

**Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure  
Criteria and Procedures for the Department of Astronomy  
Revised: 09/12/11**

**Table of Contents**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| I Preamble .....  | 4  |
| II Department Mission .....   | 4  |
| III Definitions.....  | 5  |
| A Faculty Advisory Committee .....  | 5  |
| 1 Regular Tenure Track Faculty .....  | 5  |
| 2 Regular Research Track Faculty .....                                      | 5  |
| 3 Conflict of Interest .....  | 5  |
| 4 Minimum Composition.....  | 6  |
| B Quorum.....   | 6  |
| C Recommendation from the Faculty Advisory Committee .....                  | 6  |
| 1 Appointment .....   | 6  |
| 2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal..... | 6  |
| IV Appointments.....  | 6  |
| A Criteria .....  | 6  |
| 1 Regular Tenure Track Faculty .....  | 7  |
| 2 Regular Tenure Track Faculty—Regional Campus.....                         | 8  |
| 3 Regular Research Track Faculty .....                                      | 8  |
| 4 Auxiliary Faculty .....   | 9  |
| 5 Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty .....                           | 10 |
| B Procedures .....  | 10 |
| 1 Regular Tenure Track Faculty .....  | 10 |
| 2 Regular Tenure Track Faculty—Regional Campus.....                         | 11 |
| 3 Regular Research Track Faculty .....                                      | 12 |
| 4 Transfer of Track .....   | 13 |
| 5 Auxiliary Faculty .....   | 13 |
| 6 Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty .....                           | 13 |
| V Annual Review Procedures.....   | 14 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
|  | 2  |
| A Probationary Tenure Track Faculty .....              | 15 |
| 1 Regional Campus Faculty .....                        | 15 |
| 2 Fourth-Year Review.....                              | 15 |
| 3 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period.....      | 16 |
| B Tenured Faculty.....                                 | 16 |
| C Tenured Faculty—Regional Campus .....                | 16 |
| D Regular Research Track Faculty .....                 | 17 |
| VI Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards .....      | 17 |
| A Criteria .....                                       | 17 |
| B Procedures .....                                     | 17 |
| C Documentation .....                                  | 18 |
| VII Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews.....    | 18 |
| A Criteria .....                                       | 18 |
| 1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure .....   | 19 |
| 2 Promotion to Professor .....                         | 21 |
| 3 Alternative Path to Promotion to Professor .....     | 21 |
| 4 Regional Campus Faculty .....                        | 22 |
| 5 Regular Research Track Faculty .....                 | 22 |
| B Procedures .....                                     | 22 |
| 1 Candidate Responsibilities.....                      | 22 |
| 2 Departmental Review Committee Responsibilities ..... | 23 |
| 3 Faculty Advisory Committee Responsibilities .....    | 24 |
| 4 Department Chair Responsibilities .....              | 25 |
| 5 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty.....          | 26 |
| 6 External Evaluations .....                           | 26 |
| C Documentation .....                                  | 27 |
| 1 Teaching.....  | 27 |
| 2 Research.....  | 28 |
| 3 Service.....   | 28 |
| VIII Appeals.....                                      | 28 |
| IX Seventh-Year Reviews.....                           | 29 |

X Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching..... 29

    A Student Evaluation of Teaching..... 29

    B Peer Evaluation of Teaching ..... 29

## **I Preamble**

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty [www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php](http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policy and Procedures Handbook, <http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>; and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the department and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the department will follow the new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years on the appointment or reappointment of the department chair.

This document must be approved by the dean of the college and the Office of Academic Affairs before it may be implemented. It sets forth the department's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the college and university, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the dean and the Office of Academic Affairs accept the mission and criteria of the department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to departmental mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01, [www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php](http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php) 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, [www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php](http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php) 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.

## **II Department Mission**

The mission of the Department of Astronomy is to promote and enhance the research of the department to a level that is competitive with that of the best universities in the country, and to promote teaching and service by the department to an equally high level of excellence.

Excellence in research involves advancing our understanding of the universe and making those advances known through scholarly publications and presentations, stimulating the research work of graduate students and colleagues both at Ohio State and elsewhere, and establishing a reputation for independent work at the forefront of astronomical research. It necessitates hiring, and then promoting, only outstanding new faculty to preserve and enhance our college's strength in research.

