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I. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapter 6 of the Rules of the University Faculty ("Additional Rules Concerning Faculty Appointment, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure"), the Office of Academic Affairs procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews, and any additional policies established by the College and the University. Should those rules and policies change, the Department shall follow those new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years on appointment or reappointment of the Department Chair.

II. DEPARTMENT MISSION

The academic mission of the Department is to promote the study of the languages, literatures, and cultures of Greeks and Romans in all periods from antiquity to the present, specifically through: the publication of original research that engages directly with broader philosophical debates about the constitution of knowledge in the Humanities; the teaching of this knowledge, its sources, and the methodological and theoretical challenges to undergraduate and graduate students, to prepare some for a professional future in the field and all for a life of learning and critical thinking; the mediation of this knowledge to a wide constituency of colleagues and friends of Greek and Roman studies, inside and outside the University; and the fostering of a collegial environment that promotes excellence in research, teaching, and discussion.

A. RESEARCH

The purpose of research in Greek and Latin is to improve in quality and relevance our knowledge and understanding of the classical world, medieval and neo-Latin, and Byzantine and Modern Greek culture and history. The Department is a nationally and internationally recognized community of scholars, which makes important contributions to the intellectual debates and issues that concern Classicists, Latinists, Hellenists, or any specialists in related disciplines. An individual faculty member's research may emphasize the discovery of new material or knowledge, the promulgation of persuasive interpretations, or the creation of new understandings or applications. Excellence is measured by the value which the work has for the understanding or appreciation of the particular field.

B. TEACHING
In keeping with the mission of a land-grant institution, we embrace our responsibilities and activities as teachers, both to undergraduates and to graduate students. Our students include those who want a broad education and those who want to specialize as majors, minors, or graduate students. Besides classroom instruction we also recognize that teaching often requires independent studies with a student or a group of students. Undergraduate students might need additional language training or specific introductions to research projects, graduate students need advising and guidance for research papers, publications and especially their dissertation: these activities are an integral part of our teaching duties. Finally, as members of a community of scholars in diverse disciplines, we believe that public lectures, committee work, and published research are forms of teaching. Our teaching assignments will take into account the needs of our students, the demands of our discipline and, whenever possible, the research interests of the faculty. Evaluation of teaching will reflect the needs of the audiences, while always considering the twin goals of benefit and enjoyment.

C. SERVICE

Service to the general needs of the Department, the college, the university, and the community is an essential element of good citizenship.

III. APPOINTMENTS

The Department of Greek and Latin will make faculty appointments that enhance the quality of the Department and its effectiveness in pursuing its mission. Since the Department expects that its senior members will be distinguished scholars within their areas of research and that junior members will be persons who have reasonable promise of achieving that status, excellence in scholarship is, therefore, a necessary condition for appointment or promotion to any continuing position. Since the Department expects excellence in teaching from all of its members as part of its mission, entry-level appointments will require evidence of potential as effective teachers and senior appointments will require evidence of effectiveness in the classroom and in other educational forums.

A. CRITERIA:

1. TENURE TRACK FACULTY—COLUMBUS CAMPUS

a. Instructor

An appointment to the rank of instructor should normally be made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but the appointee has not completed the
required terminal degree at the onset of the appointment. The appointment is always probationary and may not exceed three years. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year. When an instructor is promoted to the rank of assistant professor, prior service credit will be granted for time spent as an instructor unless the faculty member indicates in writing at the time of the promotion that he or she does not wish such credit. This written request must be forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs through the Dean of the College so that tenure records may be adjusted accordingly.

b. Assistant Professor

The minimum requirement for appointment at or promotion to the rank of assistant professor is an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience and promise both of a strong research profile and the ability to advance through the ranks. The candidate should demonstrate either in the dissertation or in published material (or both) the potential for significant published contributions to scholarship in his or her field and should demonstrate potential or ability as an effective teacher.

An appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary and may not exceed six years, including prior service credit. An assistant professor is reviewed for promotion and tenure no later than the sixth year of appointment as an assistant professor and informed by the end of the sixth year as to whether promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the seventh year.

c. Professor or Associate Professor

An appointment as professor or associate professor requires an earned doctorate or the equivalent. It will generally entail tenure. However, a probationary period not to exceed four years may be granted by the Office of Academic Affairs upon petition of the Department and College. For the petition to be approved, a compelling rationale must be provided regarding why appointment at a senior rank is appropriate but tenure is not. All appointments to the rank of associate professor or professor require prior approval of the Executive Vice President and Provost.

2. TENURE TRACK FACULTY—REGIONAL CAMPUS

The criteria for appointment on the regional campuses are the same as for appointment on the Columbus Campus.
3. Auxiliary Faculty

Auxiliary appointments are made to faculty who provide significant resources for the Department in teaching and service. These are not tenured or tenure-track appointments. Auxiliary appointments may be made for only one year at a time and thus require formal annual renewal if they are to be continued.

An individual with an auxiliary appointment may participate in Department Council meetings but may not vote and may not participate in faculty meetings. Auxiliary appointees may serve on appropriate Departmental committees. The criteria for appointment of auxiliary faculty with modified faculty titles (such as "adjunct" and "visiting") are comparable to the criteria for appointment at the regular ranks. These criteria will also serve as a basis for evaluating the occasional auxiliary faculty member who desires promotion. Auxiliary appointments in the Department of Greek and Latin include the following:

a. Senior Lecturer

Appointment at the rank of Senior Lecturer will require the Ph.D. degree or its equivalent, demonstrated potential for significant scholarship and ability as an effective teacher in Greek and/or Latin. Senior lecturers may teach at any level for which they are qualified. Their teaching must be evaluated in writing by their students and by the Chair or his/her designee and by others among the regular faculty. Such appointments may be renewed for up to three years, provided that their record in teaching, scholarship, and service has served the Department’s mission and that there is a continuing need for their services.

b. Lecturer

The minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of Lecturer will be that all work for the Ph.D. except the dissertation be completed at the time of the appointment. Normally, lecturers will teach lower division courses. Their appointments will be made on a course-by-course and quarter-by-quarter basis. Their teaching must be evaluated by their students and by the Chair or his/her designee. Lecturers may be reappointed if there is a continuing need for their services and if their teaching has been effective.

c. Visiting Faculty

Visiting faculty must have credentials as scholars and teachers similar to those of a regular appointment at the same level (as stated elsewhere in this document). Visiting faculty are eligible to teach at any level for which they are qualified as scholars and teachers. Visiting faculty, whose appointments may not exceed three continuous years, include individuals on leave from other academic institutions and temporary faculty.
d. Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct faculty must have credentials as scholars and teachers similar to those of a regular appointment at the same level (as stated elsewhere in this document). Adjunct faculty are eligible to teach at any level for which they are qualified as scholars and teachers. Such appointments typically take advantage of opportunities and are not the result of a Departmental search.

