

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE
CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

DEPARTMENT OF ARTS ADMINISTRATION, EDUCATION AND POLICY

College of Arts and Sciences

The Ohio State University

Revised February 2018
Approved by Department Faculty 02/05/18
OAA approved 5-15-18

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ARTS ADMINISTRATION, EDUCATION AND POLICY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	PREAMBLE	4
2.	DEPARTMENT MISSION	5
3.	DEFINITIONS	6
3.1	Committee of Eligible Faculty	6
3.2	Quorum	6
3.3	Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty	7
4.	APPOINTMENTS	7
4.1	Criteria	7
4.1.1	Tenure Track Faculty	7
4.1.2	Tenure Track Faculty at Regional Campuses	9
4.1.3	Associated Faculty.....	9
4.1.4	Courtesy Appointments.....	9
4.2	Procedures	9
4.2.1	Tenure Track Faculty	10
4.2.2	Tenure Track Faculty at Regional Campuses	12
4.2.3	Associated Faculty.....	12
4.2.4	Courtesy Appointments.....	12
5.	ANNUAL REVIEWS PROCEDURES	12
5.1	Probationary Tenure Track Faculty	13
5.1.1	Faculty at a Regional Campus	14
5.1.2	Fourth-Year Review	14
5.1.3	Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period	14
5.2	Tenured Faculty	14
5.3	Tenured Faculty at a Regional Campus	15
6.	MERIT SALARY INCREASES	16
6.1	Criteria	16
6.2	Procedures	17
6.3	Documentation	18
7.	PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS	18
7.1	Criteria	19
7.1.1	Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure	19
7.1.2	Promotion to Professor	26
7.1.3	Faculty at a Regional Campus	27
7.2	Procedures	28
7.2.1	Tenure Track Faculty	28
7.2.2	Tenure Track Faculty at a Regional Campus	30
7.3	Documentation	32
7.3.1	Scholarship.....	32

7.3.2	Teaching.....	32
7.3.3	Service	32
8.	APPEALS	33
9.	SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS	33
10.	APPENDICES-TEACHING EVALUATION POLICY AND PROCEDURES	33

1. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the [Rules of the University Faculty](#), the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the [Policy and Procedures Handbook](#), and other policies and procedures of the College and University to which the Department and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the Department will follow the 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 five years on the appointment or reappointment of the Department Chair.

The Dean of the College and the Office of Academic Affairs must approve this document before it may be implemented. It sets forth the Department's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the College and University, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the Dean and the Office of Academic Affairs accept the mission and criteria of the Department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to Departmental mission and criteria.

The faculty and administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01, <https://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html> 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 (same link as above) and other standards specific to this Department and College; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.

Decisions considering appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the university's [policy on equal opportunity](#).

Program Descriptions

The Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy's programs promote understanding of the arts and visual culture for all students through a curriculum that is research-based, interdisciplinary, and intent on collaboration with communities both within and outside the University, state, and nation. We emphasize understanding of arts and culture, especially visual and other material culture, in a global, culturally diverse, and technological society. This content is explored through the following: pedagogical theory and practices; critical inquiry of historical and contemporary artworks; the analysis of public and educational policy in the arts and cultures; and inquiry in the philosophical, historical, and policy foundations of art education, arts

management, and cultural policy administration. Our curriculum includes attention to understanding multimedia technologies in cultural production, critique of policies, teaching, learning, assessment strategies, and awareness of comparative international practices.

The scope of the Department's undergraduate offerings includes general education courses in arts criticism and diversity and an art methods course for elementary classroom teachers. The Department offers a Bachelor of Art Education (BAE) degree program that provides undergraduate students with a well-rounded liberal arts education, intensive studies in visual culture, and significant preparatory course work in the theory, practices, and pedagogy of art education. The Department has taken the lead in the development of an undergraduate minor in entrepreneurship and the arts in collaboration with the Fisher College of Business. A new undergraduate Bachelor of Arts in Arts Management (BAAM) was implemented in the Fall Semester, 2012.

Graduate programs include courses for experienced teachers and graduate licensure students that lead to the MA degree (both on campus and online); the MA degree in arts policy and administration is carried out in collaboration with the John Glenn College of Public Affairs; Departmental specializations in museum education, art education and cultural policy and arts management are available to graduate students; the Department offers professional development for in-service teachers and school and arts administrators; and an array of doctoral research specializations leading to the PhD degree.

2. DEPARTMENT MISSION

The mission of the Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy is to critically engage cultural meaning through excellence in research, policy, teaching, and leadership that fosters social change and advances the public interest through the arts and visual culture.

The Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy prepares educators, researchers, administrators and policy makers for research and practice in the interdisciplinary field of art education through its integrated, multifaceted programs and collaborations within and outside the University. Key goals are to prepare students to lead through the arts, to function as a critical and informed citizenry, to advance the public interest with regard to opportunity, diversity, effective public policy, social justice, and creativity; to critically engage cultural meaning through excellence in research, policy, teaching, and leadership that fosters social change and advances the public interest through the arts and visual culture at the local, state, national and international levels in the areas of research, teaching and service.

3. DEFINITIONS

3.1 Committee of Eligible Faculty

The Committee of Eligible Faculty for appointment consists of all tenure track and tenured faculty whose TIU is the Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy.

Tenure-Track Faculty: The eligible faculty for appointment consists of all tenure-track faculty whose tenure resides in the department. For an appointment at senior rank, a second vote is taken by the faculty members eligible to vote on the rank under consideration.

The eligible faculty for senior rank new appointments and for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion reviews of tenure-track faculty consists of all tenured faculty of equal rank to (if reviewing appointments that will be lateral hires from another institution) or higher than the candidate whose tenure resides in the department excluding the Department Chair; the Dean and Assistant, Associate and Divisional Deans of the College; the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President.

For tenure reviews of probationary professors, eligible faculty are tenured professors (excluding the Department Chair, the Dean and Assistant and Associate Deans of the College; the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President) whose tenure resides in the Department.

Conflict of Interest: A conflict of interest exists when an eligible faculty member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close, interpersonal relations, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some way on the candidate's services, 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.