Excellence in teaching involves (1) presenting in astronomy undergraduate service courses the most engaging and content-rich educational product possible, (2) providing in courses designed primarily for our majors sufficient understanding of modern astronomy to prepare a strong student for graduate study in astronomy, (3) continuous updating of our upper level undergraduate and graduate courses to present state-of-the-art information to our students in the most exciting and stimulating ways possible, (4) helping to develop excellent research and workplace skills for students through mentoring their work on research and dissertations, and (5) evaluating teaching quality, both by peers and students, to improve our teaching to the highest possible level.

Excellence in service involves (1) serving responsibly on committees within our department, College, and University; (2) serving on professional committees at state, national, and international levels, providing service in the form of peer-reviewing documents for journals and funding agencies, and evaluating colleagues at other universities involved in the promotion and tenure process; and (3) sharing the fruits of our educational and research endeavors with the community outside of the university, especially through formal outreach programs.

### **III Definitions**

#### **A Faculty Advisory Committee**

Faculty appointments and reviews are carried out by the Faculty Advisory Committee which is comprised of all regular faculty who are eligible to consider a particular case, as described below.

#### **1 Regular Tenure Track Faculty**

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of regular tenure track faculty consists of all tenure track faculty whose tenure resides in the department.

The eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion reviews of regular 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.

For tenure reviews of probationary professors, eligible faculty are tenured professors 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.

#### **2 Regular Research Track Faculty**

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of regular research track faculty consists of all tenure track faculty whose tenure resides in the department, all regular clinical track faculty whose primary appointment is in the department, and all regular research track faculty whose primary appointment is in the department.

The eligible faculty for reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of regular research track faculty consists of all tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in the department and all nonprobationary research track faculty whose primary appointment is 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.

#### **3 Conflict of Interest**

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

#### **4 Minimum Composition**

In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members to constitute the Faculty Advisory Committee, the department chair, after consulting with the dean, will appoint a faculty member from another department within the college.

#### **B 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. 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.

Eligible faculty who are away from campus may participate in personnel discussions via teleconferencing technology. However, they must participate in the entire discussion in order to be eligible to vote.

#### **C Recommendation from the Faculty Advisory Committee**

In all votes taken on personnel matters, only “yes” and “no” votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to consider whether they are participating fully in the review process when abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter.

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted.

#### **1 Appointment**

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

#### **2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal**

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast are positive.

### **IV Appointments**

#### **A Criteria**

The department is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the department. Recognizing the value of a diverse faculty, the department will make every attempt to seek out qualified female and minority candidates and encourage them to apply. The appointment of tenure-track faculty must meet the highest possible standards of excellence, consistent with the mission of the Department of Astronomy, and must be based on criteria that reflect strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the faculty ranks. No offer will be extended in the event that the search process does not yield one or more candidates who would enhance the quality of the department. The search is either canceled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

## 1 Regular Tenure Track Faculty

**Instructor.** Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but requirements for the terminal degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. When an instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment.

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

**Assistant Professor.** An earned doctorate is required for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. 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 Faculty Advisory 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.

To be appointed as assistant professor, a candidate must

1. provide clear evidence of excellent research promise, as demonstrated by published research papers;
2. have outstanding outside letters of reference, attesting that the candidate is one of the top researchers in his or her peer group nationally;
3. demonstrate good communication skills, revealed in part by a departmental colloquium and in part by an evaluation of the candidate's publications;
4. display evidence for the potential to perform effective service; and
5. display evidence for the potential of good departmental citizenship, which involves working to advance the department's mission and treating students, colleagues and staff with professionalism and respect.

**Associate Professor and Professor.** A candidate being recruited to Ohio State University as an associate professor or a full professor must meet or exceed the department's criteria for promotion to associate professor or professor, respectively, with particular emphasis on the candidate's reputation for scholarly research. However, if the candidate has not previously held a faculty position, criteria such as teaching evaluations, supervision of graduate students, and ability to obtain external grant support may be replaced by the faculty's opinion of the candidate's potential in these areas based on factors such as clarity of explanation in research papers and public talks and on research reputation. In the case of appointment at the rank of professor, there should be strong evidence that the candidate will establish a well-funded,

productive and internationally recognized research program, after a short transition period, which will involve the education and training of Ph.D. students.