4. COURTESY APPOINTMENTS

A courtesy appointment in the Department of Greek and Latin will require a Ph.D. in Greek and Latin or in an equivalent or related field and a tenure-track appointment in another unit at The Ohio State University. It will be based on the expectation that the appointee will contribute substantially to the Department’s mission. Such an individual may participate in Department Council meetings and may be appointed to Department committees. He or she may hold graduate faculty status in the Department, upon the recommendation of the Graduate Studies Committee, but may not be the sole adviser of Ph.D. students. Such appointments may collaborate with regular faculty in graduate and undergraduate courses and may participate in program development. Continuation of the appointment will reflect ongoing contributions to the Department’s mission and will be terminated when those contributions cease to exist or cease to serve the Departments needs. Unlike auxiliary appointments, courtesy appointments do not require formal annual renewal.

B. PROCEDURES:

1. TENURE TRACK FACULTY—COLUMBUS CAMPUS

After consultation with the faculty and upon approval by vote of a job description and after approval by the Dean of the College of Humanities, the Chair shall appoint a search committee for any tenure-track or tenured appointment. The committee shall solicit applications broadly and by a variety of means, including advertisements in journals and professional organizations, listings on the Internet, letters to graduate institutions and leading scholars asking for nominations, and invitations to potential candidates asking them to apply. After a national search, generally including personal interviews at appropriate professional meetings, the committee will report to the faculty and submit a short list of the top candidates, at least one of whom could contribute to the diversity of the unit, to an on-campus interview. If the search committee judges that in the pool of candidates there is no qualified person who can contribute to the diversity of the unit, it will explain at a meeting of the faculty its efforts to attract a diverse pool of applicants and will describe the pool of applicants and the pool of finalists before asking the faculty
to vote on inviting the finalists to campus for an interview. After discussion and in accordance with the majority vote of the faculty, the committee will normally invite top candidates for on-campus interviews. Since we are a small Department, at this point the official work of the committee is usually complete. At the Departmental meeting called to review the candidates, representatives of the Graduate Student Association will be asked to report the views of the graduate student body and participate in a discussion of their view with the faculty, then they will leave the meeting; this report has to be based on a formal consultation of all graduate students. After full discussion the faculty will select the top candidate by a written confidential ballot. A two-thirds vote is normally expected before the Chair can recommend the appointment to the Dean of the College. If the top candidate receives more than half but less than two-thirds of the votes, the faculty will vote again on the single top candidate. If this candidate still receives less than two-thirds of the votes, the chair in consultation with the dean will decide whether to make an offer to the top-ranked candidate on the basis of a simple majority or to end the search and begin again. If the chair decides to make an offer, she or he will write a letter of explanation of the circumstances to the faculty with a copy to be sent to the Dean. After the offer is made, the Chair will discuss the search with the graduate students.

2. TENURE TRACK FACULTY—REGIONAL CAMPUSES

The regional campus has primary responsibility for determining the need for a position and the position description, but it should consult with and seek the agreement of the Department Chair and faculty of the Columbus Department. The Chair of the Department and the regional campus Dean/Director will agree on a single search committee for the position consisting of members of both units. Candidates should be interviewed by the regional campus Dean/Director, the Chair of the Department, the search committee, and representatives of both faculties. Candidates will be evaluated on both campuses, with the Columbus faculty taking primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate’s record and potential as a scholar. At the end of the evaluation process, the search committee will make a recommendation to the Department Chair and the regional campus Dean/Director. A decision to hire requires agreement on the part of the Department faculty (as determined by vote in a faculty meeting) and of the regional campus Dean/Director. Negotiations with a candidate should not begin without such agreement and a letter of offer must be signed by the Chair of the Department and the Dean/Director of the regional campus. Once appointed, tenure-track and tenured faculty on the regional campus will have the same voting rights in faculty meeting and in tenure and promotion decisions as their counterparts on the Columbus campus.

3. AUXILLIARY FACULTY

a. Senior Lecturer
Senior Lecturers will be appointed by the Chair after consultation with the full faculty and in accordance with the majority opinion as determined by a vote of the regular faculty.

b. Lecturer

Lecturers will be appointed by the Chair in consultation with the Chair’s advisory committee.

c. Visiting Faculty

Visiting faculty will be appointed by the Chair upon consultation with the full faculty and in accordance with the majority opinion as determined by a vote of the regular faculty. When appropriate, the Chair will convene a search committee and follow the regular search procedures of the Department as outlined in Section III.B.1 above.

d. Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct faculty will be appointed by the Chair upon consultation with the full faculty and in accordance with the majority opinion as determined by a vote of the regular faculty.

4. COURTESY APPOINTMENTS

Courtesy appointments will be made by the Chair upon consultation with the full faculty and in accordance with the majority opinion as determined by a vote of the regular faculty.

IV. ANNUAL REVIEWS

A. ALL FACULTY

1. PLANNING AND REPORTING PROCEDURES

Before the beginning of any academic year, the Chair will invite each faculty member to discuss specific goals for the coming year in scholarship, teaching, and service. Committee appointments, teaching assignments, and other discretionary actions of the
Chair will reflect this meeting and the faculty member may request to have the understanding reached put in writing. During the spring quarter, the Chair will notify all faculty in a timely manner of the forthcoming the annual review and invite a summary of the relevant activities and accomplishments of the past year (Annual Performance Report). It will be up to the individual faculty member to provide the Chair at the time of the review with (1) a current Curriculum Vitae, (2) a summary of the year’s activities and accomplishments in a format requested by the Chair, and (3) copies of SEI forms for all courses taught during the review period. If there was an understanding at the beginning of the year as described above, the summary should reflect and comment upon that understanding in terms of the year’s accomplishments. In addition, it is recommended that faculty provide the Chair with a copy of the comments of anonymous referees, unsolicited letters from students and alumni, and any other indicators of the quality and impact of the faculty member’s work on others. The Chair may also seek additional information as necessary and consult colleagues as necessary for a fair and thorough review. In this regard, the Chair may invite reviews of public presentations, curricular development, service, or general impact of scholarship from anyone in a position to evaluate the faculty member’s performance. Copies of these supplementary materials and of the Teaching Evaluation Committee evaluations or summaries of the faculty member’s teaching evaluations as specified in 2b(1)d-f (below) will be provided to the faculty member at least one week before the annual review so that he or she may provide explanation or other comment. Documentation of teaching and additional documentation for Probationary Faculty and Associate Professors is specified in the respective sections below (IV.A.2; IV.B-C)

2. EVALUATION OF TEACHING

a. The Teaching Evaluation Process

(1). All faculty are expected to offer students in all regularly scheduled courses an opportunity to evaluate the course and the instruction in the course. The use of the University Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) is required. The use of other forms of evaluation is left to the discretion of the instructor. The instructor will submit the results to the Chair annually in accord with the procedures outlined in IV.A.2.b(1) below. These will be evaluated and, where appropriate, summarized by the Teaching Evaluation Committee (TEC). The results will be entered into the faculty member’s Annual Review Dossier for use by the appropriate P&T Committee for the annual review of assistant and associate professors and by the Chair in the Annual Performance Review. If the P&T Committee or the Chair detects any problems in the teaching evaluations or year-end summaries, the Chair may suggest to the faculty member that he or she seek an informal or formal peer review the following year.

(2). Probationary Faculty will undergo a formal peer review in at least the second, third, and fourth years of his or her employment. At least six courses will be evaluated over the three-year period, including (ideally) at least one large lecture course, one small
lecture/discussion course, one 200-600 level language course, and one 700-900 level graduate course. The member of the TEC performing the review will follow the guidelines of Section IV.A.2.b(2).a below and make a written report, a copy of which will be made available to the probationary faculty member. The report will be forwarded to the Chair of the P&T Committee and will become part of the probationary faculty member’s file. If the TEC Chair cannot cover the necessary peer reviews with members of the TEC, she or he may call upon other appropriate members of the faculty.

