

**Faculty Appointments, Promotion & Tenure:
Criteria and Procedures**

DEPARTMENT

OF

ENGLISH

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

OAA Approval, July 24, 2016

Table of Contents

I. Preamble	4
II. Mission Statement	4
III. Definitions	5
A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty	5
B. Conflict of Interest	5
C. Promotion and Tenure Committee	6
D. Quorum	7
E. Recommendations from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty	7
IV. Appointments	7
A. Criteria	7
1. Tenure-track Faculty	7
2. Tenure-track Faculty – Regional Campus	8
3. Probationary Period	8
4. Associated Faculty	8
Courtesy Faculty for Tenure-track Faculty	9
B. Procedures	9
1. Tenure-track Faculty	9
2. Regional Campus Faculty	11
3. Associated Faculty	11
4. Courtesy Appointments	11
V. Annual Review Procedures	12
A. Tenure-track Faculty	12
1. Probationary Faculty	12
2. Probationary Regional Campus Faculty	13
3. Fourth-Year Reviews	13
4. Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period	15
B. Tenured Faculty	15
C. Tenured Regional Campus Faculty	16
D. Associated Faculty	16
VI. Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards	17
A. Criteria	17
B. Procedures	17
C. Documentation	18
D. Regional Campus Faculty	18
VII. Promotion and Tenure Reviews	18
A. Criteria	18
1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	18
2. Promotion to Professor	21
3. Regional Campus Faculty	22
B. General Procedures	23
1. Regional Campus Faculty	24
2. Promotion to Associate Professor	24

3. External Evaluations	24
4. Non-Mandatory Reviews for Promotion to Associate Professor	26
5. Promotion to Professor.....	26
6. Comments Process	27
7. Procedures Oversight Designee (POD)	27
C. Documentation.....	27
VIII. Appeals.....	30
IX. Seventh-Year Review.....	30
X. Student and Peer Review of Teaching	30
A. Student Evaluation of Teaching	30
B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	31

I. PREAMBLE

What follows is a supplement to Chapter 6 of the Rules of the University Faculty (Additional Rules Concerning Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure) <http://trustees.osu.edu> the Office of Academic Affairs' annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews <http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>; and any additional policies established by the College and the University to which the Department and its faculty are subject.

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 the appointment or reappointment of the department Chair.

This document, in accordance with Faculty Rules, has been approved by the Executive Dean of the College and the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University; any significant changes must also receive approval before they can be implemented. This section 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 its criteria and procedures for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document the Executive Dean and Executive Vice President and Provost accept the mission and criteria of the Department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating continuing faculty and candidates for positions in relation to the Department's mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) 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 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) 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 (<http://hr.osu.edu/policy/policy110.pdf>).

II. MISSION STATEMENT

The Department of English is dedicated to the development and teaching of knowledge about the study of language, literature, media, and culture in the English speaking world. In addition, the Department is dedicated to serving audiences both inside and outside the University, through participation in activities ranging from supporting faculty governance to participating in community-based Arts and Humanities as well as interdisciplinary programs. We believe that the analytical study of literature, folklore, media, language, and writing helps develop a capacity for logical thought, a greater awareness of the complexity of value judgments, and the imaginative possibilities of the mind itself. English studies can expand our emotional, creative, and

cognitive capacities, can sharpen our ability to make difficult judgments, and can help us understand societies, times, and subcultures different from our own.

The audiences for our teaching include the large number of undergraduates who take our courses to satisfy General Education requirements; our own English majors and minors; and graduate students in our three degree programs, the M.A., the M.F.A., and the Ph.D. The audiences for our research include other scholars and writers, who participate in our critical conversations; teachers who are looking for ways to apply research findings in their classrooms; graduate students who are beginning their professional training; segments of the larger public interested in literature, language, and the humanities. The audiences for our service are also diverse; they include our colleagues at OSU and a broad spectrum of the public: high school teachers, people in various occupations who want to work on special skills, and citizens interested in the Humanities. The Department is dedicated to improving continuously the quality of its contributions to these multiple audiences.

We believe all faculty should make significant contributions in each of the three areas of teaching, research and service. For promotion and tenure, we require evidence of effective teaching at both the graduate and undergraduate levels as measured by student evaluations and reports of peer visitors, who will also evaluate course materials such as syllabi and assignments. Effectiveness on the graduate level is also measured by the quality of one's work as an advisor on student committees. In research, we require evidence of a faculty member's ability to make significant, high-quality contributions to important conversations in his or her field; this evidence typically takes the form of a published book or a sustained, original scholarly project in another form appropriate to the field, as well as essays in major refereed journals or edited volumes, conference papers at national meetings of scholarly organizations, and book reviews and review essays. For promotion to Professor, we require a second body of published scholarship, typically a published book or a sustained, original scholarly project in another form appropriate to the field and additional articles, reviews, presentations, and edited work beyond that required for tenure. In service, we recognize a variety of valuable contributions: service within the Department, within the College, within the University, within the larger profession of English Studies, and within the community—local, state, national, or international.

III. DEFINITIONS

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of tenure-track faculty on the Columbus campus consists of all tenure-track faculty (Instructors, Assistant, Associate, and Professors) for whom English is the Tenure-Initiating Unit (TIU). Faculty who have joint appointments in English through another TIU should refer to the Division of Arts & Humanities Supplementary Guidelines for Faculty with Joint Appointments:

<http://artsandsciences.osu.edu/arts-humanities-supp-apt>

The eligible faculty for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews of tenure-track faculty consists of all tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in the Department excluding the Department Chair, the Dean and

Assistant and Associate Deans of the College, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President.

B. Conflict of Interest

No faculty member may participate in the review of a particular candidate when he or she has a conflict of interest. Such a conflict exists in the following cases:

- When there is a familial or comparable relationship with a candidate.
- When there is a close professional relationship such that the faculty member stands to gain or lose professionally from the outcome of the review of the candidate, for example, co-authorship or co-editorship on a significant portion of the candidate's research or collaboration with the candidate on major grants supporting that research.
- When the faculty member was the candidate's dissertation adviser.

When there is a question about potential conflicts, the P&T Chair in consultation with the Procedures Oversight Designee shall determine whether it is appropriate for the faculty member to recuse himself or herself from a particular review. Letters from collaborators may be appropriate as a means of determining a faculty member's contributions to joint work, but the faculty member should not be present at the review of the candidate.

C. Promotion and Tenure Committee

The **Committee on Promotion and Tenure** (P&T) consists of faculty chosen from the ranks of Professors and Associate Professors. Its primary duty is to gather relevant information on Associate Professors being considered for promotion, and for Assistant Professors being considered for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, in order to aid the eligible faculty in making decisions concerning tenure and promotion. One member of the Committee is designated the Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) for Assistant Professors; another member is designated the POD for senior faculty. Both positions are dedicated to seeing that the Department fairly and appropriately carries out its own procedures and those of the College and OAA. The Chair of the P&T Committee oversees the Committee, ensures the proper execution of the Department's P&T policies and procedures, and participates with the Chair of the Department in coordinating and conducting annual reviews of Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors. The senior POD organizes the annual reviews of Associate Professors.

