review, whichever is less. Non-mandatory reviews cannot proceed without this.

6. Indications of rank appropriate service as noted in section IV.A(2) of the college A, P&T document. These are noted by completing the service section of the core dossier completed in OSU:Pro.

7. Candidates have 10 days to provide comments or decline to comment on reports and or recommendation letters generated at each level of review. The OSU form for this purpose will be provided to you by the department or associate dean’s office. Complete and return to the appropriate office for inclusion in the dossier.
The following items will be added to the dossier at the department and college level:

1. Completed comment forms from both the TIU and college level reviews;

2. Annual performance reviews from the past five years;

3. Peer Assessment of Teaching report(s). Non-mandatory reviews cannot proceed without this.

4. At least five letters from external reviewers; no more than two being from reviewers suggested by the candidate. A cover sheet indicating the qualification of each letter writer will be completed by the department and included in the dossier that is forwarded for CPC review. A summary of responding and non-responding external evaluators will also be completed and included by the department.
APPENDIX C-4

CORE DOSSIER ELEMENTS AND REQUIREMENTS – Promotion Review; Path 2

The following elements comprise the materials referred to as the dossier for Path 2 promotion review. See Appendix D for a description of the assistance available to you from your department Procedures Oversight Designee (D-POD) and department chair. The D-POD selected by your department and your department chair should be consulted in time for their assistance prior to the June 1 deadline for submission.

1. Original Dossier Checklist signed by candidate. This OSU form will be provided by the senior associate dean’s office once the candidates for review have been determined.

2. Updated Curriculum Vita

3. Core dossier completed in OSU:Pro.

4. A statement of teaching activities including how these activities meet the standards of excellence for teaching as outlined in section IV.A of the college A, P&T document. This information should be recorded in the teaching section of the core dossier completed in OSU:Pro. In addition, provide:
   a. Syllabi from all courses taught in the past five years or since the last P&T review, whichever is less;
   b. SEIs from all courses taught in the last five years or since the last P&T review, whichever is less. Non-mandatory reviews cannot proceed without this.

5. Completion of the service section of the core dossier including a statement of how service activities meet the criteria for excellence as demonstrated by sustained significant impact on the service accomplishments of the department and college (section VI.A of the college A, P&T document).

6. Completion of the research section of the core dossier including a statement of how research activities meet the standards of sustained achievement found in section VI.A of the college A, P&T document. In addition, provide no more than six examples of research activities.

7. Candidates have 10 days to provide comments or decline to comment on reports and or recommendation letters generated at each level of review. The OSU form for this purpose will be provided to you by the department or associate dean’s office. Complete and return to the appropriate office for inclusion in the dossier.

The following items will be added to the dossier at the department and college level:

1. Completed comment forms from both the TIU and college level reviews;

2. Annual performance reviews from the past five years;
3. Peer Assessment of Teaching report(s). Non-mandatory reviews cannot proceed without this;

4. At least five letters from external reviewers; no more than half being from reviewers suggested by the candidate. A cover sheet indicating the qualification of each letter writer will be completed by the department. A summary of responding and non-responding external evaluators will also be completed and included by the department.
APPENDIX D

Responsibilities of the Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) for the Department (D-POD) and College (C-POD)
APPENDIX D

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PROCEDURES OVERSIGHT DESIGNEE (POD)

Procedures Oversight Designees are appointed by the voting-eligible faculty at the department level and by the CPC at the college level. A summary of the duties of the POD is found at http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/PODDuties.pdf


- The D-POD is selected no later than April 1 by the voting-eligible department faculty.
- The D-POD must be familiar with the written guidelines on the promotion and tenure process at the department and university levels.
- Prior to the departmental promotion and tenure meeting (held by the end of the fourth week of the autumn term) the D-POD, along with the department chair and the assigned CPC representative, reviews the dossier to ensure that it meets all requirements and is ready for distribution to all eligible faculty. This includes:
  - assuring that the dossier is prepared correctly using the most current dossier format; asking the candidate to make any needed changes, and verifying that requested changes have been completed and
  - affirming that the accuracy of all publications listed in the dossier has been verified. If anyone other than the D-POD performs this function it must be noted on the Dossier Checklist.
- Works with the department chair to address and resolve any conflicts of interest.
- Assures that proper criteria are applied when candidates come up for early review or have an extension of the tenure clock.
- During the review meeting the D-POD ensures that the proceedings are carried out in a highly professional manner and that the committee’s process follows university and college guidelines.
- Assures that the review process is fair and unbiased, including monitoring the equitable treatment for women and minority candidates, including assuring that the proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions about members of underrepresented groups that could bias their review.
  - Specifically monitors the review process in regard to equitable treatment for...
candidates based upon protected status (age, ancestry, color, disability, gender identity or expression, genetic information, military status, national origin, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, or veteran status).