Appointment at the rank of associate professor normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at senior rank is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional, i.e., terminal year of employment is offered.

Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a senior rank and approved for tenure, if appropriate, but the university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency. Such persons have 5 years to obtain permanent residency status. If residency status is not obtained, the department may request visiting faculty status for up to 3 more years.

## **2 Regular 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 Regular Research Track Faculty**

The titles of research professor, research associate professor, and research assistant professor are for researchers appointed for fixed term contracts that do not entail tenure. Regular research-track faculty are not eligible to vote in department matters. The salary, benefits and overhead for research faculty are normally to be paid entirely by extramural funds through grants and contracts obtained by the faculty member, although in unusual circumstances the salary may be paid temporarily from University resources other than those generated from tuition and subsidy, subject to the availability of such funds. The expectation is that research faculty generally will be devoted to full-time research.

Appointment of regular research track faculty entails one- to five-year contracts. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to regular research track faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the department wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see Faculty Rule 3335-7, [www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php](http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php).

While instructional duties are not part of the criteria for appointment as research faculty, occasional teaching is permissible subject to approval by a majority of the regular tenure-track faculty and faculty with joint appointments in the department. Research faculty may teach graduate courses and/or supervise graduate students with the permission of the Graduate Committee. However, a research faculty member cannot assume regular teaching duties over an extended period, since this function is reserved for regular tenure-track faculty or instructors.

An earned doctorate degree or equivalent in astronomy or related field is required to be considered for a research faculty appointment. The research productivity and impact of a research professor, research associate professor, and research assistant professor should be comparable to the research expected of a tenure-track professor, associate professor, and assistant professor respectively, or they should provide strong support for an existing or planned research program or initiative in the Department of Astronomy.

**Research Assistant Professor.** In addition to an earned doctorate, appointment at the rank of research assistant professor requires a record of high-quality publications that strongly indicate the ability to sustain an independent, externally funded research program.

**Research Associate Professor and Research Professor.** In addition to an earned doctorate, appointment at the rank of research associate professor or research professor requires that the individual meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria for promotion to these ranks with respect to their research record and promise.

## 5 Auxiliary Faculty

Awarding of an auxiliary faculty position is contingent upon the performance of significant ongoing service to the department, regardless of whether or not the position is compensated. Auxiliary faculty are not eligible to vote in department matters. Auxiliary appointments are made for no more than one year at a time.

**Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor.** Adjunct appointments are never compensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who volunteer considerable uncompensated academic service to the department, such as teaching a course, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of regular tenure track faculty. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of regular tenure track faculty.

**Lecturer.** Appointment as lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a Master's degree in a astronomy or a related field. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is desirable. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure.

**Senior Lecturer.** Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a doctorate in astronomy or a related field, along with evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction; or a Master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience with documentation of high quality. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion.

**Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%.** In the Department of Astronomy, appointments at regular titles at 49% FTE or below are made only to support the teaching mission of the department. It is expected that such appointments will be rare and undertaken only under exceptional circumstances. The rank of auxiliary faculty with regular titles is determined by applying the criteria for the teaching function only for appointment of regular tenure-track faculty. Auxiliary faculty with regular titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are the same teaching criteria that apply for promotion of regular tenure-track faculty.

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

## 6 Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty

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

## B Procedures

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

- recruitment of regular tenure track, clinical track and research track faculty
- appointments at senior rank or with prior service credit
- hiring faculty from other institutions after April 30
- appointment of foreign nationals
- letters of offer

## 1 Regular 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](http://www.hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf) .

Searches for tenure track faculty proceed as follows:

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

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

The search committee:

- Appoints a Diversity Advocate who is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants.
- Develops a search announcement for internal posting in the university Personnel Postings (formerly known as the “green sheet”) through the Office of Human Resources Employment Services ([www.hr.osu.edu/](http://www.hr.osu.edu/)) and external advertising, subject to the department chair's approval. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.

- Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must assure that at least one print (as opposed to on-line) advertisement appears in a location likely to be read by qualified potential applicants. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency (“green card”), and strict U.S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their appointment to a tenure track position included an advertisement in a field-specific nationally circulated print journal.
- Screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents to the full faculty a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. If the faculty agrees with this judgment, on-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the department office. If the faculty does not agree, the department chair in consultation with the faculty determines the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, cancel the search for the time being).