(3). Associate Professors will undergo peer reviews during the two to three years before promotion to Full Professor is expected. At least four courses will be evaluated, (ideally) one large lecture course, one small lecture/discussion course, one 200-600 level language course, and one 700-900 level graduate course. The member of the TEC performing the review will follow the guidelines below (IV.A.2.b(2)) and make a written report, a copy of which will be made available to the faculty member. The report will be forwarded to the Chair of the P&T Committee and will become part of the faculty member's file. If the TEC Chair cannot cover the necessary peer reviews with members of the TEC, he or she may call upon other appropriate members of the faculty.

b. Instruments and Procedures

(1). Student Evaluation of Instruction.
   a. Until otherwise determined by the Department the University Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) will be the formal required instrument of evaluation for all formal course offerings.

   b. In accord with OAA policies, the faculty member will appoint a student to proctor the administration of the SEI. This student will be responsible for collecting the results and forwarding them through Campus Mail.

   c. Faculty members are encouraged to use other evaluation instruments to supplement the SEI. If such are used, they are to be proctored by a student, who will return them to a designated member of the office staff. These evaluations will be retained in the office and returned to the faculty member after the final grades have been submitted. Any faculty member who wants to include these other instruments in the regularly scheduled peer review or Annual Performance Report, should follow the procedure outlined below, section e.

   d. At the beginning of the spring quarter the TEC will review all SEI reports for the prior year and will write a brief evaluation for each faculty member. The committee will compare the instructor's overall scores with those of the Department, College, and University, and highlight individual scores that are well above or well below overall rankings.

   e. If a faculty member requests the inclusion of other instruments in his or her Annual Review Dossier or Promotion and Tenure or Promotion Dossier, that
faculty member should submit the raw data and a compilation of numerical data to the TEC committee along with the SEI forms. A member of the TEC will then review the compilation of the data and will summarize written comments. This summary must describe the instrument used, indicate how it was administered (i.e. whether it was proctored by a student and retained in the office until grades were turned in), and indicate the return rate (percentage of class that filled out the evaluations) and the percentage of class represented by written comments. The committee summary must report what students wrote, no matter how much the summarizer might disagree with the comments, must present a clear sense of the proportion of positive to negative comments, and should compare this analysis with the yearly summary of SEIs.

f. The TEC will forward its evaluations of SEIs and its summaries of any other instruments of evaluation to the Chair for inclusion in the Annual Review Dossier. The Chair will transmit a copy of the evaluations and summaries to the respective faculty member at least one week prior to the Annual Review. These evaluations and summaries may be presented by the faculty member as evidence of excellence in teaching for a promotion and tenure review or a promotion review (See below, VI.C.1.a). Copies of all SEIs, evaluations of SEIs and summaries of other instruments will be retained in the Department office.

(2). Peer Review of Instruction

a. Formal Peer Review. Formal peer review of a course will be conducted by a member of the TEC assigned by the Chair of the Committee. A formal review will consist of at least two visits to the classroom. The peer reviewer will:

1. Note and take into account the level, nature, and function of the course, e.g., lecture, lecture-discussion, language course, GEC course, major course, or graduate course.

2. Describe the syllabus, textbooks, and other course materials (including reading and writing assignment, handouts, and exams).

3. List the facts of the classroom visits (i.e., date, time, quarter, course number, and title, number of students enrolled, number in attendance, and topics for the day.

4. Describe style of pedagogy.

5. Describe instructor's quality of organization, command of material, and clarity of presentation.

b. Informal Peer Review. If requested, an informal peer review of a course will be conducted by a member of the TEC assigned by the Chair of the Committee. An informal review may or may not follow the guidelines of the formal review (above, 2.1). The results of an informal peer review will be communicated to the
faculty member and will not be made public unless requested by the faculty member.

B. PROBATIONARY FACULTY

1. PROCEDURES

a. At the time of appointment, probationary faculty members shall be provided with all pertinent documents detailing Department, College, and University promotion and tenure policies and criteria. If these documents are revised during the probationary period, probationary faculty members shall be provided with copies of the revised documents.

b. The Chair of the Department and the tenured faculty shall review all untenured faculty in each year of their probationary service. The annual review will encompass the untenured faculty member's performance in the areas of research, teaching, and service, and will require evidence of continuing development in each area. External evaluations of the faculty member's work, required for tenure and promotion reviews, may be obtained for any annual review if judged appropriate by the tenured faculty or the Department Chair. The Department Chair shall inform probationary faculty members at the time of initial appointment and in a timely fashion each year thereafter when the annual review will take place and remind him or her of the required documentation stipulated in Sect. 1.d below. This documentation must be submitted at least one week prior to the date of the review. The annual review enables the Department to communicate its performance expectations to probationary faculty and to evaluate progress towards those expectations. The Department is committed to not renewing a probationary appointment following any annual review in which it is apparent that the candidate's likelihood of meeting expectations for promotion and tenure is poor. All annual review letters will become a part of a faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure.

c. In each annual review other than the fourth year review, whose procedures differ as described in IV.B.2 below, if the Chair's recommendation is to reappoint the faculty member to another year of service, that recommendation shall be final. A chair's negative recommendation to the dean, however, must follow the application of fourth year review procedures at the Department level. The dean will then follow fourth year review procedures at the college level and make a final decision in the matter.

d. Faculty under review are responsible for providing an appropriate statement and appropriate professional materials for review to the Committee on Promotion and Tenure. Such materials include (1) an up-to-date dossier organized in accord with the outline stipulated by the Office of Academic Affairs and submitted in the standard notebook, and (2) the Annual Performance Report required of all faculty as stipulated in Sect. IV.A.1 above. The Department Chair and the tenured faculty may solicit or provide additional
information that they consider relevant for inclusion in the review in accord with the guidelines of IV.A.1. The contents of the dossier and supplementary materials will constitute the evidence upon which evaluation will be made.

e. All tenured faculty must be consulted during the annual review. It is the responsibility of every tenured faculty member to review all available documentation and to participate in the review meeting. If it is absolutely impossible for a faculty member to attend the meeting, he or she may review the documentation in advance and submit an anonymous vote to be tallied at the completion of the voting. It is the Chair’s responsibility to contact all tenured faculty members and to solicit from them a vote. The Chair may participate but will not vote at this review. The vote will be taken by written, confidential ballot. A positive vote of 2/3 of the tenured faculty is required for approval of reappointment. The tenured faculty will elect a senior member and participant in the discussion to summarize their deliberations and vote in a letter to the Chair.

f. If the vote is positive and the Chair agrees with the recommendation for reappointment, he or she will provide the faculty member with a written assessment of the faculty member’s performance and professional development and notification of the decision to reappoint for an additional year. The assessment must be based upon and reflect the discussion of the tenured faculty. It will both report and evaluate the vote of that body. This Chair’s letter may take the form of an addendum to the letter from the tenured faculty or be a formal letter.