Minimum Composition: In the event that the Department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the Department Chair, after consulting with the Divisional Dean, will appoint one or more faculty members from another unit within the College for the review so that the minimum number of three can be reached.

3.2 Quorum

As per the College recommendations, the quorum is set as two thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the Department Chair has approved an off-campus assignment. Faculty

members who recuse themselves because of a conflict of interest are not counted when determining quorum.

3.3 Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters within the Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy, only **yes** and **no** votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to consider whether they are participating fully in the review process when abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter. Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted.

Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when two-thirds of the cast votes are positive.

Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal is secured when two-thirds of the votes are positive.

4. APPOINTMENTS

4.1 Criteria

The Department is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the Department. Important considerations include the individual's record to date 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 a way that will enhance their academic work and attract other outstanding faculty and students to the Department. No offer will be extended in the event that the search process does not yield one or more candidates who would enhance the quality of the Department. The search is cancelled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

4.1.1 Tenure Track Faculty

Appointments of tenure track and tenured faculty should be consistent with the mission of the Department and should enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the Department, as expressed in Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#).

Instructor:

Appointments at the rank of instructor are limited to three years and should normally be made only when the offered appointment is at that of assistant professor but the

appointee has not completed the required terminal degree at the onset of the appointment. When an instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the Department's eligible faculty, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked without a formal request for an extension of the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor:

Criteria for appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor should be consistent with the qualifications for an academic career in the discipline - an earned doctorate or other equivalent terminal degree - preferably with prior research, publication, and teaching experience, and be consistent with Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#).

Associate Professor and Professor:

Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the Department's criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at senior rank normally includes tenure. Appointments at senior rank that are not tenured have a 4-year probationary period. Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a senior rank and approved for tenure, but the University does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Education.

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 emphasis 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.

University rule [3335-6-03\(B\)](#) governs the probationary periods and duration of appointments for tenure-track faculty.

4.1.2 Tenure Track Faculty at Regional Campuses

The same criteria apply as Tenure Track Faculty (see 4.1.1 above).

4.1.3 Associated Faculty

Compensated associated faculty include lecturers and visiting faculty and they can be appointed for a period of up to three years.

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer: Candidates who are at least advanced Ph.D. students, either from within the Department or from other institutions, may be considered for temporary appointments to fill temporary teaching needs in the Department or regional campus. Appointment as a senior lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a doctorate or terminal degree in a field appropriate for the subject matter to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide high quality instruction; or a Master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience with documented high-quality performance. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion.

Visiting faculty: Appointments may not exceed three continuous years including individuals on leave from other academic institutions and temporary faculty. Visiting faculty appointments may be made at the Assistant, Associate or Professor ranks. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank they hold at their home institution. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure and promotion.

No-salary associated faculty: These include adjunct faculty and faculty with tenure-track titles at 0% FTE. They may also include visiting faculty. Criteria for no-salary appointments should include expectations for contributions to the Department. No-salary appointments are not warranted unless accompanied by substantial involvement in the academic work of the Department. Such appointments may be made for up to only one year at a time and thus require formal annual renewal by voting tenure track faculty if they are to be continued.

4.1.4 Courtesy Appointments

Courtesy appointments (i.e. no-salary joint appointments for tenure-track Ohio State faculty from other tenure initiating units) should be based on an expectation of the appointee's substantial involvement in the Department's teaching, research, and/or service programs; continuation of the appointments should reflect ongoing contribution. These can be for multiple years, with a review for continuation after three to five years.

4.2 Procedures

See the Office of Academic Affairs' [Policies and Procedures Handbook](https://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html) <https://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html> on the following topics:

- Recruitment of tenure-track, clinical, and research 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

4.2.1 Tenure Track Faculty

A national 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. The College must also approve a request to forego a national search. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the University policies set forth by the Office of Academic Affairs (see the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#)) and the College of Arts and Sciences.

This section provides information regarding search procedures leading to appointment of tenure track faculty.

Standing Departmental or ad hoc committees appointed by the Chair may request positions to address specific Departmental needs. Position requests may also arise in consequence of a long-range plan by faculty, from perceived special need opportunities, or from replacement needs. As described in the Pattern of Administration for the Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy, for each open faculty position, a Search Committee, comprised of three faculty members and one graduate student, will be appointed by the Department Chair after consultation with the Executive Committee, which is composed of the Chairs of the Undergraduate Committee (the Assistant Department Chair), the Graduate Studies Committee, a faculty member elected at large, and the Chair of the Eligible Faculty when determined necessary by the Department Chair. Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo inclusive hiring practices training available through the college or the [Office of Diversity and Inclusion](#). Implicit bias training, also strongly encouraged, is available through the [Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity](#).

After the need for the position has been determined and it has been approved by the Executive Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, the Search Committee Chair will be appointed by the Department Chair in consultation with the Executive Committee. The Chair of the Search Committee must be tenured. The Chair of the Search Committee appoints a Diversity Representative whose responsibility is to ensure as broad an applicant pool as possible, consistent with Department needs and standards and to review procedures to ensure that they are fair.

The Department Chair, in consultation with the Executive Committee, will draft a description of the position consistent with HR Policy 1.10 <http://hr.osu.edu/policy/policy110.pdf> and bring this to the faculty for approval either upon proposal to the College Dean or after approval for the search by the College Dean. The Chair will submit a Position Vacancy notice, with the position description,

through the Executive Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences to the Office of Human Resources /Classification and Compensation, develop the advertisement, and place it in the university Job Postings and in appropriate national publications, including publications that target underrepresented populations. Vigorous efforts to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates are required. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must advertise using at least one 30-day online ad in a national professional journal. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency ("green card"), and strict 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-specific nationally prominent professional journal.

After developing a mechanism for screening the pool of applicants including a means of checking references and determining the pool of candidates, the Search Committee invites a minimum of two finalists to campus for interviews and presentations. These finalists must be approved by the divisional dean and will include the divisional dean's review of the Faculty Search Diversity Recruitment Report. On-campus presentations are open to faculty and students, and the search committee solicits formal input from the faculty and students regarding their preferences among the slate of finalists. On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the Search Committee, graduate students, and Department Chair. In addition, all candidates make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their research and provide evidence of their ability to teach. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format. While on campus, candidates for tenure-track faculty positions must be interviewed by the Executive Dean, a divisional dean, or their designee. Applicant files will be made available for faculty review.

