

# APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE

## Criteria and Procedures for the Department of Classics

Adopted February 14, 1997;  
Modified May 4, 1997  
Modified April 24, 1998  
Modified October 15, 1998  
Modified December 21, 1998  
Modified January 27, 1999  
Modified May 4, 2001  
Modified October 5, 2001 (corrected Dec. 17, 2001)  
Modified May 27, 2004  
Modified April 6, 2007  
Modified March 15, 2013  
Redrafted February 7, 2015

<b>I. PREAMBLE</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>II. DEPARTMENT MISSION</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>III. DEFINITIONS</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>A. COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1) TENURE-TRACK FACULTY</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2) CONFLICT OF INTEREST</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3) MINIMUM COMPOSITION</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>B. PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>C. QUORUM</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>D. RECOMMENDATION FROM THE COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>D1. APPOINTMENT</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>D2. REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>IV. APPOINTMENTS</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>A. CRITERIA:</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1. TENURE TRACK FACULTY – ALL CAMPUSES</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>a. Instructor</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>b. Assistant Professor</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>c. Professor or Associate Professor</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2. ASSOCIATED FACULTY</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>a. Senior Lecturer</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>b. Lecturer</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>c. Visiting Faculty</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>d. Adjunct Faculty</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3. COURTESY APPOINTMENTS</b>	<b>10</b>

<b><i>B. PROCEDURES:</i></b>	<b>10</b>
<b>1. TENURE TRACK FACULTY—COLUMBUS CAMPUS</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2. TENURE TRACK FACULTY—REGIONAL CAMPUSES</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3. ASSOCIATED FACULTY</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>a. Senior Lecturer</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>b. Lecturer</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>c. Visiting Faculty</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>d. Adjunct Faculty</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>4. COURTESY APPOINTMENTS</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>ANNUAL REVIEWS</b>	<b>12</b>
<b><i>A. ALL FACULTY</i></b>	<b>12</b>
<b>1. PLANNING AND REPORTING PROCEDURES</b>	<b>13</b>
<b><i>B. PROBATIONARY FACULTY</i></b>	<b>13</b>
<b>1. PROCEDURES</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>2. FOURTH YEAR REVIEW</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>3. EXCLUSION OF TIME FROM PROBATIONARY PERIODS</b>	<b>16</b>
<b><i>C. ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS</i></b>	<b>16</b>
<b><i>D. FULL PROFESSORS</i></b>	<b>16</b>
<b><i>E. REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY</i></b>	<b>17</b>
<b>F. ASSOCIATED FACULTY</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>1. CRITERIA</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>2. PROCEDURES</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>3. DOCUMENTATION</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>VII. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION WITH TENURE, AND FOR PROMOTION</b>	<b>19</b>
<b><i>A. CRITERIA:</i></b>	<b>19</b>
<b>1. PROMOTION FROM ASSISTANT TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>2. PROMOTION TO RANK OF PROFESSOR</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>3. PROMOTION OF REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY</b>	<b>21</b>
<b><i>B. PROCEDURES</i></b>	<b>21</b>
<b>1. CANDIDATE RESPONSIBILITIES</b>	<b>21</b>

<b>2. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>3. DEPARTMENT CHAIR RESPONSIBILITIES</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>4. PROCEDURES FOR REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>5. EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS</b>	<b>25</b>
<i>C. DOCUMENTATION FOR PROMOTION WITH TENURE, AND FOR PROMOTION</i>	<b>26</b>
<b>b. Excellence in Scholarship.</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>c. Excellence in Service</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>VIII. APPEALS</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>IX. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>X. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>A. STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>B. PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>XI. REVISION OF DOCUMENT</b>	<b>32</b>

## **I. PREAMBLE**

This document is a supplement to Chapter 6 of the Rules of the University Faculty (“Rules of the University Faculty Concerning Faculty Appointment, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure,” [trustees.osu.edu/university/faculty rules](http://trustees.osu.edu/university/faculty%20rules)), 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 will 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 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. Finally, we recognize service to the needs of the department, the college, the university, and the community as an essential element of good academic citizenship.