The P&T Committee also makes recommendations regarding P&T policies and procedures in order to advise the Chair of the Department, who is responsible for updating the Department's Appointments, Promotion, & Tenure document. In addition, the P&T Committee serves in other capacities as required by Department, OAA, and College guidelines, such as making recommendations to the Chair regarding requests from untenured faculty for unpaid leaves of absence or exclusions of time from the tenure clock. All Associate Professors and Professors in the Department serve at the

request of the Chair of P&T for particular duties related to promotion and tenure, including but not limited to: serving as a scribe for the appropriate promotion meeting, recruiting external reviewers, and summarizing discursive teaching evaluations.

D. Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved Leave of Absence, Faculty Professional Leave, or External Fellowship Subsidy. 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.

E. Recommendations 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 and will be entered in the record but not counted in the vote total, according to OAA and College stipulations. Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted. A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when two-thirds (67%) of the votes cast are positive. See “Procedures: Tenure-Track Faculty” for procedure when the vote to appointment is more than half but less than two-thirds of the votes. A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for promotion and tenure and promotion is secured when two-thirds (67%) of the votes cast are positive.

IV. APPOINTMENTS

A. Criteria

1. Tenure-track Faculty

Instructor

Appointments to the rank of Instructor will normally be made only when the offered appointment is that of Assistant Professor but the appointee has not completed the Ph.D. (or equivalent) at the onset of the appointment. Such appointees must have completed this degree by the end of the third year of employment, or the appointment will not be renewed. On promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor, faculty will only be granted prior service credit for the time spent as an Instructor if they request in writing, at the time of promotion to Assistant Professor, that they wish to receive such credit. Prior service credit must be approved by the eligible faculty, the Chair, the Dean, and OAA.

Assistant Professor

A person appointed as Assistant Professor is normally expected to hold the Ph.D. or equivalent. An appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor is always probationary, and may not exceed six years, except for approved exclusions of time on

the tenure clock. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Promotion and Tenure Committee determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted.

Associate Professor and Professor

A person appointed as Associate Professor or Professor is normally expected to hold the Ph.D. or equivalent, to have successful teaching experience, and to be capable of distinguished scholarship on the evidence of work already accomplished. A person appointed as Professor should have a distinguished record of teaching and scholarship. All appointments to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor require prior approval of the Executive Vice President and Provost.

2. Tenure-track Faculty—Regional Campus

As the mission of the regional campuses emphasizes undergraduate instruction, regional campus criteria for appointment at the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor are similar to those for Columbus campus faculty, but give relatively greater emphasis at each rank to teaching experience and quality.

3. Probationary period

A. Appointments as Associate Professor and as Professor will normally 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 the College of Arts and Sciences. 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. Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a senior rank and approved for tenure, if appropriate, but the University does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency.

B. When an instructor is promoted to the rank of Assistant Professor, prior service credit will only be granted for time spent as an Instructor if the faculty member indicates in writing at the time of promotion that he or she wishes to receive such credit. This written request must be forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs through the Executive Dean of the College so that tenure records may be adjusted accordingly.

C. An appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor is always probationary, and may not exceed six years, including prior service credit.

4. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a couple weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. With the exception of visiting faculty, associated faculty may be reappointed. Associated faculty appointments are not eligible for tenure. The department appoints the following categories of associated faculty:

A. Visiting Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor. Appointments to this position require the Ph.D. or its equivalent. Such appointments may not exceed three continuous years.

B. Adjunct Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor. Appointments to any of these unsalaried or salaried positions require the Ph.D. or its equivalent as well as the scholarly profile suitable for each rank. Expected contributions to the Department include work with graduate students, participation in the scholarly life of the Department, and, in some cases, teaching in the Department.

C. Senior Lecturer. Appointments to this position require at least the M.A. or its equivalent, though in most cases the Ph.D. or its equivalent is required. Senior Lecturer appointments may be renewed indefinitely according to University rules for terms of up to three years. The Department, however, may limit terms of some Senior Lecturers for programmatic reasons. Expected contributions to the Department include undergraduate teaching and, in some cases, service. Participation in the academic and scholarly life of the department is also welcomed but not required given that it is not directly compensated.

D. Lecturer. Appointments to this position require the M.A. or its equivalent. Lecturer appointments are typically made on a semester-by-semester basis to fill teaching needs, though a few appointments for two semesters may also be made. Lecturers may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank.

5. Courtesy Appointments for Tenure-track Faculty

The Department may extend courtesy appointments to tenure-track Ohio State faculty from other tenure initiating units whose teaching and research have ties to the work of the Department. Expected contributions include advising of graduate students, participation in the scholarly life of the Department, and, in some cases, occasional teaching in the Department. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

B. Procedures

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 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).

The Executive Committee of the Department will appoint a Search Committee for each position the Department seeks to fill. Each Search Committee will consist of 3 (or occasionally 4) people, some in the field of the prospective hiring and at least one in a different but related field within the Department or from another Department. The Executive Committee will designate one person on each Search Committee to serve as Chair. The Department Chair and/or Vice-Chair will be an ex officio member of each

Search Committee. Faculty not on the Search Committee are invited to read letters, CVs, and dossiers and make comments, but the Search Committee will select the list of interviewees. A typical search for a tenure-track Assistant Professor proceeds as follows.

The search committee selects approximately six candidates to interview at MLA, by Skype, or by phone. As soon as possible after the interviews (typically before or during the first week of Spring semester), each Search Committee will determine which two (or sometimes three) candidates to bring to campus—at least one of whom should contribute to the diversity of the Department. If the search committee judges that in the pool of candidates there is no person who can contribute in this way, it will explain to the faculty its efforts to attract a diverse pool of applicants and the reasons why those efforts did not produce diversity among the finalists. Shortly after the finalists are selected, the Search Committee(s) will present these candidates to the Department in the form of a short written narrative about the search to this point and the strengths of the candidates selected for campus visitations. In effect, this narrative functions as the first stage of a "hand-off" of the hiring process from the Search Committee(s) to the eligible faculty, who are, in the case of Appointments, the tenure-track faculty of the Department.

During the campus interview, the candidate will typically meet with graduate students, tenure-track faculty, the Chair and either the Divisional Dean or Associate Dean. In addition, the candidate will be asked to participate in a "job talk" session. The session will last for about an hour and will have two parts: (1) the candidate's presentation of research; (2) a question and answer session devoted to the candidate's presentation, to the candidate's research more generally, and to teaching.

After the campus interviews, the Search Committee will solicit advice from all who met the candidate, were at the talk, or otherwise involved in the visit. The Committee will then meet to decide which candidate to recommend to the eligible faculty to receive the first offer, which the second offer, or, indeed, any other way of proceeding. This recommendation constitutes the final stage of the hand-off from the Committee to the larger body. The Chair of the Committee will present not only the recommendation but also a narrative of how the recommendation was arrived at, a narrative that includes a précis of debates within the committee. If the eligible faculty vote in favor, the Chair will then extend the offer, assuming that it has the approval of the Executive Dean. 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 Executive 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.