On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee; graduate students; the department chair; and the dean or designee. In addition, all candidates make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their research, and teach a class. The latter could be an actual class or a mock instructional situation. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow, as closely as practicable, the same interview format.

Following completion of on-campus interviews, the eligible faculty meet for discussion and voting, which is generally by secret ballot. In order for a vote to be valid, at least two-thirds of all faculty eligible to vote must vote either yes or no. Abstentions are not votes. A positive vote of at least two thirds of the participating faculty will be required. The voting faculty must first decide on a fair procedure for voting that is appropriate for the specific situation (e.g., multiple open positions, multiple qualified candidates). The adopted voting procedure must include two votes that will be reported to the dean, the first on whether or not each candidate meets the criteria of the department, the college, and the university, and a final vote on whether or not a candidate should be recommended for appointment to the faculty. Depending on the number of candidates and the number of positions, more than one ballot may be taken.

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair.

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

Potential appointment of a foreign national who lacks permanent residency must be discussed with the Office of International Affairs. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency status. The department will therefore be cautious in making such appointments and vigilant in assuring that the appointee seeks residency status promptly and diligently.

## **2 Regular Tenure Track Faculty—Regional Campus**

The regional campus has primary responsibility for determining the position description for a tenure track faculty search, but the dean/director or designee consults with the department chair to reach agreement on

the description before the search begins. The regional campus search committee must include at least one representative from the department.

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, department chair, department eligible faculty, and regional campus search committee. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. A decision to make an offer requires agreement by the department chair and regional campus dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the department chair and the regional campus dean.

### **3 Regular Research Track Faculty**

In the Department of Astronomy, appointments to research-track positions are generally made to accommodate special situations and therefore do not involve a national or international search. Any tenure-track faculty member in the department may propose someone to be considered for the research faculty. If a majority of the regular faculty agree, the department chair shall appoint a committee to collect the documentation needed for the faculty to make a decision on the proposal.

To be considered for appointment to the research faculty, the department should consider the candidate's research publications, citations to such research, and letters from external referees, solicited as per the department's promotion and tenure procedures. Appointment to the research faculty normally requires approval by a two-thirds majority of the participating faculty, and at least two thirds of the eligible faculty must participate in the vote for it to be valid. Only yes or no votes count: abstentions do not count as votes. The department chair shall report the faculty vote to the dean when such approval is obtained, along with his/her own recommendation. If the faculty vote has a majority but less than two thirds favoring appointment, the department chair at his/her discretion may forward the results of the vote and his/her own recommendation to the executive dean. All appointments as research faculty require the approval of the executive dean, and appointments at the rank of research associate professor or research professor also require the approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

Contracts for research faculty shall be for at least one year and for no more than five years. Contracts may be terminated for cause or financial exigency, in accordance with faculty rules. A contract may be renegotiated during a contract period only with the voluntary consent of the research faculty member. At the end of the penultimate year of any contract, the faculty member will be informed as to whether a new contract will be offered at the end of the contract period. If a new contract is not offered, the final year of the existing contract is the final year of employment.

The initial contract is probationary. Each spring before the penultimate year of a probationary research faculty member's contract, the voting faculty in the department shall review the member's research and contribution to the department's research productivity. A majority vote of participating faculty is required for the probationary faculty member to continue his/her appointment. The department chair shall inform the probationary faculty member at the end of each academic year if the appointment will continue for the following year.

If a research assistant professor or research associate professor has attained sufficient research productivity and stature, the of the Faculty Advisory Committee may consider promotion to research associate professor or research professor respectively, although such promotion does not carry tenure. The faculty decision shall be based on criteria similar to those used to evaluate the research of tenure-track faculty being considered for promotion. Unlike tenure-track faculty, however, a research faculty member's teaching (if any) and service are not part of the consideration. A two-thirds vote in favor of promotion is required by the voting faculty. The department chair shall forward the vote along with his or

her own recommendation to the dean, who shall make the final decision on promotion of a research faculty member.