## **III. DEFINITIONS**

### **A. COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY**

#### **1) TENURE-TRACK FACULTY**

The committee of the eligible faculty for new appointments at associate level or above, fourth-year reappointment reviews, and promotion and tenure reviews of tenure-track faculty consists of all the tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in the department, excluding the tenure initiating unit chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president. A tenured faculty member who holds a joint appointment is a member of the

eligible faculty only in the department where his or her tenure resides. For faculty recommendations on initial appointment, the committee of the eligible faculty includes assistant professors. For an appointment at senior rank, a second vote is taken by the faculty members eligible to vote on the rank under consideration. The committee of the eligible faculty has a chair who is appointed from among the full professors by the chair of the department.

## **2) CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

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

## **3) 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 executive dean, will appoint a faculty member from another department within the college. That individual should not act as the professional oversight designee for the committee of the eligible faculty.

## **B. PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE**

The department normally does not have a promotion and tenure committee on duty, as all review, promotion, and tenure cases are handled directly by the committee of the eligible faculty. In special cases, the chair of the department may appoint a promotion and tenure committee to facilitate a review, consisting of the chair of the committee of the eligible faculty, two professors, and one associate professor. The promotion and tenure committee does not vote or otherwise make recommendations on cases.

## **C. QUORUM**

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty from all campuses 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.

## **D. RECOMMENDATION FROM THE COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY**

In all votes taken on personnel matters, 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.

### **D1. APPOINTMENT**

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

### **D2. REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE**

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

## **IV. APPOINTMENTS**

The Department of Classics will make faculty appointments that enhance the quality of the department and its effectiveness in pursuing its mission. The department expects that its senior members will be distinguished scholars within their areas of research and that junior members will have reasonable promise of achieving that status. Excellence in scholarship is therefore a necessary condition for appointment or promotion to any continuing position. The department expects excellence in teaching from all of its members as part of its mission. The department further expects excellence in service to the department, the college and the university, with the understanding that assistant professors are generally spared heavier and more time-consuming service assignments.

### **A. CRITERIA:**

#### **1. TENURE TRACK FACULTY – ALL CAMPUSES**

##### **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 end of the third year of appointment or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year. Promotion occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for the 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 it 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.

### **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 be an effective teacher and to advance through the ranks. 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, and 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. ASSOCIATED FACULTY**

The department may extend associated appointments to faculty who provide significant teaching and service. These are not tenured or tenure-track appointments and may or may not have a salary. Associated appointments are made by the chair, who, when

appropriate, will consult with the faculty. Associated faculty members do not participate in department governance at any level, and may not participate in matters pertaining to promotion and tenure. They may on some occasions be asked to provide input to appropriate departmental committees. The criteria for appointment of associated faculty with modified faculty titles (such as "adjunct" and "visiting") are comparable to the criteria for appointment at the tenure-track ranks. These criteria will also serve as a basis for evaluating the occasional associated faculty member who desires promotion. Associated appointments in the Department of Classics include the following:

**a. Senior Lecturer**

Appointment at the rank of senior lecturer requires 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 tenure-track faculty. Such appointments may be renewed, 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 introductory-level courses only. Their appointments will be made on a course-by-course and semester-by-semester 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 tenure-track appointment at the same level (as defined 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 tenure-track appointment at the same level (as defined elsewhere in this document).

Adjunct faculty are eligible to teach at any level for which they are qualified. Such appointments typically are not the result of a departmental search.

### **3. COURTESY APPOINTMENTS**

A courtesy appointment in the Department of Classics requires a Ph.D. in Classics or in an equivalent or related field and a tenure-track appointment in another unit at The Ohio State University. It is based on the expectation that the appointee will contribute substantially to the department's mission. An individual with a courtesy appointment may not participate in department meetings or 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 main adviser of Ph.D. students. Such appointments may collaborate with tenure-track 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 department's needs. Unlike associated appointments, courtesy appointments do not require formal renewal.