For appointments to the rank of Associate Professor, immediately following a positive vote by the tenure-track faculty, the Associate Professors and Professors will vote to determine whether the candidate meets the Department's criteria for appointment at that rank with tenure. For appointments to the rank of Professor, immediately following a positive vote by the tenure-track faculty, the Professors will vote to determine whether the candidate meets the Department's criteria for appointment at that rank with tenure. A two-thirds majority of those voting Yes or No by secret ballot is

required. Following a positive vote from the eligible tenure-track faculty and the relevant body of Associate Professors and Professors, the Chair will then extend the offer, assuming that it has the approval of the Executive Dean. For hiring at the Associate Professor and Professor ranks, the Department must follow OAA guidelines, which include the solicitation of external evaluations of the candidate's research by scholars whose names are not given to the Department by the candidate. All offers at the Associate Professor and Professor ranks, with or without tenure, and all offers of prior service credit require the prior approval of OAA. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

2. Regional Campus Faculty

For a tenure-track position on a regional campus, the regional campus Dean/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 for the position consisting of members of both units. Candidates should, at the minimum, be interviewed by the regional campus Dean/Director, the Chair of the Department, the search committee, and representatives of both faculties. Candidates will be evaluated on both campuses, with the faculty on the Columbus campus (particularly those in the field) serving in an advisory role to the hiring campus. A decision to hire requires agreement on the part of the Chair of the Department and of the regional campus Dean/Director. Negotiations with a candidate should not begin without such agreement, and a letter of offer must be signed by the Chair of the Department and the Dean/Director of the regional campus.

3. Associated Faculty

Appointments to the positions of Visiting Assistant Professor, Senior Lecturer, and faculty with tenure-track titles <50% FTE will be made after a review of candidates by a hiring committee (with the Chair as one member), appropriate interviews, typically including one on campus, and a vote of the hiring committee.

Appointments to the positions of Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor, or Lecturer will be made at the discretion of the Chair, after consultation with the Executive Committee.

Associated faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for tenure-track faculty (see Appointment Criteria above), with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is negative, and does not proceed to the university level if the dean's recommendation is negative.

4. Courtesy Appointments

Courtesy appointments will be made at the discretion of the Chair, after consultation with the Executive Committee.

V. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES

A. Tenure-track Faculty

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the 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, scholarship, and service as set forth in the department's guidelines 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 no later than the final day of autumn semester classes.

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

1. Probationary Faculty

All probationary faculty are reviewed annually, and the entire eligible faculty participates in the fourth-year review. During the fourth year, a review at the College level is also required; an appointment cannot be renewed for the fifth year without the approval of the Executive Dean of the College.

Annual reviews of probationary faculty are conducted in the second half of the Spring semester. The candidate submits to the Chair a report of activities in the format of the OAA dossier outline; student evaluations of teaching and syllabi for the past year; a selection of scholarship in progress or completed; and any relevant evidence concerning service. The Chair may also solicit such other information and consult with colleagues as necessary to ensure a fair and thorough review. The Chair appoints a member of the faculty at Associate and Full rank to serve with the Chair, Vice-Chair, and the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee on the candidate's annual review team. The four members of the team review the material and meet with the candidate to discuss strengths and weaknesses of the performance, to offer advice about preparing for the fourth-year and sixth-year reviews, and to respond to any concerns the candidate might wish to raise. The Chair gives a summary of the discussion of the meeting to the candidate; copies of the summary also go to each member of the team and to the Executive Dean. The candidate may respond in writing. The Chair's annual review letters (and any responses from the candidate, if the candidate so chooses) become part of the faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure. The annual review letter must inform the faculty member of the right to review his or her personnel file.

If the review suggests that the candidate might be terminated prior to the fourth-year review or as a result of the regular fifth-year review, the Chair will convene the

eligible faculty to conduct a formal review following the procedures for fourth-year review. If, following this review by the eligible faculty, the Chair recommends nonrenewal of the appointment, the comments process will be invoked and, on completion of that process the case will be forwarded to the Executive Dean for College level review. As in the case of fourth-year reviews, the Executive Dean's decision shall be final.

2. Probationary Regional Campus Faculty

Probationary faculty on regional campuses will also be 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, takes 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 Executive Dean of the College. The Department review will focus on the candidate's scholarly work but will consider all aspects of his/her record. The Department Chair should give a written review to the faculty member and a copy to the Dean/Director. It is important that the Department Chair and the regional campus Dean/Director be alert to any developing discrepancy between the quality of the teaching and service on the one hand and the quality and quantity of the scholarly work on the other. When such discrepancies become apparent, the regional campus Dean/Director should seek appropriate means of addressing this problem with the faculty member and the Chair of the Department.

In the event that the regional campus Dean/Director recommends renewal and the Department Chair recommends nonrenewal, the case shall be reviewed by the Executive Dean of the College. The disagreement shall be considered during that review, with the Executive Dean of the College's judgment prevailing. If the Dean/Director recommends nonrenewal, and the Chair recommends renewal, the Chair's judgment shall prevail.

3. Fourth-Year Reviews

The purpose of the fourth-year review is to determine whether, in the view of the senior faculty, an Assistant Professor is making satisfactory progress toward establishing a record of teaching, research, and service that is likely to meet the Department's expectations in time for the sixth-year promotion and tenure review.

Procedures for the fourth-year review are the same as those for the sixth-year review except that during the fourth-year, external letters of evaluation are optional. This includes submitting all parts of the dossier outline as listed in section 4.1 of Volume III of the OAA Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/policies-procedures-handbook/3HBPT.pdf>) with the exception of external letters of evaluation. External evaluations are solicited only when either the department chair or the eligible faculty determine that they are necessary to conduct the Fourth-Year Review. This may occur when the candidate's scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input.

In assessing whether or not a colleague at fourth year is making satisfactory progress in teaching, the senior faculty will consider all of the information in the dossier, including peer observations, summaries of discursive evaluations, SEI reports, as well as other required material such as annual review letters. In assessing satisfactory progress in research, the senior faculty will use measures appropriate to the candidate's field as defined in section VII.A.1 below. For example, in fields where a published book is normally a requirement for tenure, senior faculty will typically expect to see a manuscript of the book complete by the time of the fourth-year review. In other fields, similar consideration will be given to the likelihood that a sufficient body of research will be in place by the time of sixth-year review. For every candidate, the Department's expectations with regard to research should be established early and reiterated both verbally in the annual review meetings and in writing in the Chair's letters that result from those meetings. In assessing the satisfactoriness of a candidate's service by fourth year, senior faculty will consider the record of annual review letters and other relevant evidence, such as feedback from the chairs of committees on which the candidate has served.

Before or at the mid-point of Spring semester of the fourth year of service as a member of the tenure-track faculty, the candidate submits to the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee all relevant evidence concerning teaching, scholarship, and service. For each candidate the committee assembles and distributes to the eligible faculty materials that include: (a) the OAA-designed dossier for reporting teaching, research, and service activities; (b) the candidate's cumulative SEI report and summaries of student evaluations of teaching, made by the committee and approved (or else rebutted in writing) by the candidate; (c) reports of classroom visitation by senior colleagues; (d) evaluations by senior colleagues of the candidate's scholarly writing (if available), and (e) the candidate's annual review letters. The Chair may also solicit such other information and consult with colleagues as necessary to ensure a fair and thorough review. Such information will be included in the dossier that goes forward to the college for review.