g. If the vote is positive and the Chair disagrees, he or she will explain his or her disagreement to the faculty in writing before officially communicating his or her recommendation to the faculty member under review to the Dean (see IV.B.1.j, below). The Chair will then write a letter to the Dean explaining his or her recommendation. The Chair will then provide the faculty member under review with a copy of this letter.

h. If the vote is negative and the Chair agrees, he or she will write a letter to the Dean explaining his or her recommendation. The Chair will then provide the faculty member under review with a copy of this letter and the letter of the tenured faculty.

i. In case of a negative faculty vote and in the event that the Chair does not concur in that recommendation, the Chair will explain his/her disagreement to the faculty in writing before officially communicating his/her decision to renew the appointment to the faculty member.

j. The Chair must provide the faculty member under review with a copy of his letter of recommendation and the letter of the tenured faculty. The faculty member will be given ten (10) days to respond in writing to the letters from the tenured faculty to the Chair and from the Chair to the Dean. The tenured faculty and/or the Chair may respond to this letter. There will be only one iteration of this process. All letters and responses will, then, become part of the faculty member's dossier. A copy will also be sent to the college office.
k. In the case of a recommendation for reappointment, the Chair will also compose a letter to the faculty member offering constructive and candid advice and counsel. The letter should include strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate. Both the Department’s written assessment of the faculty member and the chair’s letter must be circulated to all tenured faculty who participated in the meeting before being officially communicated to the untenured faculty member. In cases of differing assessments the Chair will attempt to resolve conflicting evaluations in a way that both advises the faculty member of those areas where his or her record is open to question and provides candid and clear advice about aspects of performance that need improvement. The Department Chair will provide both the Dean of the college and the faculty member with a copy of the Department’s written assessment of his or her performance and letter of review and advice. Probationary faculty members will meet annually with the Chair to discuss their annual reviews and future plans. If they choose, they may respond in writing to any part of the review.

l. When the chair recommends non-renewal, the case must be forwarded to the college for review, and the dean makes the final decision.

m. If the Dean agrees with a negative recommendation from the Chair, the probationary faculty will be informed of University appeal procedures (see Section VII of this document) according to the standards of notice set forth in faculty rule 3335-6-08 and in keeping with instructions from the Office of Academic Affairs. All such letters must be approved by the Dean or his/her representative in advance of being sent and shall supply to the faculty member the reasons for non-renewal. In the case of a negative decision, the appointment of the probationary faculty member will not be renewed beyond the succeeding academic year.

n. If during an annual review the Department determines by a two-thirds vote in a confidential written ballot that an assistant professor should be put up for promotion and tenure before his or her probationary term is completed, the Chair will invite that assistant professor to submit his or her dossier to the Promotion and Tenure Committee for review and evaluation in accord with Sect. VI.B.3 below.

2. FOURTH YEAR REVIEW

The fourth year review of probationary tenure-track faculty has the same purposes as any other annual review but the procedures are the same as those of the sixth year (mandatory) review for tenure, with the following three exceptions: (a) there are only two levels of review, the College and Department; (b) when the Dean agrees with the recommendation of Chair to reappoint, College committee review is optional; (c) external evaluations are optional.

Following the vote on the fourth-year review, the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee will submit to the Chair of the Department a letter in which the full Committee’s assessment of the probationary faculty member’s performance is articulated.
and discussed. The letter will also state the vote and the Committee’s recommendation. The Chair of the Department will prepare a separate evaluation of the probationary faculty member’s performance and an independent recommendation. On completion of the Departmental review, the probationary faculty member will be informed in writing that the Department evaluations are complete and that he or she may review them. The probationary faculty member has ten days from receipt of this notice to provide written comments on the Department evaluations for inclusion in the dossier. Should the probationary faculty member provide comments, the Department will have the opportunity to respond in writing to those comments. The two evaluations produced in the Department (those of the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee and of the Chair of the Department), along with any comments from the probationary faculty member and responses by the Department, will be forwarded to the Dean of the College, who must approve renewal of the appointment for a fifth year of employment.

3. EXCLUSION OF TIME FROM PROBATIONARY PERIODS
(Adapted from Faculty Rule 3335-6-03)

a. An untenured regular faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period in increments of one year to reflect the care-giving responsibilities associated with the birth of a child or adoption of a child under age 6. This exclusion is granted automatically after the Chair has informed the Office of Academic Affairs of the birth of a child or of the adoption of a child under age 6, unless they are prohibited by paragraphs (c.) or (d.) of this rule. The maximum amount of time that can be excluded from the probationary period for the birth of a child or adoption of a child under age 6 is one year. The probationary faculty member may choose to decline the one-year exclusion of time from the probationary period by so informing the Departmental chair, the dean and the Office of Academic Affairs in writing before August 1 of the new mandatory review year following granting of the declination.

b. A probationary faculty member may apply to exclude time from the probationary period in increments of one year because of personal illness, care of a seriously ill or injured person, an unpaid leave of absence, or factors beyond the faculty member's control that hinder the performance of the usual range of duties associated with being a successful University faculty member, i.e., teaching, scholarship, and service. Requests to exclude time from the probationary period made under the terms of this paragraph must be submitted in writing to the Chair of the Department. Requests shall be reviewed by a meeting of the tenured faculty, which shall advise the Department Chair regarding their appropriateness. Such requests require approval by the Department Chair, Dean, and Provost. A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any of these reasons must be made prior to the beginning of the year in which the mandatory review for tenure must occur. The extent to which the event leading to the request was beyond the faculty member's control, the extent to which it interfered with the faculty member's ability to be productive, and the faculty member's accomplishments up to the time of the request will be considered in the review of the request.
c. A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any reason will not be granted after a non-renewal notice has been issued, nor will previously approved requests to exclude time from the probationary period in any way limit the University's right not to renew a probationary appointment.

d. Except in extraordinary circumstances a maximum of three years can be excluded from the probationary period for any reason or combination of reasons for an instructor, assistant professor or associate professor. Exceptions require the approval of the tenure initiating unit Chair, Dean, and Executive Vice President and Provost.

e. Faculty members will be reviewed annually during their probationary periods regardless of whether time is excluded from that period for any of the above reasons, unless their absence from the campus during an excluded period makes conduct of such a review impractical.

f. For purposes of performance reviews of probationary faculty, the length of the probationary period is the actual number of years of employment at this University less any years of service excluded from the probationary period under the terms of this rule. Expectations for productivity during the probationary period cannot be increased as a consequence of exclusions of time granted under the terms of this rule.

C. ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

The Chair of the Department and the Full Professors shall review all Associate Professors annually in the spring. This annual review will encompass the faculty member’s performance in the areas of research, teaching, and service, and continuing development in each area. The Department Chair shall inform all Associate Professors in a timely fashion each year when the annual review will take place and request (1) the Annual Performance Report, an updated CV, and copies of SEI forms as stipulated in Sect. A above, and (2) documentation of continuing development. For the latter the faculty member may use the OAA dossier outline, which will be required for promotion to Full Professor. These materials will then be made available to those responsible for conducting the review; they may also seek such additional information as necessary and consult colleagues as necessary for a fair and thorough review. This annual review enables the Full Professors to communicate their expectations to Associate Professors and to evaluate their progress towards those expectations.