The Search Committee recommends a candidate or slate of candidates to the Chair and faculty, with a minimum of two candidates when possible. If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the Department Chair decides which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the Department Chair.

Potential appointment of a foreign national who lacks permanent residency must be discussed with the Office of International Affairs. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency status. The department will therefore be cautious

in making such appointments and vigilant in assuring that the appointee seeks residency status promptly and diligently.

4.2.2 Tenure Track Faculty at Regional Campuses

In the case of a tenure track position on a regional campus, the regional campus Dean or Director has primary responsibility for determining the need for a position and the position description, but should consult with and seek agreement with the Department Chair. The Chair of the Department and the regional campus Dean/Director will agree on a single search committee consisting of members of both units. Candidates should at a minimum, be interviewed by the regional Dean/Director, the Chair of the Department, the search committee and representatives of both faculties. Candidates will be evaluated on both campuses, with the faculty on the Columbus campus taking primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's record as a scholar. A decision to hire requires agreement on the part of the Chair of the Department and the regional Dean/Director. Negotiations with a candidate should not begin without such agreement and both the Chair of the Department and the Dean/Director of the regional campus must sign the letter of offer.

4.2.3 Associated Faculty

Searches for compensated associated faculty may be initiated at the request of individuals, a group of faculty, or at the recommendation of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. The Chair is responsible for making the appointment of compensated associated faculty after consultation with the faculty. No-salary associated faculty are appointed by the Chair after consultation with the faculty. The Chair, in conjunction with the faculty, will conduct an annual review of associated faculty to determine whether reappointment is appropriate. The review may consider the scholarly qualifications of the candidate, his or her teaching effectiveness, and/or the future needs of the Department.

4.2.4 Courtesy Appointments

The Chair, in conjunction with the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, will review and make decisions about the qualifications of a candidate seeking a no-salary appointment in the Department in relation to the needs of the Department. 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.

5. ANNUAL REVIEWS PROCEDURES

The Department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs Faculty Annual Review Policy (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>).

The annual reviews of every faculty member are based on expected performance in teaching, research, and service as set forth in the Department'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 the annual performance review of every faculty member is described under MERIT SALARY INCREASES below. This material must be submitted to the Department Chair by the end of the first week of Spring Semester.

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.

5.1 Probationary Tenure Track Faculty

Procedures for annual reviews of probationary tenure track faculty are consistent with Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#) C and G, as well as with Office of Academic Affairs policies.

At the time of appointment, probationary faculty members shall be provided with all pertinent documents detailing Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy, College of Arts and Sciences, 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.

In accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#) (C), (See Appendix I), probationary tenure-track faculty will be reviewed annually. The purpose of this review is to assess the performance of the faculty member in the three areas of research, teaching, and service and to form the basis for a decision on renewal of the appointment and possible merit salary increments for the upcoming year. The performance of each probationary faculty member is evaluated relative to the Department's published criteria for appointment, promotion, and tenure. Probationary faculty are required to submit an updated core dossier every year as part of their annual review.

If the Department Chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The Department Chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The Department Chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the Dean of the College. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments, if he or she chooses).

If the Department Chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) [<http://trustees.osu.edu>]) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the

dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

5.1.1 Faculty at a Regional Campus

Probationary faculty at a regional campus are reviewed annually by the regional campus Dean/Director and by 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 considers all aspects of the record, including teaching and service. The Department Chair will give a written review to the faculty member and a copy to the Dean or Director. It is important that the Chair of the Department and the regional campus Dean/Director be alerted to any developing discrepancy for the probationary faculty member between the quality of teaching and service on 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 might eventually disagree on a tenure recommendation. When such discrepancies become apparent, the regional campus Dean/Director should seek appropriate means of addressing the problem with the faculty member and the Chair of the Department.

5.1.2 Fourth-Year Review

In accordance with University Rule [3335-6-03](#)(3), fourth-year reviews follow exactly the same procedures as that prescribed below for sixth-year review including the comments process, with the exception that external letters of evaluation are not solicited, and the Executive Dean (not the Provost) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. Since renewal of appointment of a probationary assistant professor for the fifth year requires the approval of the Executive Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, this review is to be conducted during the Spring Semester.

5.1.3 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#) (D) provides for time to be excluded from the probationary period for birth or adoption of a child, personal illness, care of sick or injured person or other factors beyond a faculty member's control that significantly interfere with productivity.

5.2 Tenured Faculty

By the end of the first week of Spring Semester of each year, Annual Activity Reports following protocol for core dossier requirements will be required from all tenured faculty; this report will follow the outline of performance factors provided below as documentation for promotion and tenure. This report is used by the Chair to prepare the

Departmental annual activity report. This faculty activity report, student evaluations of teaching, and peer teaching reviews (when available) are used for the purposes of an annual review of tenure track and tenured faculty. Based on this evidence, the Department Chair writes an evaluation letter to each of the tenure track and tenured faculty members reviewed.

All faculty members must have a face-to-face meeting with the Department Chair as part of their annual review. At this meeting, the Chair will provide the faculty member with an assessment of his/her performance in the areas of research, teaching, and service, and s/he will be given the opportunity to respond in writing. Notification of salary for the upcoming year will be sent out in a separate letter when that information becomes available.

5.3 Tenured Faculty at a Regional Campus

The regional campus Dean/Director will conduct the annual reviews of tenured regional campus faculty. A copy of the Dean/Director's review letter should be sent to the Department Chair. In addition, the faculty member, the Dean/Director or the Chair may request a meeting to discuss the review or any other concerns.

Annual review of the probationary faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then moves to the department and proceeds as described above. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the Department Chair discusses the matter with the regional campus Dean/Director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

5.4 Associated Faculty

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The Department Chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. The Department Chair's recommendation on renewal of the appointment is final. If the recommendation is to renew, the Department Chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment are reviewed annually by the Department Chair, or designee. The Department Chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. No later than October 15 of the final year of the appointment, the Chair will decide whether or not to reappoint. The Department Chair's recommendation on reappointment is final.