The Chair, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the candidate should pay careful attention to the guidelines and materials—and the format of their presentation—specified by the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Procedures Oversight Designee will be responsible for verifying the accuracy of the candidates' citations and other aspects of the candidates' dossiers. The Procedures Oversight Designee will also check the dossiers to ensure the appropriateness of their contents.

At its Spring semester meeting, the eligible faculty (that is, all Associate Professors and Professors with tenure from all campuses) discusses each candidate separately. After all candidates have been discussed, a straw vote is taken on those candidates by secret ballot; the results are announced to the meeting, and those results determine the order of final discussion. The candidate with the highest total in the straw vote is considered first, and each consideration begins with the introduction of a formal motion that the candidate pass the review. Once the formal motion has been made, discussion of the case is resumed. At the conclusion of this discussion, a final vote by secret ballot will be conducted.

For fourth-year review, the Department forwards the complete dossier to the college, including its recommendations to the Executive Dean via two letters: one from the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, summarizing the case and one from the Department Chair expressing his or her view of the case. The Executive Dean, at his or her discretion, will convene the College Promotion and Tenure Committee to review the Department's recommendations as part of the College review of the case. However, before reaching a negative decision or a decision contrary to the Department's recommendation, the Executive Dean must consult with the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, as provided in Faculty Rule 3335-6-03. The Executive Dean's decision in the fourth year is not forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost. If the outcome of the review is negative, the fifth year is the terminal appointment.

If all annual review decisions in the first five years are positive, the Department makes a recommendation about promotion and tenure in the autumn of the sixth year, and sends the recommendation forward for action, first, by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Executive Dean, then by the Executive Vice President and Provost, and, finally, for positive decisions, by the Board of Trustees. If the ultimate decision about the case is negative, the seventh year is a terminal appointment. If the ultimate decision about the case is positive, the promotion and tenure takes effect at the beginning of the seventh year.

At both the fourth and sixth years, candidates will be informed promptly when recommendations have been reached at each level of review. They will be given copies of the letters from the Chair and from the Promotion and Tenure Committee stating the recommendations and the reasons for them. Candidates will be informed that they have ten calendar days to submit comments in writing on these letters. If a candidate does submit comments, the Chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee may, in turn, provide written responses to the candidate's comments. Similarly, candidates will be invited to examine letters from the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and from the Executive Dean and to comment in writing on these letters. The Executive Dean and the College P&T Committee may, in turn, provide written responses to a candidate's comments.

4. Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) (trustees.osu.edu) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure-track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period.

An exclusionary year for care-giving responsibilities associated with the birth or adoption of a child under age six is automatic once the Department and the College notify OAA using the Notification of a Birth or Adoption Form. If the exclusionary year is not desired, the form does not need to be submitted.

A probationary faculty member may also apply to exclude time from the probationary period in increments of one year because of personal illness, care of a seriously ill or injured person, an unpaid leave of absence, or factors beyond the faculty member's control that hinder professional performance. Requests for such an exclusion must be made to the Chair, who shall ask the Promotion and Tenure Committee to vote

upon these requests. Such requests require approval by the Chair, Executive Dean, and Executive Vice President and Provost. A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any of these reasons must be made prior to April 1 of the year in which the mandatory review for tenure must occur. The extent to which the event leading to the request was beyond the faculty member's control, the extent to which it interfered with the faculty member's ability to be productive, and the faculty member's accomplishments up to the time of the request will be considered in the review of the request.

A request to exclude time from the probationary period will not be granted after a nonrenewal notice has been issued nor will previously approved requests to exclude time from the probationary period in any way limit the University's right not to renew a probationary appointment. The maximum number of years that may be excluded from a probationary period is three.

Expectations for productivity during the probationary period cannot be increased as a consequence of exclusions of time granted for any of the above reasons.

Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>).

B. Tenured Faculty

All tenured faculty receive an annual evaluation of their performances. For the Associate Professors, the Chair consults with the Professors, who help with the process. During early Spring semester, the Associate Review Coordinator, typically the Associate Professor POD, consults with the faculty at the Associate Professor and Professor ranks to arrange review partners. The Associate Review Coordinator ensures that the workload is distributed as fairly as possible and that, ideally, the same person is not reviewing the same colleague every year. For Professors, the Chair consults with the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, who will help with the process. The end result is that all Associate Professors and Professors receive an annual review letter based on their Activity Report. The annual review letter is separate from the salary letter. The purpose of the annual review letter is as follows:

- (1) to aid individual faculty in their on-going self-assessments of their teaching, research, and service;
- (2) to foster greater knowledge of each other's work and the opportunity for regular, serious discussion of it; and
- (3) to provide, over time, fuller information to the Chair and the salary committees for their deliberations about raises.

For Associate Professors, the letter becomes part of their official Promotion and Tenure file. By OAA rule, a face-to-face conference with the Chair must be scheduled for every faculty member. Any faculty member at the Associate Professor or Professor rank who wants a more extensive review may request one. Such reviews typically require the assessment of additional materials.

C. Tenured Faculty—Regional Campus

Tenured regional campus faculty are reviewed annually following the same procedures used for Columbus tenured faculty. The one difference is that they will also

receive a performance review of teaching and service by their regional campus Dean/Director, as set forth in the Policy on Faculty Annual Reviews in the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook. The regional campus Dean/Director will send that letter to the department chair so that the regional campus assessment of teaching and service might be referenced in the Chair's letter and placed in the faculty member's personnel file. The department will have primary responsibility for evaluating a faculty member's research and/or creative activity. In the case of a 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. In addition, the faculty member, the Dean/Director, or the Chair may request a meeting to discuss the review or any other concerns.

D. Associated Faculty

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The Department Chair, or designee, meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and prepares a written evaluation. 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 of up to three years.

Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple-year appointment are reviewed annually by the Department Chair, or designee. The Department Chair, or designee, meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals and prepares a written evaluation. No later than October 1 of the final year of 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

A. 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.

Meritorious performance in teaching, research, and service are assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. The time frame for assessing performance will be the twelve months of the previous calendar year, 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 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.

B. Procedures

The Chair annually presents to the Executive Dean recommendations about merit salary increases. In preparing those recommendations, the Chair seeks the advice of the Associate Professors and Professors through the establishment of a Committee on Merit Salary Increases. This Committee consists of the Chair and the elected Professors and Associate Professors on the Executive Committee. These four persons and the Chair are charged to look at merit and equity issues, on an annual and career basis. Anyone is free to confer on an individual basis with the Chair on excellence and equity issues.

Since final favorable action upon the Chair's recommendations for promotion or merit salary increases is determined by a number of factors—the sufficiency of legislative appropriations, the budgets of the College and the Department, the approval of the Executive Dean and the Executive Vice President and Provost—Department members should realize that a recommendation sets in motion administrative procedures over which the Department has no direct control.

See also the “Faculty Salary Appeals” section of the Pattern of Administration (POA) for the procedures governing a formal salary appeal.

C. Documentation

The documents that all faculty need to submit to the Department are (1) an annually updated CV; (2) the annual report of professional activities; (3) and any other documentation as deemed appropriate by the Chair and the Committee. The Associate Professors and Professors are encouraged to submit information concerning their teaching (e.g., awards or recognitions), service (e.g., student activities, etc.), and research (e.g., publications or papers read at scholarly meetings) both to the weekly Newsletter and to the Department of English Annual Report of Professional Activities.