#### **4 Transfer of Track**

Regular tenure track faculty may transfer to a research track if appropriate circumstances exist. Tenure is lost upon transfer, and transfers must be approved by the department chair, the college dean, and the executive vice president and provost.

The request for transfer must be initiated by the faculty member in writing and must state clearly how the individual's career goals and activities have changed.

Transfers from regular research track to the tenure track are not permitted. Regular research track faculty members may apply for tenure track positions and compete in regular national searches for such positions.

#### **5 Auxiliary Faculty**

In the Department of Astronomy, appointments to teaching positions as assistant professor, associate professor, or professor with FTE below 50% are expected to be rare and are used to accommodate special circumstances. These therefore do not involve a national or international search. Initial appointment to faculty positions below 50% may be proposed by the department chair and require a simple majority for approval. Review and reappointment of all compensated auxiliary faculty is decided by the department chair in consultation with the department Steering Committee.

Appointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department. The proposal is considered at a regular faculty meeting and if approved by the faculty, the department chair extends an offer.

Auxiliary appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter period is appropriate to the circumstances. All auxiliary appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Adjunct appointments may be renewed only when the uncompensated academic service for which the appointment was made continues. Visiting appointments are limited to three consecutive years at 100% FTE. Lecturer appointments are usually made on a term by term basis.

Auxiliary faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for regular faculty (see above), with the following exceptions:

- the review is based only upon the teaching function;
- the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is negative;
- the review does not proceed to the university level if the dean's recommendation is negative.

#### **6 Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty**

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

## V Annual Review Procedures

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, research, and service as set forth in the department's Pattern of Administration document, which outlines policy on faculty duties and responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.

The documentation required for the annual performance review of every faculty member is described under Merit Salary Increases below. This material must be submitted to the department chair by a deadline established by the chair, generally no earlier than the final day of autumn term classes and no later than the end of March of the following year.

During the course of making committee assignments for the coming academic year, the department chair will appoint for each assistant and associate professor a Departmental Review Committee, generally comprised of full professors only who are able to evaluate the research, teaching, and service of the faculty member under review. The Departmental Review Committee will prepare a written report, as described below, which it will present to the Faculty Advisory Committee for the faculty member under review. As detailed in §III.A, the Faculty Advisory Committee consists of all of the tenured faculty whose tenure resides in the Department of Astronomy and with rank higher than that of the member being reviewed, excluding those Astronomy faculty who also hold administrative positions with jurisdictional interests in the promotion and tenure process. In addition, faculty with a potential conflict of interest in the case of a particular faculty member, even though technically a member of the eligible faculty, may not be eligible to participate in the faculty deliberations on promotion and tenure on that case.

The Departmental Review Committees for assistant and associate professors will be responsible for peer evaluations of the faculty member's teaching through observations of classes and reviews of written student evaluations; the goal is to obtain peer evaluations of every regular course (excluding individual studies courses) the faculty member teaches. The department chair will be responsible for providing a copy of the submitted Annual Report, cumulative student evaluations of instruction (SEIs), copies of submitted peer evaluations of teaching, and copies of the previous year's Annual Report and Annual Review for assistant and associate professors to their respective Departmental Review Committee.

The review shall assess the faculty member's performance and professional development, and should include both strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate. The review will provide the basis for the salary recommendation for the following year. All Annual Review letters and Departmental Review Committee reports to date shall become a part of a faculty member's dossier for subsequent Annual Reviews during the probationary period, including the review for tenure or for promotion and tenure. The chair will meet with each untenured faculty member at the conclusion of the Annual Review to discuss the faculty member's performance and future goals and plans.

Normally, it is expected that the Annual Review process will be completed by the end of spring term or by a date assigned by the college office with a signed copy of the chair's Annual Review and, for assistant and associate professors, a copy of the Departmental Review Committee report provided to the faculty member and to the college office.

The department chair is required (per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35, [www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php](http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php)) to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04, [www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php](http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php)) to view

their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

### **A Probationary Tenure Track Faculty**

The Departmental Review Committee for each untenured faculty member shall prepare during spring term a written and signed report to the Faculty Advisory Committee by a deadline set by the department chair. The Faculty Advisory Committee will then prepare a report to the department chair, which is generally based on the report of the Departmental Review Committee, but the Faculty Advisory Committee report will also include one of the following recommendations for untenured faculty:

- 1) with permission of the untenured faculty member under review, the review process for promotion and/or tenure will be conducted the following summer and autumn terms, or
- 2) progress is satisfactory, or
- 3) progress is unsatisfactory, or
- 4) progress is unsatisfactory and the appointment should be terminated at the end of the following academic year.