6. MERIT SALARY INCREASES

6.1 Criteria

Except when the university dictates any type of across the board salary increase, all funds for annual salary increases are directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and assuring, to the extent possible given financial constraints, that salaries reflect the market and are internally equitable.

On occasion, one-time cash payments or other rewards, such as extra travel funds, are made to recognize non-continuing contributions that justify reward but do not justify permanent salary increases. Such payments/rewards are considered at the time of annual salary recommendations.

The criteria employed for determining recommendations for merit salary increases to Arts Administration, Education and Policy Department faculty are based on contributions in the areas of research, teaching, and service in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. The time frame for assessing performance will be the past 36 months, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity. Faculty with high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

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.

Research

Merit increases will be given as recognition of excellence in the realm of research and creative scholarly activity. Research and scholarship in our faculty are extremely diverse across the categories of Traditional, Public, and/or Creative Scholarship. It is the consensus of the Department that merit raises relative to publications/exhibits/performances/activities ought generally to occur at the date it occurs or is published or performed. However, increases for long-term projects might well be distributed over more than one year. In the case of book-length manuscripts, some recognition may be given at the time of acceptance, as well as the time of publication.

Evidence includes:

- Copies of all scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.

- Documentation of grants and contracts received.
- Other relevant documentation of scholarship as appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted).

Teaching

Merit increases will be given in recognition of excellence in teaching. Teaching activities in our faculty are extremely diverse with many highly individualized approaches. This diversity must be taken into account in assessing individual performance. Evidence includes:

Cumulative eSEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught.

Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details, including required number, included in Section X: Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching below)

Service

Merit increases will be given as recognition of excellence in the realm of service. We recognize service as an extremely individualized and varied activity. Service in the five areas will be considered: Departmental, College, University, community (local, State), and professional field (national, international).

6.2 Procedures

Decisions on the merit increase will be decided after evaluation of the Annual Activity Reports, student evaluations, and peer-teaching reviews have been assessed. Accomplishments of the twelve-month period covered by the Annual Activity Report will form the basis for the annual review and merit salary allocation, although these will be considered in the context of the faculty member's record during the previous three years. The Chair may consider the appropriateness of the salary level to the individual's overall record and make adjustments to address salary equity issues.

The Chair will then recommend annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the Executive Dean, who may modify these recommendations.

Faculty members who wish to discuss dissatisfaction with their salary increase with the Chair should be prepared to explain how their salary (rather than the increase) is inappropriately low, since increases are solely a means to the end of an optimal distribution of salaries.

Regional campus Deans/Directors have responsibility for recommending to the Provost increases for regional campus faculty. Each Dean/Director will consult with the Department Chair before making these recommendations.

6.3 Documentation

The annual performance review of every faculty member requires that all documentation described below, including the two summary documents, be submitted to the Department Chair no later than the specific date in Spring term as designated by the Department Chair.

- Updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place;
- Updated Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), Volume 3;
- Additional materials as requested by the Department Chair.

Any published materials presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or other final form that documents actual publication. An author's manuscript does not document publication.

Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the annual review, as such solicitation places its recipient in an awkward position and produces a result that is unlikely to be candid.

The time period covered by the documentation described below is the calendar year.

7. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 <https://trustees.osu.edu/index.php?q=rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html>

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.

7.1 Criteria

7.1.1 Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) (C) provides the following general criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure:

The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a scholar, and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the University.

Tenure is not awarded below the rank of Associate Professor at The Ohio State University.

In accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) (D) the granting of promotion and tenure is to be based on convincing evidence of the candidate's achievement over the probationary period of excellence in teaching, scholarship and service in fields relevant to the Department's Academic Mission, as well as on indications of future potential for high-quality professional development. The Department expects exceptional contributions in scholarship and teaching and an indication that the candidate will achieve excellence in service in the future. Excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service are moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the [American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

In cases of promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, the review for tenure and promotion during the final year of the probationary period is mandatory and must take place. Prior to that, a faculty member may ask to be considered for non-mandatory promotion and tenure review at any time. A candidate may withdraw from review at any stage in the process by making a written request to that effect to the Chair of the Department. Withdrawal from the mandatory tenure review during the final probationary year means that tenure will not be granted and the ending date of the appointment will be at the end of the succeeding academic year.

The Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy accounts for and encourages flexibility in faculty production, in keeping with the university's statement of context for tenure and promotion reviews: "...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.”

Essentially, in addition to what we are calling “Traditional” Research, Teaching and Service expectations, we also qualify the “Public Sphere” and “Creative Activities” as significant to the discovery and transmission of knowledge in our department’s fields of study and therefore in considering qualification for tenure and promotion. A candidate for promotion and tenure will be evaluated for their national reputation for **superior intellectual attainment** in their field of study, as evidenced by their Research, Teaching and Service.

Candidates **must meet expectations** of the department, as described below, for Research, Teaching and Service to be considered for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

Scholarship: Traditional, Public, and Creative

Overall, faculty are expected to display superior intellectual attainment based on a focused research agenda clearly described in their Research Statement. To meet this requirement, faculty may engage in a combination of scholarship that falls into the categories of Traditional, Public, and/or Creative, with a required minimal output of traditional publications to meet expectations for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. For faculty members solely conducting Traditional Scholarship, meeting expectations includes an average of two traditional publications a year and two scholarly presentations at reputable academic conferences per year. For faculty highly engaged in Public and/or Creative Scholarship, traditional publications may average one publication per year along with one or more scholarly presentations at reputable academic conferences per year. Again, the combination of areas of scholarship (Traditional, Public, and/or Creative) are to be clearly described in the Research Statement in relationship to fulfilling the Faculty member’s focused research agenda. The research agenda should be consistent with the Department’s and the University’s Mission statements. Examples, expectations, and evidence of output for each category of scholarship follows:

Traditional Scholarship includes peer-reviewed academic articles, book chapters, book reviews, and books (often equating to two to five journal articles), keynote presentations (often equating to one journal article), scholarly presentations at reputable academic conferences (invited and peer-reviewed), and funded external grants for an amount exceeding \$10,000 and/or of exceptional reputation. In reviewing grant activity, both the quality, acceptance rate, and amount of the grant will be considered in evaluating the value. Faculty members are encouraged to conduct collaborative and/or individual work in the area of Traditional Scholarship and in keeping with practices in the fields of study. For collaborative publications, faculty must quantify and describe explicitly their contributions to allow for accurate assessment.