D. Regional Campus Faculty

Each of the regional campuses has its own amount of money for distribution to its faculty. Regional campus Deans/Directors have responsibility for recommending to the Executive Vice President and Provost increases for regional campus faculty. Each Dean/Director will consult with the Department Chair before making these recommendations.

VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEWS

A. Criteria

Promotion and tenure in the Department of English shall be administered in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (D) and other University and College

guidelines. Copies of these documents shall be made available to every new or continuing tenure-track faculty member (of the level of Instructor or above), together with such additions, amendments, and/or revisions as might subsequently be issued.

The following guidelines are supplementary to the University and College documents and set forth procedures applicable particularly to the Department of English. In formulating its judgments on promotion and tenure, the Department takes into account the candidate's accomplishment in (1) teaching; (2) scholarship; and (3) service to the campus (where relevant), the Department, the University, and the profession. As our mission statement indicates, the Department is aware that no one of these criteria can or should be applied mechanically. The Department's everyday life provides a variety of informal means for cultivating teaching, scholarship, and service. People share teaching ideas, exchange syllabi, visit each other's classes, consult with course directors; they try out early versions of scholarly papers at Department colloquia, or invite particular colleagues to evaluate early-draft manuscripts; they suggest changes in curriculum or policy that require committee deliberation. The Department's basic vitality will always depend on this informal activity, which can also help candidates for promotion and tenure meet the general criteria described below.

1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in the Department of English requires excellence in both scholarship and teaching, where scholarship is defined as research, scholarly, and/or creative work. Demonstration of commitment to and effectiveness in service is required, and the promise of excellence in service is expected. Excellence in scholarship means attainment of measurable national or international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of high quality published research and/or other relevant creative endeavors. A successful candidate will have an emerging national reputation as a scholar. Excellence in teaching means the provision to all students of the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning and, to the most capable and motivated students, an enhanced learning experience. Excellence in service means the provision of a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more publics, including the university, the local community, the State of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations. The service contribution during the probationary period of Assistant Professors is limited by design. The most important judgment is that the candidate will achieve excellence in service in the future.

The substantial probability that a high rate of quality scholarship and excellence in teaching and service will continue needs to be established. The claim that retention of the candidate will improve the overall quality and standing of the unit needs to be supported.

Excellence in teaching, research, 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:

<http://www.aaup.org/report/statement-professional-ethics>.

Teaching

The Department considers excellence in teaching as important as excellence in scholarship, and it takes into consideration the candidate's effectiveness among the variety of students enrolled in our courses, in exciting interest, cultivating independent thought, and imparting demonstrable knowledge and skill. Candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to advise students regularly and, upon appointment to the graduate faculty, to serve on M.A. or Ph.D. examination committees and to direct M.A. and eventually Ph.D. dissertations or, for faculty in Creative Writing, to direct M.F.A. theses.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness should ordinarily consist of: (a) student evaluations from a variety of classes, at different levels of the curriculum where appropriate; (b) written reports of classroom visitation by senior colleagues, including assessments of syllabi and other course materials; and (c) a written self-evaluation describing rationales and procedures, and evaluating both successes and failures in particular courses. Further details are included below in the section on Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching.

Scholarship

Scholarship is indispensable to membership on the University's graduate faculty, and is expected of all persons holding professorial rank. Beyond the quantitative standards for promotion to each rank (see below), the Department values especially the quality of a candidate's scholarship: its originality, lucidity, and intellectual depth. Evidence of scholarship should consist of published scholarship or creative work, singly or collaboratively authored, or, where appropriate, textbooks, journal articles on pedagogy, recordings, videotapes, films, and works in electronic or other media, singly or collaboratively produced. Publication and other scholarly and creative activities occur in diverse media (e.g., print and digital format), and the same standard—clear excellence—applies regardless of the medium. Scholarship and creative work should normally be reviewed in the medium in which it was published (e.g., web publications should be read online).

Candidates must also demonstrate evidence of having made significant, high-quality contributions to important conversations in their field. In most cases, this evidence takes the form of a book or at least a finished manuscript under final, board-approved contract, published or officially approved for publication by a press with a strong reputation, or of a sustained, original scholarly project in another form appropriate to the field, as well as essays in major refereed journals or edited volumes, conference papers at national meetings of scholarly organizations, and book reviews and review essays. For those who have been hired to teach in the Creative Writing MFA Program, this evidence will typically take the form of two published books (one published before or in contract at the time of hire), or of a published book and a second book under final contract.

If the candidate specializes in a field of study where the standard of scholarly excellence usually takes a form other than a single-authored book or sustained scholarly project, the Department Chair, the P&T Chair, and the candidate will consult with other faculty in the field to determine the quantitative and qualitative criteria that the

candidate will need to meet in order to fulfill the expectations for promotion and tenure. These criteria will be documented in the first-year and subsequent annual reviews.

Publication (or imminent publication) of scholarly or creative work by highly respected publishers is strong evidence that the candidate's research has met the profession's standards of peer review. However, a quantitative record is not itself a guarantee that the research has met the Department's qualitative standards. The eligible faculty of the Department will make that judgment on the basis of their reading and discussion of the scholarship or creative work and of assessments of it in published reviews (if any) and the letters from external evaluators.

In addition, every candidate must show evidence of substantial efforts to gain outside funding for research or creative work and of the promise for continued research or creative productivity.

Service

Candidates for promotion and tenure are expected to assume committee responsibilities when called upon by the Department, the College, the University, or the profession, and to participate where appropriate in activities that support the academic mission of the University in the community, and in general to participate in and contribute to the collective intellectual life of the Department. Evidence of service should consist of a record of service activities, along with the testimony of those served where appropriate; candidates must also write a statement about their service for their promotion and tenure dossier. As indicated below, service is considered by the College to include service to one or more of several publics: the university, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations.

2. Promotion to Professor

For promotion to Professor in the Department of English, faculty must demonstrate significant achievement beyond what was required for promotion to Associate Professor. Typically, a candidate for promotion to Professor will be someone whose scholarly or creative work has attained measurable national and/or international distinction, and whose teaching and service have been consistently strong to excellent. External hires at the Professor level with tenure should demonstrate the same accomplishments in scholarship, teaching, and service as persons promoted within the university.

The Department places the highest value on candidates' demonstration of scholarly excellence. "Excellence" here typically means attainment of measurable national or international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of high-quality published research and/or other relevant creative endeavors. Such productivity will have resulted in an additional body of published work beyond that required for tenure. This work may take the form of an additional published book or sustained scholarly or creative projects of comparable weight and coherence. Additional evidence of scholarly productivity is also required, such as essays, book chapters, scholarly editions, conference presentations, readings of creative work, and book reviews. All

such work should be disseminated in the form most appropriate to its content or to the candidate's field.

Excellence in teaching means providing to all students an opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning and, to the most capable and motivated students, an enhanced learning experience. Excellence in teaching can also be measured by national or international recognition, as evidenced by pedagogical publications, awards, honors, and/or critical student outcomes. Promotion candidates on the Columbus campus will usually demonstrate, in addition to a strong record of undergraduate pedagogy, evidence of extensive graduate teaching and graduate advising in their fields. All candidates for promotion to Professor should have a minimum of three peer reviews covering the five years preceding the promotion case. All Professors on duty are expected to be available to do these evaluations. Candidates for promotion to Professor should have their teaching at different levels of the curriculum evaluated, and if on the Columbus campus they should have at least one graduate course evaluated, if taught.