- If the D-POD observes any significant deviations from these guidelines, he/she submits a report to the department chair and to the dean (see below for a more detailed outline of steps).

- The D-POD is responsible for recording the votes of the TIU P&T committee on the Dossier Checklist included with the dossier materials. By signing the completed form the D-POD is confirming that “I understand that if the tenure initiating unit reviews and forwards a dossier lacking key information and/or containing less than credible external evaluation, the review process may have to begin anew.”

Duties of the C-POD:

- Members of the CPC select one of its members as C-POD during the meeting scheduled to review the related case. The C-POD should not be the chair of the CPC and should not also be the report writer for the case.

- If more than one person is being reviewed at a particular meeting, different CPC members present can be elected as the C-POD for different cases.

- The C-POD must be familiar with the written guidelines on the promotion and tenure process at the college and university levels.

- Works with the CPC chair to address and resolve any conflicts of interest.

- During the meeting the C-POD ensures that the committee’s process follows university and college guidelines and is fair and unbiased, including monitoring the equitable treatment for women and minority candidates, including assuring that the proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions about members of underrepresented groups that could bias their review.

- If the C-POD observes any significant deviations from these guidelines, he/she submits a report to the department chair and to the dean (see below for a more detailed outline of steps).

- The C-POD is responsible for recording the votes of the P&T committee on the Dossier Checklist included with the dossier materials. By signing the completed form the C-POD is confirming that “I understand that if the college reviews and forwards a dossier to the Office of Academic Affairs that lacks key information and/or containing less than credible external evaluation, the review process may have to begin anew.”
If the D-POD or the C-POD observe any significant deviations from college or university guidelines or has any concerns about a review, these concerns should first be brought to the attention of the person or review body generating the concerns. For example, if a dossier is not prepared correctly, the POD should ask the candidate who prepared the dossier to make needed changes. If appropriate procedures are not being followed by either faculty or staff, then those individuals should be promptly informed of the problem.

If concerns cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of the POD, then they should be brought to the attention of the relevant administrator (TIU head or dean, depending on the level of review). The administrator must look into the matter and respond in writing to the POD regarding either the actions taken or the reasons that action was judged to be unwarranted.

Although a single committee member is assigned oversight responsibility, all members of review bodies must accept personal responsibility for assuring that reviews are procedurally correct, fair, and free of bias for all faculty members. Review bodies, not the POD, are ultimately responsible for the integrity of the review process.
APPENDIX E

Ballots

E-1 Ballot for Fourth Year Review – Department
E-2 Ballot for Fourth Year Review – CPC
E-3 Ballot for Promotion and Tenure Review – Department
E-4 Ballot for Promotion and Tenure Review – CPC
E-5 Ballot for Promotion Review - Department
E-6 Ballot for Promotion Review – CPC
E-7 Ballot for Reconsidering a Case Should New Information Become Available
E-8 Ballot for Evaluating Self-Defined Fields of Work
APPENDIX E-1

Ballot for Fourth Year Review – Department Meeting

Candidate Being Reviewed: __________________________ Date: __________

Choose one:

___ re-appoint (the candidate’s record is currently evolving in ways worthy of
    re-appointment)

___ contract termination (the candidate’s record is currently evolving in ways
    that are inconsistent with promotion and tenure at some future date and it
    is very unlikely that weaknesses in this record can be addressed in a timely
    manner)

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

If you voted to re-appoint, choose one:

___ on track for promotion and tenure (the candidate’s record is currently
    evolving in ways that are consistent with promotion and tenure at some future
    date)

___ on track for promotion and tenure, with reservations (aspects of the
    candidate’s record are currently evolving in ways that are consistent with
    promotion and tenure at some future date, although there are some weaknesses in
    the record that will need to be addressed)

___ off track for promotion and tenure (the candidate’s record is currently
    evolving in ways that are inconsistent with promotion and tenure at some future
    date, although it may be possible to address the weaknesses in the record in a
    timely manner)

In fourth year reviews it is particularly important to provide the candidate with developmental feedback. Please take the time to provide such feedback in the space below. Likewise, if you have information that you would like to share with the CPC and with the dean with regard to this case, please do so here.