Evidence of meeting the expectation of superior intellectual attainment within the area of Traditional Scholarship includes the publication of peer-reviewed articles in reputable journals, books and book contracts with reputable publishers, research awards with reputable academic organizations, citations of publications, and service as senior editor of a reputable journal or book series (or the equivalent). Candidates must produce several publications that are *peer-reviewed in the field of study* as a minimal requirement to meet expectations for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The burden of proof lies on the candidate to define their field of study and how their publications have been vetted within that field of study, including quality indicators.

Faculty members may opt for a solely Traditional trajectory of research. In this case, **meeting expectations** includes an average of two traditional publications per year and two scholarly presentations at reputable academic conferences per year. For faculty members who opt for a combination of scholarship, Traditional Scholarship is expected at half the rate and in combination with evidence of high quality Public and/or Creative scholarly output to meet expectations.

Candidates who perform above this average production level and/or achieve additional scholarly outputs as described in this section **exceed expectations** of scholarship for consideration of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

Public Scholarship includes public/collaborative art works, government reports, program evaluations, state and national curriculum development, multimedia projects, fellowships/residencies, curatorial work, and alternative publications and productions. Public and community engaged researchers often partner with community organizations and neighborhoods; government agencies; cultural organizations; arts institutions and small organizations; and social justice organizations. Projects in this category typically co-construct knowledge, engage in meaningful partnerships in a long-term process, and include researcher-to-community relationships that allow all participants to meet common goals.

Evidence of superior intellectual attainment for public scholarship will be evaluated through an external letter by an expert in the field who specializes in public scholarship (see “other letters” p. 26). Publication of public practices in traditional scholarly outlets is also considered evidence if the publication venue is peer-reviewed by an appropriate field of study (such as community engagement journals, field-specific journals, public practice journals, and the like). As described in the previous section, candidates who pursue this path of scholarship are also expected to produce traditional publications at about half the rate of a solely traditional scholar (i.e. on average one publication per year and one academic presentation per year). Due to the nature of public scholarship, the burden of proof ultimately lies on the candidate to provide sufficient and objective evidence of superior intellectual attainment to meet department expectations. Faculty members pursuing this path toward promotion and tenure are encouraged to work closely with senior faculty in developing a portfolio with evidence of meeting expectations.

The value of public scholarship in the Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy is immense, and similarly supported by research conferences, academic journals, and organizations such as Imagining America and others. Valuing this work as a form of scholarship for candidates pursuing promotion and tenure is important and necessary to the fields represented in this department to further the work of developing new knowledge, connecting the university to the community, and improving research practices and knowledge-based outcomes for the betterment of society.

Creative Scholarship includes juried or invited group or solo exhibitions; performances; novels; creative nonfiction books; essays; poetry; artwork published in literary, academic, or arts-based journals and catalogues; visual essays; multimedia and website projects; curatorial projects; museum multimedia exhibits; and animation and visual effects.

Evidence of superior intellectual attainment for creative scholarship is most clearly evaluated by the venues for exhibition, performance, and/or production, such as a solo art exhibit, a published poem in a reputable literary publication, and the like. In situations where the venue does not inherently characterize the significance of the contribution, creative scholarship can also be evaluated through an external letter by an expert in the field who specializes in the type of creative work specific to the candidate, if the creative outlets are not sufficiently reviewed for exhibit. In these cases, the creative activity might more closely resemble the types of activities of public scholarship and should follow a similar process of external letter as review. Publication of creative activities in traditional scholarly outlets is also considered evidence if the publication venue is peer-reviewed by an appropriate field of study. As described in the previous section, candidates who pursue this path of scholarship are also expected to produce traditional publications at about half the rate of a solely traditional scholar (i.e. on average one publication per year and one academic presentation per year). Due to the nature of creative scholarship, the burden of proof ultimately lies on the candidate to provide sufficient and objective evidence of superior intellectual attainment to meet department expectations. Faculty members pursuing this path toward promotion and tenure are encouraged to work closely with senior faculty in developing a portfolio and evidence of meeting expectations.

The value of creative scholarship in the Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy is inherent, as the fields of study in the department are creative and faculty are often practicing artists, producers, performers, choreographers, writers, or the like. Valuing this work as a form of scholarship for candidates pursuing promotion and tenure is important and necessary to the fields represented in this department to further the work of developing new knowledge in the arts, connecting the university to the community, and improving research and creative practices and knowledge-based outcomes for the betterment of society.

Teaching

Evidence of meeting expectations in teaching will emphasize success in developing student interest and competence in art education, arts administration and/or cultural policy. The assessment of teaching excellence will be based on (but need not be limited to) student evaluations of teaching and peer evaluation, all reports from Peer Teaching Evaluation Committees, SEI and Departmental course evaluations (or their equivalent) for all courses taught during the candidate's probationary period or for the previous five years for senior faculty promotion, representative syllabi and other course materials, and teaching awards and distinction.

Peer evaluation of teaching is performed by another faculty member on average every year for probationary faculty (for a total of at least five peer evaluations for tenure requirements) and every three years for tenured Associate Professors. This faculty evaluation is based on the review of course materials (including syllabi, examinations and other instructional materials), the instructor's self-evaluation statement, and/or observation of classroom teaching. Other measures of success that are considered are program and course development, related activities outside the classroom (advising, symposia, etc.), degrees or honors theses advised to completion and interdepartmental teaching. Measures that may also be used include the candidate's self-evaluation as to approach and goals and description of specific strategies for improvement--past, current and planned; and assessment of the success of a candidate's present and former graduate students.