In the area of service, candidates are expected to have built a record of significant professional service at the College, University, and national levels, while also continuing to provide high-quality service to the Department. Although not required, evidence of professionally-related public service at the local, national, or international levels is also valued.

In all promotion cases, the candidate's record should also demonstrate a probability that his or her high rate of quality scholarship and/or excellence in teaching and service will continue. The record should also justify any claim that retention of the candidate will improve the overall quality and standing of the unit.

While acknowledging that a typical case for promotion to Professor will emphasize a candidate's scholarly or creative achievements, especially as measured through publication and (inter)national reputation, the College of Arts and Sciences also recognizes that, "[w]here a candidate has made truly extraordinary contributions in the areas of teaching or service, that record may warrant promotion in combination with a less extensive, though excellent record of continued productivity in scholarship." In screening candidates for promotion, the Department of English honors this principle of exception as described in the College's APT document, with an understanding that such contributions—whether within or beyond the university—must be documentable in ways that can be reviewed by external evaluators as well as by the senior faculty.

3. Regional Campus Faculty

As members of the Department of English, regional campus faculty are expected to contribute to scholarship in their discipline. These contributions will be evaluated by the same means and according to the same criteria as described above. In recognition of the different mission of the regional campuses, however, the Department makes some adjustments in quantitative research expectations. Because the primary mission of the regional campuses is to provide high-quality undergraduate instruction and serve the academic needs of their communities, the Department will give greater weight to the performances in undergraduate teaching and service of regional campus faculty. For promotion to Associate Professor, regional campus candidates will be expected to meet the same research requirements as Columbus faculty—a published book (or a finished

book manuscript under board-approved contract) or a sustained, original scholarly project appropriate to the field—with the exception that additional published work is desirable but not, as it is for Columbus faculty, the standard expectation. The general criteria for promotion to Professor on the regional campuses as described above under “Criteria for Promotion to Professor” are understood to apply to regional campus faculty. The Department will look for sustained excellence in undergraduate teaching and mentoring and will not expect graduate advising, and in considering the record will keep in mind the different mission of the regional campuses as described above.

Because the responsibility for maintaining strong ties with the local community falls more directly on the regional campus faculty than is the case on the Columbus campus, service for regional campus candidates may be understood to include not only active participation on campus committees and in professional organizations but also participation in those activities that support the academic mission of the University in the community.

In formulating its judgment on regional campus candidates, the Department pays close attention to the recommendations of the campus's Peer Review Committee and the campus Dean/Director.

B. General Procedures

As noted above, annual reviews of untenured faculty (including those on regional campuses) are the responsibility of the Chair of the Department.

For fourth-year reviews, sixth-year reviews, and reviews regarding promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, the Promotion and Tenure Committee serves the important function of notifying candidates of deadlines, contacting external reviewers, ensuring the timely distribution of all materials to the eligible faculty, and otherwise overseeing the process of the review. The formal recommendations in each case are reached by vote of the relevant body of eligible faculty at a meeting or meetings scheduled early enough to meet subsequent deadlines set by the College of Arts and Sciences.

The longstanding tradition of the Department of English is that the Chair of the Department runs the meetings in which faculty discuss and vote on cases for fourth-year, sixth-year, and promotion review. Because the Department Chair writes and submits to the College an independent evaluation of the case and does not vote with the rest of the body, however, the Chair's participation in these meetings should remain as neutral as possible. S/He will run the meeting by normal Rules of Order (asking for motions and recognizing speakers from the floor). S/He will not volunteer evaluative comments on cases under discussion, although s/he may, if asked from the floor, offer statements of factual information relevant to a particular case.

If the Chair decides for any reason to recuse him/herself from the duties of running all or part of a P&T meeting, s/he retains the right to be present in order to hear the full discussion. If the Chair is recused from running all or part of a P&T meeting, his/her duties in that respect will fall to the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

For fourth-year reviews, sixth-year reviews, and reviews for promotion to Professor, the voting procedure is as follows: after all candidates have been discussed,

a straw vote is taken on those candidates by secret ballot; the results are announced to the meeting, and those results determine the order of final discussion. The candidate with the highest total in the straw vote will be considered first, and each consideration will begin with the introduction of a formal motion that the candidate pass the review. Once the formal motion has been made, discussion of the case is resumed. At the conclusion of this discussion, a final vote by secret ballot will be conducted. A two-thirds majority is required for an affirmative recommendation. Proxy votes are not allowed, but those who have participated in the meeting via teleconferencing may vote.

For reviews of candidates for tenured Associate Professor or Professor positions: the same procedures apply, except that the straw vote may be omitted if any member of the review body (Associate Professors and Professors in the case of candidates for Associate Professor positions and the Professors in the case of candidates for Professor positions), including the Chair, so proposes and no one objects.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee, acting for the committee of the whole, submits a written report on each candidate to the Chair indicating the eligible faculty's vote and recommendation, and an explanation of that recommendation, typically rendered as a summary of the discussion among those present at the review meeting. The Chair includes that report in the dossier forwarded to the Executive Dean.

The Chair also writes a separate recommendation and assessment of the case to be included in the dossier sent to the Executive Dean. The purpose of this letter is to present an assessment from the Chair's perspective of the candidate's work in the areas of teaching, research, and service. While the Chair's letter should not comment on evidence in the case not available to everyone else, the letter may discuss at greater length items that the Chair, by virtue of his/her position, has special knowledge of. The Chair's letter will also comment on the relevant contextual features of the case such as the disciplinary standing of the external evaluators.

If the Chair's individual view of a candidate's merit may lead to a recommendation different from that of the relevant body of eligible faculty, the Chair will communicate in writing to that body the reasons for that recommendation.

1. Regional Campus Faculty

Except when the review is a mandatory review for tenure, the Department determines which faculty members will be reviewed for promotion and tenure or for promotion. If a regional campus faculty member is to be reviewed, the Department Chair will so notify the faculty member, with a copy to the Dean/Director of the regional campus.

The Dean/Director will initiate a review by the regional campus faculty according to the procedures established on the campus. This review focuses mainly on teaching and service. The Dean/Director forwards the report of this review, and a recommendation to the Chair of the Department, for inclusion in the candidate's dossier and for the use of the Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee. From this point the review follows the same course as all promotion and tenure reviews.

2. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

The procedure is identical to that followed for fourth-year review (see above) with one exception: the Committee on Promotion and Tenure solicits evaluations of the candidate's scholarship from scholars outside the University as well as colleagues within the Department.

3. External Evaluations

A minimum of five credible and useful external evaluations of scholarship is required for all P&T as well as all promotion reviews. To ensure that this minimum is met, the Department generally lines up six evaluators for each candidate.

A credible and useful evaluation:

a) Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's research (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor, or post doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. The Department will obtain evaluations, whenever possible, from scholars who hold the rank of Professor 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.

b) Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will usefulness be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

A list of potential evaluators will be assembled by the P&T Chair, in consultation with the P&T Committee, the candidate, and senior faculty, especially those with expertise in the candidate's field(s). The P&T Chair will also consult the candidate about how to define his or her field(s). If there are no Associate Professors and Professors in the candidate's field(s) within the English Department, the P&T Chair and Committee will assemble a list of potential evaluators based on advice given by Associate Professors and Professors outside the Department in the relevant field(s).