#### ***B. PROCEDURES:***

See the Faculty Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection, and the Policy on Faculty Appointments in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html) (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>), for information on the following topics: recruitment of tenure-track faculty; appointments at senior rank or with prior service credit; hiring faculty from other institutions after April 30; appointment of foreign nationals; and letters of offer.

#### **1. TENURE TRACK FACULTY—COLUMBUS CAMPUS**

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 approved by the College and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must be consistent with the University policies set forth in the most recent update of [A Guide to Effective Searches](http://www.hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf) ([www.hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf](http://www.hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf)).

After consultation with the eligible faculty meeting together, and upon approval faculty vote of a job description, and after approval by the executive dean, the chair will appoint a search committee for any tenure-track or tenured appointment. The committee will 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.

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 advisory committee will report the views of the graduate student body and participate in a discussion of those views 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 eligible faculty will select the top candidate by a written confidential ballot. A positive vote of two-thirds of the faculty present is normally expected before the chair can recommend the appointment to the executive 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, s/he will write a letter of explanation of the circumstances to the faculty with a copy to be sent to the executive 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 or director will agree on a single search committee for the position consisting of members of both units. Except as stipulated here, the committee will otherwise follow the procedures governing Columbus Campus searches (above). Candidates should be interviewed by the regional campus dean or 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 or director. A chair's decision to hire must be informed by a vote of the eligible faculty and agreement with regional campus dean or 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 or 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. ASSOCIATED FACULTY**

#### **a. Senior Lecturer**

The chair appoints senior lecturers after consultation with the full faculty and in accordance with the majority opinion as determined by a vote of the tenure-track faculty.

#### **b. Lecturer**

The chair appoints lecturers in consultation with the chair's advisory committee.

#### **c. Visiting Faculty**

The chair appoints visiting faculty after consultation with the full faculty and in accordance with the majority opinion as determined by a vote of the tenure-track faculty. When appropriate, the chair will convene a search committee and follow the regular search procedures of the department as outlined in Section IV.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 tenure-track 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 tenure-track faculty.

## **ANNUAL REVIEWS**

### **A. ALL FACULTY**

## **1. PLANNING AND REPORTING PROCEDURES**

At the beginning of the academic year, the chair will invite each tenure-track 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 semester, the chair will notify all faculty in a timely manner of the forthcoming annual review and invite a summary of the relevant activities and accomplishments of the past year (the annual performance report). If an understanding at the beginning of the year as described above, the summary should reflect and comment upon the year's accomplishments in terms of that understanding.

Faculty under review are responsible for providing the appropriate documentation to the committee of the eligible faculty. Such materials include (1) an up-to-date dossier organized in accord with the outline stipulated by the Office of Academic Affairs; (2) the annual performance report. The contents of the dossier and supplementary materials will constitute the evidence upon which evaluation will be made. 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 (.A.2; .B-C).

### ***B. PROBATIONARY FACULTY***

#### **1. PROCEDURES**

a. At the time of appointment, probationary faculty members will 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 will be provided with copies of the revised documents.

b. The chair of the department and the committee of the eligible faculty will review all untenured faculty in each year of their probationary service following the procedures

used for fourth-year reviews. 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. (It is, however, understood that junior faculty contribute less in the area of service than their senior colleagues.) The Chair will 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 her or him of the required documentation stipulated in 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. The committee of the eligible faculty must meet and discuss each probationary faculty member's annual performance at the annual review. It is the responsibility of every committee 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, s/he may participate in the meeting by Skype or teleconference. In each annual review other than the fourth-year review, whose procedures differ as described in V.B.2 below, the vote of the committee is only advisory to the chair. The chair may participate but not vote at this review. The committee will appoint a senior member and participant in the discussion to summarize the deliberations and explain the vote in a letter to the chair.

d. If the chair's recommendation is to reappoint the faculty member to another year of service, that recommendation is final. If the chair's recommendation to the dean is to *not* reappoint the faculty member, the Dean will then follow fourth-year review procedures at the college level and make a final decision in the matter.