The Full Professors will elect one who has participated in the discussion to summarize their deliberations in a letter to the Chair. After the meeting the Chair will provide the faculty member with a written assessment of his or her performance and professional development, based upon and reflecting the discussion of the Full Professors. The Chair’s letter may take the form of an addendum to the letter from the tenured faculty or be a
formal letter. If the Chair’s assessment disagrees in essential details with the assessment written by the Full Professors, the Chair will explain his/her disagreement in a letter to them.

**D. FULL PROFESSORS**

Full Professors will submit the Annual Performance Report stipulated in Sect IV.A, above. The Chair will review these documents and other documents, as necessary, will consult members of the faculty as appropriate, and will use this information as the basis for an Annual Performance Review. The Chair will provide each faculty member with written feedback regarding his/her performance and future plans.

**E. RESPONSES**

A tenured member of the Department may request a meeting with the Chair in order to discuss his or her review, and may respond in writing to the performance evaluations. The response procedure for Probationary Faculty is outlined in Sect. IV.B.1, above.

**F. REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY**

1. Probationary faculty on regional campuses will be reviewed annually by the regional campus Dean/Director and by the tenured faculty and the Chair of the Department on the Columbus campus. The regional campus review, which focuses mainly on teaching and service, should take place first. The Dean/Director’s report of that review and a copy of the faculty member’s annual report will be forwarded to the Chair of the Department with a copy to the dean of the college. The Department review will focus on the candidate's scholarly work and on the appropriateness of course content and course standards, but will consider all aspects of his/her record. The Departmental Chair should give a written review to the faculty member and a copy to the regional campus dean/director. It is important that the chair of the Department and the regional campus dean/director be alert to any developing discrepancy for the probationary faculty member between the quality of teaching and service on the one hand and the quality and quantity of scholarly work on the other, in order to minimize the possibility that the regional campus and the Department may disagree on a tenure recommendation. When such discrepancies become apparent, the regional campus dean should seek appropriate means of addressing this problem with the faculty member and the Chair of the Department.

2. The annual reviews of tenured regional campus faculty are conducted by the regional campus Dean/Director according to policies set forth on the OAA Website. A copy of the Dean/Director's review letter should be sent to the Department Chair. In addition, the
faculty member, the Chair, or the Dean/Director may request a meeting to discuss the review or any other concerns.
G. OTHER REVIEWS

If, at any time during the year, the Chair finds it necessary to consider the contractual arrangements or continuation of service of any instructor, assistant professor, or associate professor, including tenure and/or promotion, he/she shall so inform a committee of all full professors in the Department. If at any time there are fewer than three full professors, the Chair will ask the Dean to appoint the requisite number of full professors from elsewhere in the College of Humanities. This committee shall return a recommendation to the Chair of the Department.

V. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS

A. COLUMBUS CAMPUS FACULTY

1. CRITERIA

The annual performance review described in Sect. IV.A-C. will serve as the basis for the Chair's annual salary recommendations, which may be included in the written evaluation, which the Chair shall provide to each Department member. Unless the President or the Dean directs otherwise, all money made available to the Department for annual increments is distributed on the basis of merit in the categories of scholarship, teaching, and service as measured with reference to the Department’s mission (Sect. II, above). While quantitative measures are always useful, they will never be the sole criterion by which performance is measured. Merit in scholarship may be determined by such quantitative indicators as the number and scope of publications, but must also be qualified by the standing of the publisher, journals, and professional conferences that serve as outlets for scholarship, the anonymous evaluations provided by the process of peer review, professional awards, prizes and recognition for work done, and finally the review committee’s and the Chair’s own judgment regarding the quality and impact of the scholarship. Merit in teaching should consider the number and difficulty of courses and independent studies taught, curricular innovation, development of teaching materials, direction of papers, theses, or dissertations, recruitment, advisement, and examination of majors and graduate students, as well as student evaluations and SEI scores and peer reviews as specified in Sect IV.A.2 above. Merit in service is reflected in committee and administrative service, and by such qualitative indicators as visibility as editors, members of editorial boards, or leaders in professional societies, and exceptional service on Departmental, College, or University committees. In making salary recommendations to the Dean, the Chair will normally consider only the previous year's performance of individual faculty; he or she will never consider promises of forthcoming performance, but may take into account the appropriateness of the salary level to the individual’s
overall performance over several years. The Dean shall determine the amount of incremental money made available to the Department, and the Chair shall discuss salary recommendations with the Dean. When they have agreed on the salary recommendations the Dean will forward his/her recommendations to the Provost's office for concurrence. Final responsibility for all salary and contractual agreements rests with the Board of Trustees.

2. PROCEDURES

The annual salary review will be based on the Annual Performance Review discussed in Sect. IV, above. In addition to the Annual Performance Report and supplementary materials submitted for the annual performance review faculty are invited to inform the chair of any reasons for considering past performance or the general appropriateness of current salary to performance. In making salary recommendations, the Chair will review this and other information as necessary and will be advised by a Salary Advisory Committee consisting of three faculty members chosen by vote at a meeting of the faculty. The committee shall consist of one representative of each rank, unless all members of a rank decline to serve. At least one new member of the Salary Review Committee will be elected each year to replace a member whose service is completed.

B. REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY

Each of the regional campuses has its own resources for salary increases for its faculty. The regional campus Dean or Director must consult with the Department Chair before recommending salaries for the regional faculty.

VI. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE, AND FOR PROMOTION

A. CRITERIA:

1. PROMOTION FROM INSTRUCTOR TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

To be eligible for promotion from instructor to assistant professor, the candidate must have a Ph.D. degree and have demonstrated potential for significant published contributions to scholarship in his/her field and ability as an effective teacher in the Department of Greek and Latin.
2. PROMOTION FROM ASSISTANT TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE

A candidate for promotion with tenure is expected to have a research record that demonstrates clear distinction in scholarship, as is appropriate to faculty at a major research institution. The candidate must present a significant body of scholarship in his/her field. He or she must show significant achievements that will have an impact on scholarly discussion and demonstrate the ability to undertake sustained and continuing original work. Typically this will take the form of a finished book, published or under final board-approved contract and in production with a quality press, as well as other evidence of quality in scholarship, such as published articles, invited book chapters, conference papers, invitations to conferences, and the winning of grants in national and international competitions.

There must also be evidence that the assistant professor will continue to make original and significant scholarly contributions in the future. This is most easily provided by a consistent record of productivity and a well-articulated research agenda. In addition, the assistant professor must have demonstrated excellence as a teacher of graduates and undergraduates. Typically, an assistant professor in Classics is not and should not be asked to serve on many committees; nevertheless, he or she should have established a record of good Departmental citizenship through a willingness to serve when asked and conscientious performance. While it is recognized that some faculty are stronger in one area than in another, it is nevertheless the case that in the Department of Greek and Latin no activity contributes as much to the Departmental mission as research. Consequently, it is the case that extraordinary scholarship may compensate for an ordinary record in teaching, but extraordinary teaching must be accompanied by a strong record of scholarship. On the other hand, the Department’s teaching mission cannot be overlooked, and even extraordinary scholarship cannot compensate for poor teaching. These criteria and the procedures for evaluating performance are further elaborated in other paragraphs of this section.