The candidate is responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the Department and may add up to six 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 Chair of Promotion and Tenure decides whether removal is justified. The final list of potential evaluators will then be sent to the College for approval.

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 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) 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 the Department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The Chair of Promotion and Tenure shall be responsible for determining who will recruit the evaluators by phone or email, but typically this person will be the Chair of Promotion and Tenure, a member of the P&T Committee, or a senior colleague in the candidate's field.

The Department will follow the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format, provided at <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 (e.g., 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.

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

4. Non-Mandatory Reviews for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

The eligible faculty meet during Spring semester or after a positive fourth-year review to decide whether to approve requests from Assistant Professors to undergo a non-mandatory review for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure in the following fall of that year. The screening of candidates who have just undergone fourth-year review will be based on the materials submitted for that review. The screening of all other candidates (i.e. those who have not yet passed a fourth-year review) will be based on the following materials submitted for the eligible senior faculty to review: (1) the candidate's current core dossier, including complete narrative sections on teaching, research and service, plus a cumulative SEI report; (2) a current C.V.; (3) copies of all previous annual review letters and peer teaching observations; and (4) documentation confirming the publication schedule of the book(s) or comparable major project(s) that will be central to the promotion and tenure case. The documentation mentioned under

item (4) should include, in the case of books, a final (board-approved) contract, and, in the case of articles or other works, letters of acceptance or other formal agreements to publish the work(s) in question.

Except in the cases of those who have just gone through fourth-year review, this screening meeting for candidates seeking non-mandatory P&T review should typically occur within the first six weeks of spring semester, and all the relevant materials for review should be available at least one week prior to the date of the screening meeting.

A two-thirds majority is required for a promotion and tenure review to be conducted the following year, and the vote on this is to be conducted by secret ballot. If the decision is to move forward with the non-mandatory review, the Department Chair and the Chair of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure begin the same process as that followed for a mandatory sixth-year review. A decision to permit a review to take place in no way commits the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department Chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself. Nor does a decision to permit a non-mandatory review obligate the candidate to go through with the review should he or she choose, on the basis of feedback from the screening meeting or other factors, to wait until the completion of the full probationary period before undergoing a mandatory sixth-year review. If the recommendation of the eligible faculty at the Spring semester or fourth-year review meeting is negative, the matter is considered closed for that year.

5. Promotion to Professor

During fall semester, Associate Professors who wish to be considered for promotion to Professor in the following academic year should make that request known to the Chair and / or Chair of P&T. Should they arise, promotion cases for those who currently hold the rank of Associate Professor without tenure will be handled by the same procedures as those described below. The Professors meet early in Spring semester to screen materials submitted in support of that request. Approval of the request will be based on a positive review of the following documentation: (1) the candidate's up-to-date CV; (2) three statements—like those required for the core dossier—providing a narrative of the candidate's research program and accomplishments in teaching and in service going back five years or to last promotion, whichever is more recent; and (3) a cumulative SEI report. The Professors will also have access to the candidate's annual review letters going back five years or to last promotion, whichever is more recent. If a major research project such as a monograph is going to figure prominently in the promotion case but has not yet been published, the statement on research (under item 2 in the preceding list) should include a timeline for publication, with a copy of a final board-approved contract attached. Letters of acceptance for other major publications not yet in print should also be included. Likewise, the statement on teaching for Columbus campus faculty should include an updated list of graduate student and honors student committees, if these are not included on the C.V. An updated core dossier is not required for the screening meeting. But if the screening vote is positive, the candidate must submit a core dossier later in the spring as part of the materials for his/her regular annual review for that year.

This screening meeting should typically occur within the first six weeks of spring semester, and all the relevant materials for review should be available at least one week prior to the date of the screening meeting. At the screening meeting, a two-thirds majority, voting by secret ballot, is required to approve a request that a promotion review be conducted in the following autumn.

If the decision is to consider, the Department Chair and the Chair of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure begin the same process as that followed for a sixth-year review: they assemble and distribute complete dossiers on each candidate, including documentation about teaching, published reviews of scholarship, and at least five, though preferably six, written evaluations by scholars at other universities. At a meeting during Autumn semester, the Professors decide whether to recommend promotion. A two-thirds majority of those voting by secret ballot is required for an affirmative recommendation. Proxy votes are not honored, but those who have participated in the meeting via teleconferencing may vote.

If the recommendation of the Professors at the Spring semester meeting is negative, the matter is considered closed for that year. However, the Professors may delay for only one year the request of an Associate Professor to be considered for promotion to Full. Any subsequent request by the Associate Professor will automatically result in a full review.

6. Comments Process

As soon as the report of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Chair's letter to the Executive Dean have been completed, the candidate is given copies. The candidate may provide the Chair with written comments on these letters for inclusion in the dossier within ten calendar days. The Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Chair may, in turn, provide written responses to the candidate's comments for inclusion in the dossier. Only one iteration of comments on the Departmental review is permitted.

7. Procedures Oversight Designee (POD)

When the Promotion and Tenure Committee is appointed, one member must be selected as the Procedures Oversight Designee (one POD is assigned for Assistant Professors and another POD for Associate Professors). This member will work to ensure that the review body at each level follows written procedures governing the reviews, that the proceedings are carried out in a highly professional manner, and, in particular, that the proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions about members of underrepresented groups that could bias the review. Any procedural difficulties or other concerns about the review should first be brought to the attention of the relevant review body. If they cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of the Designee, then they should be brought to the attention of the relevant administrator (Chair, Executive Dean, or Executive Vice President and Provost, depending on the level of the review). That individual must look into the matter and provide a response to the Designee regarding either actions taken, or why action is judged not to be warranted.

C. DOCUMENTATION

Every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. While the Promotion and Tenure Committee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by the candidate, including the Core Dossier (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/CoreDossier.pdf>). The Department is responsible for summarizing the discursive evaluations, collecting the peer evaluations of teaching, and acquiring the external assessments of the research.

The complete dossier, including the documentation of teaching noted in bold below, is forwarded when the review moves beyond the department. The documentation of scholarship and service noted below is for use during the department review only, unless reviewers at the college and university levels specifically request it. 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 candidates solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

1. Teaching

The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, to present. Required documentation includes but is not limited to:

- 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 (see Section X). For probationary faculty, the number is five conducted since the time of hire (probationary faculty do not have to be observed in their first year of teaching, but they should have at least four peer evaluations by the time of fourth-year review). For tenured faculty, the number is three conducted in the past five years. These evaluations should cover classes at different levels of the curriculum (lower-division undergraduate, upper-division undergraduate, and, if applicable, graduate courses).
- SEI reports for every class taught.
- Copies of student discursive evaluations collected for every class taught during the time period of the review.
- A copy of the syllabus for every class taught during the time period of the review.
- Copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter or email from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.
- Teaching activities as listed in the core dossier such as:

- involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers;
- extension and continuing education instruction;
- involvement in curriculum development;
- awards and formal recognition of teaching;
- presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences;
- adoption of teaching materials at other colleges or universities;
- other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.