e. Both the committee's written assessment of the faculty member and the chair's letter must be circulated to all faculty who participated in the meeting before being officially communicated to the untenured faculty member. The chair must provide the faculty member under review with a copy of his or her letter of recommendation and the letter of the committee of the eligible faculty. The faculty member will be given ten (10) days to respond in writing to the letters from the committee of the eligible faculty to the chair and/or from the chair to the executive dean. The chair of the committee and/or the department 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. All faculty members of all ranks 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.

f. 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. 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.

g. If the executive 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 executive dean or her/his representative in advance of being sent and will explain 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.

h. If during an annual review the committee of the eligible faculty 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 committee for review and evaluation in accordance with section 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 department and the college; (b) when the executive dean agrees with the recommendation of the chair to reappoint, college committee review is optional; (c) external evaluations are optional. Unlike other annual reviews, the vote of the eligible faculty in the fourth-year review is not only advisory to the chair but has independent standing.

Following the vote on the fourth-year review, the chair of the committee of the eligible faculty 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 stated and discussed. The letter will also record 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 he or she may review the department's evaluations. The probationary faculty member has ten days from receipt of this notice to provide written comments on the department's evaluations for inclusion in the dossier. Should the probationary faculty member provide comments, the committee will have the opportunity to respond in writing to those comments. There will be only one iteration of this process. The two evaluations produced in the department (those of the committee of the eligible faculty and of the chair of the department), along with any comments from the probationary faculty member and responses by the chair of

the committee (or a designee), will be forwarded to the executive dean of the college, who must approve renewal of the appointment for a fifth year of employment.

### **3. EXCLUSION OF TIME FROM PROBATIONARY PERIODS**

Probationary faculty at any rank may exclude time from the probationary period under Faculty Rule 3335-6-03. Probationary faculty will be reviewed annually during their probationary periods regardless of whether time is excluded from that period, unless their absence from campus during an excluded period makes the conduct of such review impractical.

#### ***C. ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS***

The chair of the department and the full professors review all associate professors annually in the spring. This 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 will inform all associate professors in a timely fashion each year when the annual review will take place and request the annual performance report, an updated CV, copies of SEI forms as stipulated in section A above, and 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 be made available to the committee of the eligible faculty; they may also seek additional information 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 of the full professors 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 her/his disagreement in a letter to them. 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. The chair of the committee of the eligible faculty may respond to this response. There will only one iteration of this process. All faculty members of all ranks 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.

#### ***D. FULL PROFESSORS***

Full professors will submit the annual performance report stipulated in section V.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. 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.

### ***E. REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY***

1. Probationary faculty on regional campuses will be reviewed annually by the regional campus dean or 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 or 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 sent 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 or her record. The department chair should give a written review to the faculty member and a copy to the regional campus dean or director. It is important that the chair of the department and the regional campus dean or 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 or director should seek appropriate means of addressing this problem with the faculty member and the chair of the department. 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.

2. The annual reviews of tenured regional campus faculty are conducted by the regional campus dean or director according to policies set forth on the OAA website. A copy of the dean or director's review letter should be sent to the department chair, who will evaluate the research portion of the annual performance. 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.

### ***F. 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.

## **VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS**

### **1. CRITERIA**

The annual performance review described in Sect. V.A-C. serves as the basis for the chair's annual salary recommendations, which may be included in the written evaluation and which the chair provides to each department member. Unless the president or the executive 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 (section II, above). While quantitative measures are always useful, they are never to 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, SEI scores, and peer reviews as specified in section V.A.2 above.

Merit in service is reflected in committee and administrative service, and by qualitative indicators such as the visibility of faculty members as editors, members of editorial boards, or leaders in professional societies, and exceptional service on department, college, or university committees.

In making salary recommendations to the executive 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.

## **2. PROCEDURES**

The annual salary review will be based on the annual performance review discussed in section V, 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 consult with the advisory committee. The executive dean determines the amount of incremental money available to the department, and the chair makes salary recommendations with the executive dean. The regional campuses have their own resources for salary increases for their faculty. The regional campus dean or director must consult with the department chair before recommending salaries for the regional faculty.