3. PROMOTION TO RANK OF PROFESSOR

The Department of Greek and Latin expects an individual ready for promotion to professor to be a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. While individuals seeking promotion are assessed only in regard to their assigned responsibilities, exceptional performance in these assignments is required. To be eligible for promotion to professor, a faculty member must have made outstanding scholarly contributions to his or her area of expertise, contributions that have secured him or her a national or international reputation for intellectual eminence in his or her field. It is expected that the faculty member will have a second body of scholarship that represents a continuing and strong record of publications since promotion to the associate professor rank. It is further required that there be strong evidence that the scholar’s work has had a major impact on his or her field. Typically, evidence will include a second book,
published or in production with a quality press, and a series of refereed journal articles, book chapters, edited works, conference papers, and book reviews beyond those presented for tenure, as well as national and international grants and fellowships, and invitations to speak at prestigious conferences and universities, to contribute to international publications, and to be a visiting professor on other campuses. There must be evidence not only of continuous past accomplishment, but of a strong ongoing scholarly agenda that predicts continued eminence in the field. In addition, he or she must have demonstrated continued excellence as a teacher of graduates and undergraduates, and must have an excellent record of service to the Department, University, and scholarly community. These criteria and the procedures for evaluating performance are further elaborated in other paragraphs of this section.

4. PROMOTION OF REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY

Expectations for regional campus faculty differ somewhat from those for faculty on the Columbus campus. The primary function of the regional campuses is to provide high quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities. The relative emphasis on teaching and service expected of regional campus faculty will therefore ordinarily be greater. The Department expects regional campus faculty to establish a program of high quality scholarship. The Department recognizes, however, that the greater teaching and service commitments of regional campus faculty require a different set of expectations. The judgment whether a particular body of work meets Departmental standards for tenure and/or promotion will take into consideration the regional campuses’ different mission, higher teaching expectations and lesser access to research resources. Given these considerations, a minimal reasonable expectation for regional campus faculty is the maintenance of a clear and active agenda of research that regularly produces both small notes of a scholarly nature and larger articles while aiming eventually at the completion of a substantial publication.

B. PROCEDURES

1. THE PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEES

a. The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consist of all tenured associate and full professors. Reviews for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure shall be considered by the entire Promotion and Tenure Committee. Reviews for promotion to Full Professor shall be considered by the Senior Promotion and Tenure Committee, which shall consist of all tenured Full Professors. Reviews for tenure alone shall be considered by a committee consisting of all tenured professors at the same or higher rank.
b. The Chair of the Department shall appoint a Promotion and Tenure Chair from among the members of the committee at a level appropriate for the cases that will come before the committee in a given year. The Chair may appoint both a full professor for promotion-to-full-professor cases and another full professor or an associate professor for promotion-to-associate-professor cases in a year when the number of cases at both levels creates an unfair burden for a single Promotion and Tenure Chair. The appropriate Promotion and Tenure Chair will serve as the channel of official communication between the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the candidate.

c. Faculty members with a familial or comparable relationship with a candidate shall not participate in the review of that candidate. In addition, a close professional relationship may give rise to a conflict of interest. To adjudicate these cases, the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will ask before any deliberations begin if conflict of interest is grounds for exclusion of any faculty member who has not voluntarily excluded him or herself from the deliberations. The Committee will vote on any disputed cases and a majority opinion will prevail.

d. Prior to the beginning of any review the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will appoint a Procedures Oversight Designee who will be responsible for monitoring the promotion and tenure process to assure that reviews are procedurally correct and that reviews of members of underrepresented groups are free of bias.

2. INITIATION OF REVIEWS

a. A mandatory review for promotion and/or tenure is initiated by the Chair of the Department in accord with the timetable stated in the individual’s letter of offer of a position. A non-mandatory review may be initiated either by the Chair or by a faculty member.

b. A faculty member requesting a non-mandatory review shall inform the Chair in writing by the first day of the Spring quarter preceding the academic year in which the review is to occur and shall submit detailed statements and complete documentation of his or her research, teaching, and service to the appropriate Promotion and Tenure Committee at a time determined by the Chair of the committee. It is recommended that this documentation be presented in the format required for the formal review as stipulated in VI.C. The appropriate Promotion and Tenure Committee will review these materials and evaluate the request. A two-thirds vote, taken by written confidential ballot, will constitute a positive recommendation to the Chair of the Department.

c. The Department Chair will be a participating, but non-voting member during the deliberations of the appropriate Promotion and Tenure Committee. The recommendation of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will be advisory to the Department Chair and will be communicated in writing by the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Upon receiving the recommendation of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Chair
may authorize a formal review or may decline to put the applicant forth, if the candidate’s accomplishments are judged not to warrant such a review. The Chair will inform the applicant in writing of his or her decision. In no case may an associate professor be denied formal promotion review for more than three consecutive years. In cases where the Department Chair determines not to follow the recommendation of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, he or she will communicate that decision and its rationale in writing to all members of the appropriate Promotion and Tenure Committee.

d. In addition to considering any applications from faculty for a non-mandatory review, the Chair will consult in the spring with the relevant Promotion and Tenure Committees to determine whether any Columbus or regional campus faculty that have not applied or that are not subject to mandatory review might be nominated. For probationary faculty and Associate Professors on the Columbus campus this consultation will normally take place in connection with the annual review. The relevant committee may consult past Annual Performance Report, SEIs, Teaching Evaluation Committee evaluations and summaries, and peer reviews, and may request additional materials from the candidate, such as summaries of research accomplishments since the last promotion, classes taught in the last five years, and anything else deemed necessary by the Chair or Promotion and Tenure Committee. The vote will be taken by written, confidential ballot. A positive vote of 2/3 of the tenured faculty will be considered a positive recommendation to the Chair of the Department to proceed with the review.

3. THE REVIEW PROCESS

a. Before the end of the spring quarter the Chair will instruct any faculty member coming up for a mandatory or non-mandatory review in the following year to compile a complete dossier in accord with the specifications of VLC and the current requirements of the OAA. The material will be submitted in notebook format following the OAA outline. This notebook, with the addition of internal and external letters, will constitute the candidate’s dossier. The Department Chair and the Committee on Promotion and Tenure may solicit and place in the dossier additional information that they consider relevant.

b. The Department Chair and the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will collaborate in soliciting outside letters of evaluation in accord with the current requirements of the OAA and will have the letters available in time for the review in the autumn quarter.

c. The appropriate Promotion and Tenure Committee (consisting of all eligible faculty) under the direction of the Promotion and Tenure Chair will systematically review the candidate's dossier describing accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service. Particular and specific evaluation will be made in each of these categories. The vote will be taken by written, confidential ballot. Individuals not physically present for promotion and tenure discussions must participate in the discussion via conference call in order to cast a ballot. A positive vote of 2/3 of the tenured faculty will be considered a positive recommendation to the Chair of the Department. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure
Committee will then write a letter to the Departmental Chair summarizing the deliberations (including the dissenting opinions, if they exist) and recording the vote.