The chair shall base each untenured faculty member's Annual Review in part on the documents provided by the faculty member and in part on the report from the Faculty Advisory Committee.

If the chair recommends that an eligible faculty member be reappointed to another probationary year of service, that recommendation is final. The department chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The department chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the dean of the college. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments, if he or she chooses).

If the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04, [www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php](http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php)) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

### **1 Regional Campus Faculty**

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

### **2 Fourth-Year Review**

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, including the solicitation of external letters, and with the exception that the dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

The Faculty Advisory Committee conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment. By two thirds vote, the Faculty Advisory Committee will recommend to the Chair one of the following options:

- 1) with permission of the candidate, the review process for promotion and tenure will be conducted during the following summer and autumn, or
- 2) progress is satisfactory and the candidate will be considered for promotion and tenure in some subsequent year, or
- 3) progress is unsatisfactory and appointment will be terminated after the fifth year of service.

The Faculty Advisory Committee forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department chair. The department chair conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04, [www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php](http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php)) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

### **3 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period**

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D), [www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php](http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period. 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**

In the Department of Astronomy, the review of tenured faculty will differ from the review of untenured faculty in the following ways (in addition to the fact that non-renewal for the following year is not an option for tenured faculty, and that “the review process for promotion and tenure” described above shall be replaced with “the review process for promotion”):

- While associate professors will provide documents on teaching, research, and service for their review to their respective Departmental Review Committees, full professors will provide their documents to the chair since they do not have a Departmental Review Committee.
- Associate professors will be reviewed annually by the Faculty Advisory Committee. The deliberations of the Faculty Advisory Committee will include consideration of whether or not the case should be considered for promotion to full professor during the following academic year.
- Full professors are reviewed annually by the department chair. The department chair meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals, and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

### **C Tenured Faculty—Regional Campus**

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

## **D Regular Research Track Faculty**

The annual review process for regular research track probationary and nonprobationary faculty is identical to that for tenure track probationary and tenured faculty, except that non-probationary regular research faculty may participate in the review of regular research faculty of lower rank.

In the penultimate contract year of a regular research faculty member's appointment, the department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If it will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08, [www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php](http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php) must be observed.

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

## **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 past 36 months, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity. Faculty with high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty members whose performance is below expectations 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 department chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the dean, who may modify these recommendations. In formulating recommendations, the department chair may consult with the Steering Committee on all proposed raises, except for members of the Steering Committee. Salary increases are formulated in dollar amounts rather than percentage increases, with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the department chair divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) and considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate.

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

### **C Documentation**

The annual performance review of every faculty member requires that all documentation described below be submitted to the department chair no later than the deadline given by the chair. The time period covered by the documentation described below is the previous 12 months. Specifically required are the following general documents:

- An updated CV, which will remain on file in the department office and will be available to any faculty member through the department chair's assistant.
- Assistant and associate professors should also provide an updated Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, Book 3 (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>).
- A list of all scholarly papers submitted, published, or accepted for publication since the previous year's report.
- SEI reports for every class taught since the previous Annual Review, and other relevant documentation of teaching, such as student narrative evaluations, as appropriate.
- A list of current grants and contracts, including project title, role of the faculty member (e.g., PI or Co-PI), funding agency, grant identifier used by the funding agency, funded period, dollar amount, and OSURF project number.
- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate, e.g., grants and contract proposals that have been submitted, telescope time awarded, etc.
- A list of service contributions, including committees at the international, national, state, university, college, and department levels, membership on scientific organizing committees, participation in reviews (as a referee of research papers or TAC member, for example), etc.
- A short narrative describing progress made since the last Annual Review and plans for the upcoming academic year.

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

This documentation, along with cumulative SEIs, peer reviews of teaching on file in the department office, and the written summary of the previous year's Annual Review (described below) constitute the formal documentation for the current Annual Review.