## **3. DOCUMENTATION**

Annual merit evaluations are based on each faculty member's Annual Activity Report and Review. The documentation required and recommended for that Review is specified in section V.A.1, above. Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation for an annual review at the required time will receive no salary increase in that year, and may not expect to recoup the foregone raise at a later time.

# **VII. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION WITH TENURE, AND FOR PROMOTION**

## ***A. CRITERIA:***

### **1. PROMOTION FROM ASSISTANT TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE**

A candidate for promotion with tenure is expected to have a research record that demonstrates a high standard of excellence and 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 or her field and 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.

The pattern of performance over the probationary period should yield a high degree of confidence that the candidate will continue to develop professionally. 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 Classics 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.

## **2. PROMOTION TO RANK OF PROFESSOR**

The Department of Classics 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 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/or 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 graduate and undergraduate students, and must have an excellent record of leadership in 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.

### **3. 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***

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 ([trustees.osu.edu/university/faculty rules](http://trustees.osu.edu/university/faculty%20rules) ) and the Office Academic Affairs' annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook ([oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html](http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html)). The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty appointments in the department.

#### **1. CANDIDATE RESPONSIBILITIES**

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

Candidates are responsible for submitting a copy of the department's APT Document that was in effect at the time of the candidate's 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.

Candidates are responsible for reviewing 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. The

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.)

## **2. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY**

The responsibilities of the Eligible Faculty are as follows:

- To review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. A two-thirds affirmative vote is required for the review to proceed.
  - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
  - A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 ([trustees.osu.edu/university/facultyrules](http://trustees.osu.edu/university/facultyrules)) only 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 must confirm with the Department Chair that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident with 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 by the committee 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.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, the Committee of the Eligible Faculty provides administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.

- **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.
- **Late Spring:** Suggest the names of external evaluators to the Department Chair. This responsibility falls mainly to the Chair of the Eligible Faculty, who may solicit suggestions from the rest of the Committee.
- **Early Autumn:** The Chair of the Committee, the POD, and any other committee members so designated by the Chair review the candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and they work with the candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins. They meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- Review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed. Members must attend all Eligible Faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; participate in discussion of every case; and vote.
- Write an evaluation of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service that reflects the committee's discussion and vote and summarizes the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair.
- Provide a written response, on behalf of the Eligible Faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure-initiating unit is another department. The Eligible Faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

### 3. DEPARTMENT CHAIR RESPONSIBILITIES

The responsibilities of the Department Chair are as follows:

- Where relevant, to verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty members who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure will not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this Department.
- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To 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.
- To 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.
- To attend the meetings of the Eligible Faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the Eligible Faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the Eligible Faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process: of the recommendations by the Eligible Faculty and Department Chair; of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the Eligible Faculty and Department Chair; and of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the Department Chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the Department Chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier.

- To forward the completed dossier to the College office by that office's deadline, except in the case of associated faculty for whom the Department Chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the Department Chair is final in such cases.
- To receive the Committee of the Eligible Faculty's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the Department Chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the Department Chair of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

#### **4. PROCEDURES FOR REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY**

Regional campus faculty are first reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus Dean/ Director. The regional campus review focuses on teaching and service.

The regional campus Dean/ Director forwards the written evaluation and recommendation of the regional campus review to the Department Chair, from which point the review follows the procedures described for the Columbus campus faculty.

#### **5. EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS**

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews, all research appointment contract renewals and promotion reviews, and all adjunct faculty promotion reviews.

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to provide an arms' length judgment of the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This Department will only solicit evaluations from full professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.

<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>

- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is

analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will “usefulness” be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the Department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, the Department seeks at least twice the number of letters required, and solicits these letters no later than the end of the spring semester prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

As described above, the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the Department Chair, and the candidate assemble a list of potential evaluators. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 ([trustees.osu.edu/university/faculty rules](http://trustees.osu.edu/university/faculty%20rules)) requires that no more than half of 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.