d. The Department Chair will be a participating but non-voting member during the deliberations of the appropriate faculty body. Under normal circumstances, the Departmental Chair, advised by the appropriate Promotion and Tenure Committee, makes all recommendations regarding promotion and tenure. The reports of the Promotion and Tenure Committees are advisory to the Chair and in the case of disagreement must include dissenting opinions, in the form of a summary acceptable to the dissenter. In his/her recommendation to the Dean, the Departmental Chair will record the numerical vote on the candidate's case and the faculty's assessment of the quality, effectiveness, and significance of the candidate's record in scholarship, teaching, and service. The report of the Chair must reflect the pros and cons of a contested case. If the Chair's recommendation differs from the faculty's vote, he/she shall explain his/her disagreements with the faculty in writing before communicating a recommendation to the Dean of the College.

e. The Chair shall prepare a written assessment of the case and recommendation for the Dean. The Chair's assessment, as well as the report of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure, shall be included in the candidate's dossier. When these documents are completed, the Chair will so notify the candidate in writing. The candidate may request a copy of both documents and may provide the Department Chair with written comments on the Departmental review for inclusion in the dossier within ten calendar days of notification of the completion of the review. The Committee on Promotion and Tenure and/or Chair may provide written responses to the candidate's comments for inclusion in the dossier. Only one iteration of comments on the Departmental level review is permitted.

f. The Department Chair shall forward the dossier with all internal and external evaluations, candidate comments on the Departmental review, and Promotion and Tenure Committee and/or Chair responses to those comments, if any, to the Dean of the College.

g. Only the candidate may stop any review for promotion and tenure once external letters of evaluation have been sought. The candidate may withdraw from review at any stage of the process by so informing the Department Chair in writing. If the review process has moved beyond the Department, the Department Chair shall inform the Dean or the Provost, as relevant, of the candidate's withdrawal. Withdrawal from the mandatory tenure review during the final probationary year means that tenure will not be granted.

h. The Chair of the Department is responsible for informing the candidate in writing of the Provost's final decision (if negative) or recommendation to the Board of Trustees (if positive).
4. PROCEDURES: PROMOTION AND TENURE, AND PROMOTION OF REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY

Except when the review is a mandatory review for tenure, the Department determines which faculty members will be reviewed for possible promotion and tenure or for promotion. The determination may be made upon request of a faculty member or it may be initiated by the Committee on Promotion and Tenure. If a regional campus faculty member is to be reviewed, the Department Chair will so notify the faculty member, with a copy to the Dean/Director of the regional campus. The Dean/Director will initiate a review by the regional campus faculty according to the procedures established on the campus. This review focuses mainly on teaching and service. The regional campus dean/director forwards the report of this review, and a recommendation to the Chair of the Department, for inclusion in the candidate's dossier and for the guidance of the Department's Committee on Promotion and Tenure. From this point the review follows the same course as all promotion and tenure reviews with two exceptions:

a. The Chair of the Department will send to the Dean/Director copies of the peer evaluations, of the Departmental committee’s report and of the Chair’s recommendation.

b. If the recommendations of the regional campus dean/director and the Chair of the Department differ, the Dean of the College of Humanities will consult with both before making a recommendation.

5. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION OF FACULTY WITH JOINT APPOINTMENTS

In the case of a faculty member who has a joint appointment but whose tenure-initiating unit is the Department of Greek and Latin, the Department of Greek and Latin and the other unit will conduct separate promotion and tenure evaluations. The candidate will place in his/her dossier the teaching evaluations for courses taught in each unit. The Department of Greek and Latin and the other unit will consult about the selection of external evaluators, with the Department of Greek and Latin taking the lead in recruiting the reviewers. The Department of Greek and Latin will share the candidate's dossier with the other unit. The other unit will be asked to make its promotion review committee's document available to the Departmental Committee on Promotion and Tenure and to the Chair of the Department of Greek and Latin. The report of the Department's Committee on Promotion and Tenure will be made available to the committee on promotion and tenure in the other unit. The Chair of the Department and the chair or director of the other unit will each report to the Dean of the College of Humanities, and will each reference the other unit's review document in his/her report.

C. DOCUMENTATION FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE, AND FOR PROMOTION

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs
08/16/07
1. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

1. The candidate for tenure and/or promotion shall have primary responsibility for preparing, according to Office of Academic Affairs guidelines, a dossier in notebook format, documenting his/her accomplishments. The Chair of the Department or of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will be responsible for verifying in writing the accuracy of citations to the candidate’s published work and all other aspects of his or her dossier.

2. The Department Chair or his/her designee (normally the chair of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure) shall be responsible for gathering internal evidence from students and peers as appropriate regarding the quality and significance of scholarship, the quality and effectiveness of teaching as stipulated in Sect IV.A.2, and of the quality and effectiveness of service. The Department Chair or his/her designee (normally the chair of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure) shall also be responsible for obtaining letters from external evaluators and from other units at this University in which the candidate has appointment or substantial professional involvement, whether compensated or not. All solicited letters that are received must be included in the dossier. Unsolicited letters of evaluation or letters of evaluation solicited by anyone other than the Department Chair or his/her designee are not considered in promotion and tenure review at any time during the review process.

3. Documentation of every promotion and tenure or promotion case will, where appropriate, include evidence of excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service.

a. Excellence in Teaching.

It is not enough that a teacher conscientiously meets his or her obligations and successfully conveys knowledge. The Department of Greek and Latin expects clear evidence of an effective interest in students, stimulation of student interest in the subject matter, high standards of intellectual performance and, where appropriate, the use of up-to-date scholarship in teaching. Evaluation of a candidate's performance as a teacher will be based on the widest possible range of evidence. It will include (1) evidence solicited by the Department Chair or by the Chair of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure, and (2) evidence offered by the candidate.

Evidence-presented to the Committee on Promotion and Tenure regarding teaching will normally include the following:

(a) Student evaluations for all courses for all the probationary years or, in the case of promotion from associate to full professor, student evaluations for courses taught since the last promotion. See above IV.A.2.b(1).
(b) Syllabi, exams, and course assignments for all courses (100-900 levels) for all the probationary years or, in the case of promotion from associate to full professor, for all courses taught since the last promotion or in the last five years (whichever is less).

(c) A brief written statement by the candidate of his/her teaching objectives, methods, and accomplishments. This document may include a statement of the candidate's approach to and goals for teaching, a self-assessment, and a description of specific strategies for improvement of teaching. The candidate may want to call attention to innovations, improvements, and adjustments made in courses over time.

(d) Peer evaluations of a range of courses as stipulated in Sect. IV.2.a(2)-(3).

(e) Other data that the Department Chair, the Committee on Promotion and Tenure, or the candidate may judge pertinent to an evaluation of the candidate's performance in the area of teaching. This additional data might include:

--Explanations or demonstrations of especially successful or innovative teaching techniques;

--Explanations of special teaching accomplishments, awards, and the like;

--Information regarding his/her publication of teaching materials and articles on teaching techniques.

--Descriptions of technical innovations and use of new technology in preparing course material, delivering information, setting learning tasks and evaluating performance.

--Team teaching and interdisciplinary work that brings research in Greek and Latin into meaningful interaction with other areas of research and instruction in the College and University.

b. Excellence in Scholarship.