To **meet teaching expectations** for consideration of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, candidates are expected to do the following:

- Successfully teaching a total of four courses per year unless otherwise stipulated in institutional rules, contract, or course releases;
- Effectively performing regular teaching duties including class preparation, grading, and periodic revision of course syllabi, revisions to course content, student supervision, and mentorship;
- Receiving electronic SEI Student Evaluation summaries averaging at minimum 4.0 across the courses taught (based on a unit mean of 4.5 in the department). The electronic SEI's will be considered only when at least 50% of students in the class have responded;
- Serving on at least one Ph.D. and three M.A. Thesis or Project Committees;
- Chairing at least one M.A. Thesis or Project for each promotion period.

Candidates will **exceed teaching expectations** for the following:

- Serving on or chairing above the minimum expectations of Ph.D. and M.A. committees;
- Collaborating and actively engaging with other faculty in program development;
- Developing innovative teaching methods;
- Receiving honors, awards, or grants for teaching;
- Creating new course(s) that reflect developments in the field that enhance and advance the Department's Mission Statement and programming;

- Involvement/support in external student exhibitions, presentations, activities, and publications;
- Distinction of student accomplishments – recognition and awards;
- Supervision of Graduate Teaching Associates;
- Involvement in interdisciplinary and collaborative pedagogical efforts with colleagues from other departments and institutions.

Evaluative evidence of quality teaching should show indications that the candidate's teaching includes the following:

- Developed new and effective instructional techniques and materials appropriate to the objectives and level of the course (as evident in peer reviews of teaching, teaching materials and/or student narrative comments);
- Demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge (as evident in peer reviews of teaching and teaching materials);
- Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm (as evident in peer reviews of teaching, teaching materials, eSEI items 1,3,5,6,8,9 and/or student narrative comments);
- Demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom or online technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment (as evident in peer reviews of teaching, teaching materials, eSEI items 2,8,9 and/or student narrative comments);
- Engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, critical thinking, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process (as evident in peer reviews of teaching, teaching materials, eSEI items 2,4,8 and/or student narrative comments);
- Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process (as evident in student narrative comments);
- Treated students with respect and courtesy (as evident in peer reviews of teaching and/or student narrative comments).

For candidates to be considered for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, they **must meet expectations** for teaching in the department. Candidates are encouraged to exceed expectations for teaching due to the educational foundation and values toward teaching in the department.

Service

Every member of the Department's faculty is expected to assume his/her share of responsibility for the governance and function of the Department, College and University. An appropriate amount of professional and community service is required to meet expectations for consideration for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

Evidence of distinction in service may include support of administrative tasks, committee work, performance of duties as an officer in professional organizations, organizing colloquia, symposiums, conferences and exhibitions, lecturing to local audiences and providing support to local teachers and arts organizations.

In evaluating service, commitment, leadership, quality and competence are more important than numbers of activities. Faculty are also expected to participate in professional organizations and/or professional consultation at the state, national, and international levels.

Department faculty on the Columbus and regional campuses are expected to actively participate in Department, College, University, and regional campus governance. Faculty are also expected to participate in professional organizations and/or professional consultation at the state, national, and international levels.

For purposes of promotion and tenure, candidates **must meet expectations** for service by participating in the following:

- Attending and actively participating in Department faculty meetings;
- Actively serving on and participating in Departmental committees as appointed by the Chair of the Department;
- Actively participating in professional organizations (e.g. art, art education, cultural policy, arts administration, education, and interdisciplinary organizations).

For purposes of promotion and tenure, candidates who **exceed expectations** for service participate in the following:

- Appointment as the Undergraduate Chair (Assistant Department Chair), Graduate Studies Committee Chair, Director of the Barnett Center, or Chair of the Eligible Faculty in the Department;
- Appointment as Chair to other Departmental or University committees;
- Serving on College of Arts and Sciences and/or University committees and/or other ad hoc committees and task forces;
- Maintaining contact with area art teachers and/or community arts organizations and institutions and serving as a resource and/or mentor;
- Serving as a liaison between the Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy and arts-related groups and/or organizations inside and/or outside the University;
- Elected or appointed to leadership roles in University, College and/or school committees and/or assignments;
- Elected or appointed to leadership roles in professional arts or educational organizations;
- Coordinating and/or advising professional arts-related organizations inside/outside the University;
- Organizing conferences and symposia relevant to current topics or new directions in the field;
- Involvement in interdisciplinary/collaborative outreach and service efforts with colleagues from other departments and institutions;
- Participation in advisory or other roles with student groups and organizations.

For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to present evidence that she or he has:

- Made quality service contributions to the Department and University;
- Started to emerge in leadership responsibilities in local, national and/or international organizations. Based on individual faculty member's research focus, local service may be more important to their leadership.

For candidates to be considered for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, they **must meet expectations** for service in the department. Candidates are encouraged to exceed expectations for service due to the public interface and values toward community engagement in the department.

7.1.2 Promotion to Professor

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (<https://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html>) 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, it is recognized that an academic career may consist of various phases in which a concentration on Research, Teaching, and Service creates a composite professional life. Promotion to professor in the department, therefore, requires the candidate meet expectations in each area of Research, Teaching and Service, however these accomplishments might be exceptional in one or two areas and less so in the other area(s) due to excessive duties to the field, department, community, students and/or profession. For instance, where a candidate has made truly extraordinary contributions in the areas of teaching or service, that record may warrant promotion in combination with less extensive though continued productivity in research (traditional, public, and/or creative). The criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to professor is also characterized by sustained scholarly participation, a record of continuing professional service, and an established national reputation and emerging international reputation in the field.

To **meet expectations for Research** for consideration to Professor, a candidate may choose to focus on traditional, public, creative scholarship, and/or leadership. At this level of promotion, a combination with traditional scholarship is not necessary. However, a candidate focused on public and/or creative scholarship or leadership must still present evidence of exceptionality as described above in the section on promotion to Associate Professor. Different from the previous promotion to Associate Professor, a candidate for promotion to Professor may instead opt for a combination of any of these

areas of research (traditional, public, creative, and/or leadership). Evidence of scholarly leadership includes positions such as editorships, journal review board membership, book reviews, academic press leadership, keynote presentations, research awards, and fellowships. For candidates who have made significant contributions to the field, university, and/or public through scholarly leadership activities will be considered for promotion to Professor due to the strength and significance of these important contributions. Leadership in the fields of study in the department is important to our work as educators, policy makers, and administrators, and should therefore be considered as inherent to our expertise as scholars.