The Department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format, provided at [oaa.osu.edu/sampledocuments.html](http://oaa.osu.edu/sampledocuments.html), for letters requesting external evaluations.

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.

### ***C. DOCUMENTATION FOR PROMOTION WITH TENURE, AND FOR PROMOTION***

#### **1. Excellence in Teaching.**

It is not enough that a teacher conscientiously meets his or her obligations and successfully conveys knowledge. The Department of Classics 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 and resources 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 of the Eligible Faculty, and (2) evidence offered by the candidate.

Evidence-presented to the Committee of the Eligible Faculty 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 (1000-8000 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 or 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 section X, below.

(e) Other data that the Department Chair, the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, 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 or 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 Classics into meaningful interaction with other areas of research and instruction in the College and University.

## **2. 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. Comparable electronic media are also acceptable, so long as these have standard refereed processes.

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 of the Eligible Faculty. Such evidence will normally include:

(1) 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.

(2) 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 try to attend the presentations and colloquia of junior colleagues; their evaluations may be placed in writing in the candidates file. Again, the Committee may seek and the candidate may present evaluations from scholars in the field.

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

(4) 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.

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

(6) 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 or her dossier any manuscripts of articles or papers, whether they have been published or not.

### **3. Excellence in Service**

A member of the Department of Classics at The Ohio State University has an obligation to use his or 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, and it is understood that junior faculty are generally spared many service commitments. Promotion to professor, unlike promotion to associate professor, *does* entail a record of committed service to the department. This service may include, but is not limited to, graduate advising, work with graduate students on preparing candidacy exams, committed involvement on dissertation committees, chairing a dissertation committee. Additionally, associate professors are expected to chair department committees, and to demonstrate involvement in organizations, outreach projects, or other community and/or disciplinary initiatives that contribute to the well-being and enhancement of the Classics Department at OSU and across the discipline. The Committee of the Eligible Faculty 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 and quality of contributions made, 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) Presentations made in the classes of others, contributions to University publications, lectures to the Departmental faculty, and similar activities;
- c) Activities in the University community and in the community outside the University based on and related to one's professional training and professional concerns;

d) Activity in the national or international scholarly community and its institutions.

## **VIII. 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 that he or she 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.

## **IX. 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 initiation 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.

## **X. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

### **A. STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

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 evaluations will be entered into the faculty member's Annual Review Dossier for use by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty and the Chair.

The use of other forms of evaluation is left to the discretion of the instructor, though faculty members are strongly 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 given to the faculty member only after the final grades have been submitted. Any faculty member may request to include these other instruments in the regularly scheduled peer review or Annual Performance Report.

### **B. PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

The teaching of probationary faculty will be formally peer reviewed in at least the second, third, and fourth years of employment. At least five courses will be evaluated over the three-year period, including (ideally) at least one large lecture course, one small lecture or discussion course, one 2000-6000 level language course, and one 7000-8000 level graduate course. A formal review will include at least two visits to the classroom. A faculty member must be assigned by the Teaching Evaluation Coordinator to perform the review. Wherever possible a peer reviewer will be of higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed. The reviewer will make a written report, give it to the Teaching Evaluation Coordinator, who will give a copy to the probationary faculty member. The report will become part of the probationary faculty member's file. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if he or she wishes.

The teaching of associate professors will be formally peer reviewed 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 2000-6000 level language course, and one 7000-8000 level graduate course. The faculty

member assigned by the Teaching Evaluation Coordinator to perform the review will make a written report, a copy of which will be made available to the faculty member. The report will become part of the faculty member's file.

The teaching of Full Professors will be formally peer reviewed at least once every four years, with the goal of assessing teaching at all levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.

Additional or specific peer reviews of teaching may be scheduled by the Chair, especially in a case where problems become known (for example through declining SEI scores).

## **XI. REVISION OF DOCUMENT**

The Chair may ask the Committee of the Eligible Faculty or an *ad hoc* committee to recommend alterations, deletions, and additions to this document. Such recommendations will be discussed and voted on by the faculty in meeting.