2. Scholarship

The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to present. Documentation includes but is not limited to the following:

- Copies of all books, articles, chapters, short fiction, poems, short nonfiction, and other creative or scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Candidates coming up for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are strongly advised to have their book manuscripts, where relevant, published or at least completed and under board-approved contract by the time research materials are sent out to external reviewers (typically June). In the exceptional case where the candidate is making changes to the manuscript after it is sent out to external reviewers, he or she may provide the eligible faculty with the most up-to-date version at least two weeks before the P&T review. However, in such a case, both versions of the manuscript will be made available to the eligible faculty along with the candidate's outline of the differences between the versions. The candidate should also clearly mark changes in the revised manuscript to make it easier for eligible faculty to discern and evaluate the differences.
- Copies of contracts and reports by readers for scholarship as yet unpublished but under contract. Where relevant, the candidate's response to the readers' reports should also be included. Articles, book chapters, and other scholarly or creative work that have been accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter or email from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed.
- A current c.v.
- Any published reviews of the candidate's work.
- Scholarship activities as listed in the core dossier including but not limited to:
 - documentation of other creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus including screenplays, artwork, choreography, collections, compositions, curated exhibits, moving images, multimedia, performances, radio, recitals, recordings, television, and websites;
 - quality indicators, such as books or articles where the candidate's work is cited;

- documentation of grants and contracts received; and
- a list of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work.

3. Service

The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to present. Examples of documentation include but is not limited to:

- Service activities as listed in the core dossier such as:
 - involvement with professional journals and professional societies;
 - consultation activity with industry, education, or government;
 - administrative service to the department;
 - administrative service to the college;
 - administrative service to the university and Student Life;
 - advising to student groups and organizations;
 - awards and prizes for service to profession, university, or department.
- Any available documentation (e.g. letters from committee chairs) of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier. Such materials should not be solicited by the candidate; rather, the Chair of Promotion and Tenure will request them when appropriate.

VIII. APPEALS

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>).

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.

IX. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS

In rare instances, when new evidence emerges, the Department may petition the Executive Dean to conduct a seventh-year review for a candidate who has been denied promotion and tenure, as set forth in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 \(B\)](#). As noted above, the Department understands new evidence to relate to the materials used in the P&T review, not new writing or materials collected or produced since the decision was made. A seventh-year review must be approved before the end of the sixth year; both the Chair and the eligible faculty must approve proceeding with the petition to the Executive Dean. A seventh-year review follows the same procedures as a sixth-year review; it does not presume a positive outcome. Should the new review result in a negative decision, the faculty member's last day of employment is that stated in the letter of nonrenewal issued following the original negative decision.

A faculty member may not appeal the denial of a seventh-year review petition initiated by his or her tenure initiating unit 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. STUDENT AND PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

All members of the Department must allow students to evaluate their courses. Furthermore, University rule stipulates that units should have a common evaluation instrument, and, at the present time, that instrument is the SEI. For purposes of promotion and tenure decisions, Assistant Professors and Associate Professors are required to submit SEIs; however, in general, more weight will be given to other evaluative sources (such as discursive evaluations and peer observations) in reviewing an instructor's teaching, especially in instances where a low SEI response rate (prior to the implementation of apps that have made it easier for students to fill out the SEIs in class) might create unreliability in the results. All teachers are required to collect discursive commentary through the use of evaluation forms, distributed in class, that solicit information about both the quality of the course's content and the quality of the instructor's performance. One of the common topics of discussion at annual reviews will be the appropriateness and effectiveness of the candidate's discursive evaluation form.

In order for the students to feel free to express their opinions without fear of reprisal at grading time, the following procedures should be followed in distributing, collecting, and reading evaluations. First, the instructor should not be in the room when the evaluations are filled out. Second, the evaluations should be collected by someone other than the instructor (it may be one of the students), who should then place them in a sealed envelope labeled with the course number and the instructor's name and bring them to the English Department office. Third, the instructor should not pick up and read the evaluations until after the grades are turned in to the Registrar.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

By the time of the fourth-year review, the Department requires four peer evaluations of teaching, and by the time of the sixth-year review, the Department requires a minimum total of five such evaluations. The first peer evaluation must be done no later than a candidate's second year. All faculty at the Associate and Full rank are expected to do such evaluations, and the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee assists in these arrangements. Candidates should have their teaching at different levels of the curriculum evaluated.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor should have a minimum of three peer reviews covering the five years preceding the promotion case. All Professors are eligible and expected to do these evaluations. Candidates for promotion to Professor should have their teaching at different levels of the curriculum evaluated, and (except for regional campus faculty) they should be sure to have at least one graduate course evaluated, if taught.

Peer evaluators should visit at least one, and preferably two, sessions of a course. Peer reports should be thorough, detailed, honest, and fair. The following guidelines are intended to assist peer evaluators in writing evaluative reports that will be useful to those who will review the candidate's P&T case as well as to the candidate.

- Before attending the class, the peer evaluator should be given a copy of the syllabus and any relevant materials for the day of the visit, such as assignments, examinations, study guides, and handouts. If there are relevant materials posted on Carmen or pre-class discussions taking place there, the instructor should provide the peer evaluator with access to the Carmen site.
- As part of the peer evaluation report, the evaluator should describe the syllabus, including objectives, schedule, assignments, method/s of assessment, classroom policies and rules. The evaluator should also identify any stand-out strengths or potential weaknesses of the syllabus.
- The peer evaluation report should note the number of students in the class, the number who attended on the day (or days) of the visit, and, if relevant (i.e., in a discussion class), how many students contributed to class discussion. Other details—such as the room layout or student composition (e.g., an interdisciplinary class vs. a class of all or mostly English majors)—that may assist in explaining the effectiveness of the class should also be included in the report.
- The peer report should consist of an evaluative account of what the person observed. This will include a descriptive overview of how the class was structured and how each part unfolded over the allotted time. But the evaluator should also assess the success of the approach and might also cover topics such as the instructor's effectiveness as a lecturer and/or as a moderator of class discussion, the clarity of the class objectives for the day, how well the instructor seems to be meeting the aims of the course as outlined in the syllabus, the instructor's command of the material and knowledge of the subject matter, and the instructor's engagement with the students and helpfulness in answering questions.
- After the class, the peer evaluator should also discuss his/her observations with the faculty member, and this discussion may become part of the report.
- Effective peer reports generally run around two pages, single spaced—but may run longer if the observer attended more than one class.
- The peer evaluator may share his or her report with the faculty member before submitting a signed copy to the chair or P&T Chair for inclusion in the faculty member's personnel file. The purpose of such sharing is to give the instructor a chance to point out any (and only) factual errors, but having a report in hand can also assist the faculty member in promptly acting on recommendations that will improve his or her teaching. Faculty members are allowed to view the peer evaluations in their personnel file at any time.

Informal peer reviews—ones that do not generate an official report for a faculty member's file, but do elicit a conversation about that faculty member's teaching with a senior faculty observer—are also encouraged. In general, all faculty are encouraged to arrange visits to the classes of other colleagues as a way to expand their understanding of successful teaching methods and skills.

REVISED 9.20.15