To **meet expectations for Teaching** for consideration to Professor, a candidate must continue expectations outlined in the section on promotion to Associate Professor. Additionally, a candidate for Professor is expected to carry a greater load of advising PhD and MA students, serve on several PhD and MA committees, have earned “P” status with the Graduate School, developed new courses, and supported overall academic programs in the department. Candidates for Professor should show a sustained commitment to students to support them in realizing their full capabilities for learning and providing an enhanced learning experience. These teaching accomplishments can be measured by the attainment of national or international recognition, as evidenced by pedagogical publications, awards, honors, and/or critical student outcomes. All candidates for promotion to Professor should have a minimum of three peer reviews covering the five years preceding the promotion case.

To **meet expectations for Service** for consideration to Professor, a candidate must continue expectations outlined in the section on promotion to Associate Professor. Service activities might include serving as a leader, mentor, and/or advisor to students, faculty, staff, community, or professional organizations, participating on organizational boards related to the field, university appointments and fellowships, and the like. For this department, the role of faculty in the public sector is especially important, and therefore carries great weight in consideration for promotion to Professor and in lieu of traditional scholarship where warranted.

7.1.3 Faculty at a Regional Campus

Expectations for regional campus faculty differ somewhat from those for faculty on the Columbus campus. The primary mission 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 of regional campus faculty will, therefore, ordinarily be greater. The Department expects regional campus faculty members to establish a program of high quality scholarship, 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 expectation and lesser access to teaching and research resources.

7.2 Procedures

Departmental procedures for promotion and tenure reviews are guided by the provisions of Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

The core dossier outline as prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs will serve as the basis for the preparation of a candidate's dossier. As stated therein, documentation is to be presented in the areas of teaching, research and service.

Nomination for review for promotion to professor can come from (1) faculty members of the Department, together or individually, or (2) from a faculty member on his/her own behalf. A candidate may withdraw from the review at any stage in the process by making a written request to that effect to the Chair of the Department.

7.2.1 Tenure Track Faculty

During the Spring Semester, the Chair of the Eligible Faculty will notify each faculty member who is scheduled for mandatory review the following year and offer to assist the candidate in the preparation of his or her dossier, although it must be emphasized that primary responsibility for the preparation of such a dossier lies with the candidate. The Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty notifies all faculty who will be reviewed of this assistance and the deadlines that must be met for the review. The Committee of the Eligible Faculty is charged with: (a) verifying the accuracy of the candidate's dossier; (b) obtaining, with the assistance of Chair of the Department, letters of evaluation from external evaluators (i.e. professional peers outside the University; see below); (c) conducting a meeting of eligible faculty and the Department Chair to discuss the merits of tenure and/or promotion dossier of the candidate; (d) providing a summary of the candidate's narrative student evaluations; and (e) voting on the candidate's promotion and tenure or promotion and reporting the resulting votes of eligible faculty and a summary in a written form to the Department Chair.

By Rule [3335-6-04](#) (A) (3), an Associate Professor may ask to be considered for non-mandatory promotion review at any time. Assistant professors who wish to be considered for promotion before their mandatory (sixth years) may also ask to be considered for an earlier review. The screening meeting for a non-mandatory promotion review must be completed by March 15 in order for a promotion case to go forward in the following Autumn. Assistant and associate Professors who wish to be considered for promotion review will then need to speak to the Chair well before that deadline.

A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) for one year. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite

incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.

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. The Committee of the Eligible Faculty must confirm with the Department Chair that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident (has a "green card"). Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.

A decision to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the Department Chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.

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.

Review candidates must (a) submit a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines, and they 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; (b) submit a copy of the department's APT Document that was in effect at the time of his or her hire or when the candidate was last promoted, whichever is more recent, if s/he wishes to be reviewed under that document's criteria and procedures (this must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the Department); and (c) review the list of potential external evaluators developed by the Department Chair and the Committee of the Eligible Faculty; the candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so; a candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request; the Department Chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

One member of the Committee of Eligible Faculty will be designated as the Procedures Oversight Designee whose duty it will be to assure the committee and other review bodies follow the rules at each level and that the procedures are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions about members of underrepresented groups that could bias the committee's review. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the Committee of Eligible Faculty. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines. Any procedural difficulties or other concerns by the Procedures Oversight Designee about the review should be first brought to the attention of the Committee of Eligible Faculty. If the concerns cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of the Procedures Oversight Designee, the concerns should be brought to the attention of

the Department Chair. The Department Chair must review the matter and provide a response to the Procedures Oversight Designee regarding either actions taken or why action is judged not to be warranted.

At its organizational meeting, held before the Fall Semester review begins, the Committee of the Eligible Faculty will review all University, College and Departmental materials bearing on promotion and tenure policies and procedures to be followed in the current review.

The Department Chair is required to (a) make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted; (b) remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review; (c) make an independent evaluation and recommendation, based on his/her assessment of the candidate and the written recommendation of the eligible faculty, in the form of a letter to the Executive Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences; and (d) meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to its recommendations.

Once the Committee of Eligible Faculty's report and the Chair's letter have been completed, the candidate will be notified in writing of the completion of the Department's review and of the availability of these reports. The candidate may then request a copy of the reports and, within ten calendar days of notification of completion of the review, may provide the Department Chair with written comments on the reports for inclusion in the dossier. The Committee of the Eligible Faculty and/or Chair of the Department may provide written responses to the candidate's comments for inclusion in the dossier. Only one opportunity for a candidate to make comments on the Departmental level of review is permitted.

Finally, the Department Chair's recommendation, the report of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the candidate's dossier and any further comments by the candidate, Committee of the Eligible Faculty and Chair are sent forward to the Dean of the Division of Arts and Humanities.

7.2.2 Tenure Track Faculty at a Regional Campus

Except when the review is a mandatory review for promotion and tenure, the Department Chair and the candidate for promotion determine when he or she will go up for review. If a regional campus faculty member is to be reviewed, the Department Chair will 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 Dean or 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 use of the Department's Committee on Promotion and Tenure.