Scholarly excellence entails significant and original contributions to published scholarship in the candidate's field of specialization. Such contributions include the following: contributions that offer new knowledge; information that aids colleagues in the field in carrying forward their own research; invention or exploration of new fields of inquiry; application of new concepts or concepts from other disciplines to traditional areas of research; and in general any application or interpretation of concepts that advance understanding and knowledge in the candidate’s field.
The usual media for scholarly contributions are books, articles in recognized, refereed journals or prestigious invitations to contribute to publications that advance rather than summarize knowledge and understanding, and presentations at scholarly meetings.

The candidate's achievements and the likelihood of further long-term scholarly accomplishments will be evaluated on the basis of the widest possible range of evidence, including both evidence offered by the candidate and that solicited by the Department Chair and the Chair of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure. Such evidence will normally include:

(1) Letters from external evaluators. The Chair of the Department or his/her designee shall be responsible for obtaining at least five letters from distinguished persons in the candidate’s field who are either at peer or better universities or, if not in academia, are otherwise in a position to critically evaluate the faculty member’s scholarly work. The Chair or his/her designee will generate a lengthy list of potential evaluators. The faculty member under review will be shown this list and invited to augment it with a few names of individuals who meet the criteria for objective, credible evaluators. Unless the candidate’s names do not meet such criteria, the Department will make every reasonable effort to obtain at least one letter from someone suggested by the candidate. The candidate will also be allowed to remove no more than two names from the list generated by the Department. The Chair or his/her designee will submit the list of potential evaluators to the Dean of the College for his approval before proceeding to solicit evaluations. At least three months before completed evaluations are needed, the person designated by the Department to solicit external evaluations will send out letters asking persons if they are willing to evaluate the candidate. This letter will set forth expectation, anticipated due dates, and the realities of the Public Records Act. A self-addressed postcard will be enclosed on which the invitee can respond by a given date whether he or she will write an evaluation. Those agreeing to write should then be sent all needed materials and asked to supply a CV. When the external evaluations arrive, they shall be included in the candidate's dossier and thereby made available to the Committee on Promotion and Tenure, which may also consult the record of correspondence with the external evaluators. External evaluations are intended to aid the independent professional judgment of faculty involved in tenure and promotion decisions, and in no case will to substitute for the considered judgment of the appropriate Committee on Promotion and Tenure or the Departmental Chair.

(2) Publications. In evaluating publications and manuscripts, the committee will consider the nature of each publication, the type of refereeing, the reputation of a publisher or journal, and any other external measure, but will not allow extrinsic concerns to modify their scholarly judgment regarding the intrinsic merit of the publication. Ordinarily, the Committee will consider monographic or interpretive publications based upon original research as providing primary evidence of scholarly development rather than textbooks or source books conceived primarily for elementary undergraduate instruction, though the development of materials for use with new technologies may serve as evidence insofar as it entails original research. The Departmental Chair or Chair of the Committee may
solicit -- and the candidate may present -- published reviews from scholars in the field. The candidate may be asked to offer or may present the reports of anonymous referees.

(3) Scholarly activity at professional meetings. The quality of the contributions will be the primary consideration in evaluating this activity. Papers, formal commentaries on the papers of others, and participation in colloquia will be evaluated. It is part of the responsibility of senior colleagues to attend the presentations and colloquia of junior colleagues; their evaluations should be placed in writing in the candidates file. Again, the Committee may seek and the candidate may present evaluations from scholars in the field.

(4) Reviews of scholarly works for journals. The scholarship of the reviews and the nature of the journals in which they appear will be appraised.

(5) Scholarly recognition in the form of requests to serve on editorial boards of scholarly journals, to chair sessions at professional meetings and conventions or to serve on program committees for such meetings, to speak at other institutions or to assume the post of visiting professor.

(6) Recognition in the form of prizes, awards, grants, or fellowships based on scholarly esteem and reputation.

(7) Any other evidence which the candidate, the Department Chair or the senior faculty believe pertinent to the candidate’s development as a scholar. The candidate may include in his/her dossier any manuscripts of articles or papers, whether they have been published or not.

c. Excellence in Service

A member of the Department of Greek and Latin at The Ohio State University has an obligation to use his/her talents to collaborate effectively with colleagues for the betterment of the Department, the College, the University, and the larger community. A faculty member's profile of service may vary over time. The Committee on Promotion and Tenure may consider any information that the candidate, the Department Chair, or the Committee considers pertinent to a full evaluation of the candidate's ability to render effective service to these communities, including evidence relating to the quality and the quantity of such service. The information may include the number of committee meetings attended, specific projects undertaken, administrative responsibilities assumed, and individual, community or professional contributions. The Department Chair, the Committee or the candidate may solicit written assessments of a candidate's service from those who are in a position to provide them. Other information may include:

a) Service on Department, College, and University committees.
b) Service as an adviser to graduate and undergraduate students.

c) Presentations made in the classes of others, contributions to University publications, lectures to the Departmental faculty and similar activities.

d) Activities in the University community and in the community outside the University based on and related to one's professional training and professional concerns.

e) Activity in the national/international scholarly community and its institutions.

VII. APPEALS

It is the policy of the Ohio State University to make decisions regarding the renewal of probationary appointments and promotion and tenure in accordance with the standards, criteria, policies, and procedures stated in the Faculty Rules, supplemented by additional written standards, criteria, policies, and procedures established by tenure initiating units and colleges. If a candidate believes that a non-renewal decision or negative promotion and tenure decision has been made in violation of this policy and therefore alleges that it was made improperly, the candidate may appeal that decision. Procedures for appealing a decision based on an allegation of improper evaluation are described in rule 3335-5-05 of the Administrative Code. Appeals may also be based on allegations of discrimination. Such complaints should be presented in writing to the Office of Consulting Services in the Office of Human Resources with a copy to the Office of Academic Affairs within thirty days after a faculty member has been notified of the decision the faculty member wishes to challenge. A written statement of the intent to appeal may be submitted within this thirty-day period and the full complaint submitted within a reasonable period thereafter.

VIII. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS

Every effort should be made to consider new information about a candidate's performance before a final decision is made if the new information becomes available before a decision is rendered. In rare instances, the Department may petition the Dean to conduct a seventh-year review for an assistant professor who has been denied promotion and tenure. Both the eligible faculty of the Department and the Chair must approve proceeding with a petition for a seventh-year review. The petition must provide documentation of substantial new information regarding the candidate's performance that is germane to the reasons for the original negative decision. Petitions for seventh-year reviews must be initiated before the beginning of the last year of employment because the seventh-year review, if approved, would take place during the regular University review cycle of the assistant professor's seventh and last year of employment.
If the Dean concurs with the Department's petition, the Dean shall in turn petition the Provost for permission to conduct a seventh-year review. If the Provost approves the request, a new review will be conducted equivalent to the one that resulted in the non-renewal of the appointment. The conduct of a seventh-year review does not presume a positive outcome. In addition, should the new review result in a negative decision, the faculty member's last day of employment is that stated in the letter of non-renewal issued following the original negative decision.

A faculty member may not request a seventh-year review, appeal the denial of a seventh-year review petition initiated by his or her Department, or appeal a negative decision following a seventh-year review, since the faculty member has already been notified that tenure has been denied at the conclusion of the sixth-year review.

IX. REVISION OF RULES

The Chair may ask the Committee on Promotion and Tenure or an ad hoc committee to recommend alterations, deletions, and additions to this document. Such recommendations shall be discussed and voted on by the faculty in meeting.