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX E-2

Ballot for Fourth Year Review – CPC Meeting

Candidate Being Reviewed: ___________________________ Date: ____________

Choose one:

____ re-appoint (the candidate’s record is currently evolving in ways worthy of re-appointment)

____ contract termination (the candidate’s record is currently evolving in ways that are inconsistent with promotion and tenure at some future date and it is very unlikely that weaknesses in this record can be addressed in a timely manner)

Comments:

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

If you voted to re-appoint, choose one:

____ on track for promotion and tenure (the candidate’s record is currently evolving in ways that are consistent with promotion and tenure at some future date)

____ on track for promotion and tenure, with reservations (aspects of the candidate’s record are currently evolving in ways that are consistent with promotion and tenure at some future date, although there are some weaknesses in the record that will need to be addressed)

____ off track for promotion and tenure (the candidate’s record is currently evolving in ways that are inconsistent with promotion and tenure at some future date, although it may be possible to address the weaknesses in the record in a timely manner)

Comments:

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX E-3

BALLOT FOR DEPARTMENTAL PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW MEETING
PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE

Candidate being reviewed: __________________________ Date: __________________

Candidate meets the criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure as articulated in the FCOB appointments, promotion and tenure document:

YES ________

NO ________

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX E-4

BALLOT FOR CPC PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW MEETING
PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE

Candidate being reviewed: ____________________________ Date: ______________

Candidate meets the criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure as articulated in the FCOB appointments, promotion and tenure document:

YES ___________

NO ___________

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Candidate being reviewed: ___________________________ Date: __________________

Candidate meets the criteria for promotion to full professor as articulated in the FCOB appointments, promotion and tenure document:

YES ________

NO ________

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX E-6

BALLOT FOR CPC PROMOTION REVIEW MEETING
PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

Candidate being reviewed: ______________________________ Date: __________________

Candidate meets the criteria for promotion to full professor as articulated in the FCOB appointments, promotion and tenure document:

YES ______

NO ______

Comments:

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX E-7

Ballot for Reconsidering a Case Should New Information Become Available

Name of Person Being Reviewed: ____________________________________________

Date: __________________ Name of Person Voting: ________________________

Choose One:

____ voting whether or not to reconsider a fourth year review at the department level

____ voting whether or not to reconsider a fourth year review at the CPC level

____ voting whether or not to reconsider a promotion and tenure review at the department level

____ voting whether or not to reconsider a promotion and tenure review at the CPC level

____ voting whether or not to reconsider a promotion review at the department level

____ voting whether or not to reconsider a promotion review at the CPC level

Choose One:

____ Yes, the new information about this case might have changed my previous vote.

____ No, the new information about this case would not have changed my previous vote.

Comments:
APPENDIX E-8

Ballot for Evaluating Self-Defined Fields of Work

Person being reviewed: ____________________________________________

Date of Review: _____________ Name of Person Voting: ____________________

Brief description of self-defined field of work:

Is this self-defined field of work broad-based, widely recognized, and not a sub-field of one of the twelve fields currently recognized by the college? (check one)

_______ Yes  __________ No

Comments:
APPENDIX F

Template for Requests to External Evaluators
APPENDIX F

SAMPLE LETTER TO AN EXTERNAL EVALUATOR
BASED UPON UNIVERSITY GUIDELINES

The format of the sample letter is not required, merely suggested. Modifications may be needed to reflect variations across the university based on the type of scholarly activity. It is suggested that external evaluators be contacted to ascertain their ability/willingness to respond prior to sending the written request.

If a unit wishes to use a different format or to seek different information, it should fully consider both how evaluators are likely to respond to such a request, given the time provided to respond and the Public Records Act, and how much information the evaluator has on which to base the requested assessment.

The Department of XXX is considering Dr. Doe for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure [professor]. Dr. Doe’s performance in teaching, research and service will be evaluated at the department, college and university levels to determine whether promotion and tenure [promotion] will be granted. I am asking you only to provide a critical assessment of Dr. Doe’s research.

Enclosed you will find a copy of Dr. Doe’s curriculum vitae and copies of the following papers:

Please comment in some detail on the significance of the overall research program as well as on individual papers, including the scholarly merit of the work, its originality, and its impact on the field of study. In addition, how would you compare Dr. Doe to other researchers in this field at the same stage of career development?

Please don’t comment on whether Dr. Doe should be promoted and tenured [promoted] at Ohio State or would or would not be promoted and tenured [promoted] at your institution. We must make this assessment based on the total record, not just on research, and on our own criteria and standards.

Under the Ohio Public Records Act all documents related to P & T reviews, including letters of evaluation, are public records. Thus we cannot promise confidentiality.

Thank you for your time and effort in responding to this request. If for any reason you will not be able to evaluate this candidate or if you have any questions about this process, please contact me at [phone number/email address] immediately. I would appreciate receiving your response by [date].