The calendar used as a guideline for each of the steps in the Promotion and Tenure process is provided annually by the College of Arts and Sciences.

7.2.3 External Evaluations

External evaluators should be distinguished people in the candidate's field. To establish the objectivity of these evaluators, the reviewers should not be a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former graduate advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate. The candidate, Department Chair, and Committee of the Eligible Faculty should each suggest 3 external evaluators. Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate. A minimum of five credible and useful evaluations must be obtained. Any other needed letters will be solicited from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty suggestions. The letters of evaluation will meet requirements specified in the most recent OAA [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). External evaluators will be asked to appraise the worth and significance of the candidate's scholarly and professional accomplishments and future potential. The Committee of the Eligible Faculty Chair will provide external evaluators with the candidate's vita and with samples of the candidate's research. Letters not solicited by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty or by the Department Chair may not be included in the dossier.

Under no circumstances may a candidate 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, who will decide what, if any, action is warranted (requesting permission from the Office of Academic Affairs to exclude that letter from the dossier). 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. 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.

Other Letters

Candidates can request that the TIU solicit additional letters from individuals who can speak to the candidate's performance in research, service, or teaching. These letters can be from other units at the University or from individuals outside the University; these letters go in the "Other letters" section rather than the external evaluator section.

7.3 Documentation

Every candidate should follow the Academic Affairs guidelines and submit a complete and accurate dossier. The complete dossier is forwarded to the College and the Office of Academic Affairs after completion of the Departmental review. Documentation of scholarship and service is used within the Department unless the College or University requests it.

7.3.1 Scholarship

For the time period since the last promotion, candidates should submit:

- Copies of all books, papers, book chapters, or other book reviews outlined in the dossier that have been published, or accepted for publication. If a paper has been accepted for publication, but not yet published, a letter from the editor should be submitted that details that the paper has been accepted and no further revisions are needed
- Documentation of grants
- Documentation of Creative Works
- External letters by an expert in the field for community-based scholarship and technology-based scholarship
- Other relevant documentation of scholarship as appropriate

7.3.2 Teaching

Candidates should submit for the time period since the last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, the following:

- Cumulative SEIs for courses taught
- Departmental narrative evaluation comments
- Peer Evaluations of Teaching
- Course syllabi and calendars
- Other documentation of teaching as appropriate and outlined in the core dossier

7.3.3 Service

Candidates should submit for the time period since the last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, documentation of service commitments listed on the core dossier including:

- Involvement with professional societies
- Consultation activity
- Administrative service to the Department, College or University
- Advising to student groups and organizations
- Awards for service

- Any available documentation (e.g. letters from Committee Chairs) of the quality of service that characterizes the list of service activities in the dossier

8. APPEALS

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) (A) 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 the review process to follow written policies and procedures.

9. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) (B) 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.

10. APPENDICES-TEACHING EVALUATION POLICY AND PROCEDURES

Evaluation of teaching in the Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy attempts both to assess the degree to which particular teaching activities contribute to or enhance the teaching mission of the Department at large and to balance this with the individual instructional goals of the faculty as stated in syllabi, other contractual arrangements with students, and the faculty member's own statement of instructional goals. Adequate evaluation should allow some distinction between the evaluation of a course as such and a more specifically focused assessment of individual instructors and methods. We expect that the most serious and useful evaluative instruments will be tailored to the specific shapes and goals of particular courses. Evaluation of a Regional Campus faculty member's teaching is ordinarily performed by Regional Campus faculty. However, when the Regional Campus faculty member teaches on the Columbus Campus, members of the Columbus Campus Committee of the Eligible Faculty will conduct a review.

Timing of Peer Evaluations of Teaching

Professors are reviewed every five years; Associate Professors with tenure are reviewed every two years; for untenured faculty, peer evaluation of teaching occurs every year and is incorporated into the annual reviews process. A minimum of five peer evaluations are required for assistant professors at the time of the mandatory review for promotion and tenure, and a minimum of three are required at the time of a review for promotion to professor, covering the five years preceding the promotion case. The review itself will be scheduled in such a way as to allow adequate opportunity for classroom observation.

Required Documentation

Faculty being reviewed will prepare and submit documentation such as course syllabi, assignments, and examinations.

Review Process

The administration of the peer evaluation process is the responsibility of the Chair of the Eligible Faculty, who appoints faculty reviewers as needed to accommodate the following guidelines:

- Faculty evaluators must not be of lower rank than the person being reviewed. As far as possible, these duties will rotate equitably through the faculty, so that the widest range of faculty suggestions and comments may be obtained.
- In general, the review is to be informed by documentation submitted by the faculty member under review, including course syllabi and supplemental class materials as specified above. The faculty reviewer includes in the report an assessment of these materials, including their appropriateness, usefulness, currency, and consistency with the objectives stated in the syllabus. An adequate review may also include a pattern of class visitation allowing substantive comment on the teaching of one or more courses and such relevant conversations, as many develop as part of this process.
- The faculty reviewer will prepare a written report of findings and recommendations. This report should assess teaching, considering the teaching mission statement, and the terms of evaluation set out above. The report is submitted to the Chair of the Eligible Faculty and Department Chair, who, in consultation with the Chair of the Eligible Faculty and the faculty member under review, draft a plan to respond to the recommendations, if needed. Such a plan would be revisited as part of their annual review as long as necessary.

Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the electronic SEI summaries is required and explained in Section 7.1.1- Teaching. Faculty members are moreover required to use the Departmental student evaluation questionnaire or an approved form of their own design that provides students the opportunity to make narrative comments. These evaluation forms will be distributed and collected by a responsible person (student or staff member) other than the instructor in the course. That person will deliver the forms to the Departmental staff member. Copies of the narrative evaluations will be provided to the faculty member on request by the Department; the Chair's summary of the original forms will be kept on file and will be included in the appendix to the dossier for fourth year and promotion reviews. Both SEI and narrative evaluations become a part of each faculty member's annual activity report. That report will be considered incomplete if the required student SEI evaluation summaries have not been provided.