## **VII Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews**

### **A Criteria**

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, [www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php](http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php) provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the university enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors,

and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established academic patterns. In such cases care must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

## **1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, [www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php](http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php) provides the following general criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure:

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

Tenure is not awarded below the rank of associate professor at The Ohio State University.

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

Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Accepting weakness in any aspect of performance in making a tenure decision is tantamount to deliberately handicapping the department's ability to perform and to progress academically. Above all, candidates are held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. If a candidate's primary teaching role is and will continue to be undergraduate teaching, then excellence in undergraduate teaching is required. A mediocre performance in this area would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another aspect of teaching that is a significantly smaller part of the individual's responsibilities.

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/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/statementonprofessionalethics.htm>.

The accomplishments listed below in the areas of teaching, research, and service are expected of faculty for promotion to associate professor with tenure. In the evaluation of untenured associate professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

### **Teaching**

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge

- demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm
- demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment
- engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process
- provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process
- treated students with respect and courtesy
- improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs
- served as advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the department's graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise
- engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching.

## Research

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- Published a body of work in high-quality peer-reviewed venues that is thematically focused, contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and is beginning to be favorably cited or otherwise show evidence of influence on the work of others. The following attributes of the body of work are considered:
  - quality, impact, quantity
  - unique contribution to a line of inquiry or repackaging of earlier work
  - rigor of the peer-review process and degree of dissemination of publication venues. Archival journal publications and monographs are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published research more than unpublished research, and original works more than edited works.
  - empirical work, demonstrating the candidate's ability to conduct such work and to mentor future researchers, is preferred to synthetic work at this stage of career
  - while collaborative work is encouraged, and indeed is essential to some types of inquiry, the candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described to permit accurate assessment.
- A demonstrated ability to obtain and potential to sustain research program funding. Competitive peer-reviewed funding is weighted more favorably than other types, since it serves as a quality indicator of research programs, and grants requiring the exercise of intellectual creativity are weighted more heavily than those that largely dictate the work to be done. Research funding is a means to an end; funding that has not led to research productivity is disregarded in the review.
- A developing national/international reputation in the candidate's field as evidenced by external evaluations, invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals, and a beginning trend of positive citations in other researchers'

publications. A reputation based on the quality of the research contribution is distinguished from one based mainly on familiarity through the faculty member's frequent attendance at national and international conferences.

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

## **Service**

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- made substantive contributions to the governance of the department in a collegial manner that facilitates positive contributions by others
- demonstrated the potential for useful contributions to the profession.

## **2 Promotion to Professor**

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, [www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php](http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php) establishes the following general criteria for promotion to the rank of professor:

Promotion to the rank of professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in teaching; has produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated leadership in service.

For promotion to professor, a faculty member is expected to be a role model for senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. Assessment takes place in relation to specific assigned responsibilities, with exceptional performance in these responsibilities required. The specific criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with Tenure, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and increasing quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national and international reputation in the field.

When assessing a candidate's national and international reputation in the field, a national and international reputation for the scholarship of teaching may be counted as either teaching or scholarship.

In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another.

In the evaluation of untenured professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

## **3 Alternative Path to Promotion to Professor**

In reviewing promotion from associate professor to professor, the department will be receptive to cases in which the faculty member has demonstrated excellence in teaching or in areas of scholarship outside traditional original research. Correspondingly less weight will be placed on original research. For a faculty member to be promoted under such conditions, the contributions in other areas must be substantial, sustained, and of high quality, as demonstrated, for example, by recognitions at the university

or national levels. For promotion based on excellence in teaching, development and implementation of innovative and more effective approaches to instruction would be helpful in making the case, as well as evidence for above average contributions to the department's teaching mission. Positive contributions in original research will play a more limited, but not negligible, role in the evaluation.

#### **4 Regional Campus Faculty**

The primary function of the regional campuses is to provide high-quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities. With this consideration in mind, in evaluating regional campus faculty for promotion and tenure or promotion, the department will give greater emphasis to the quality of teaching and service relative to research. Recognizing that the character and quantity of research by regional campus faculty may differ from that of Columbus campus faculty, due to the weight of other responsibilities and lack of access to comparable resources, the department nevertheless expects regional campus faculty to establish a program of high-quality scholarly activity.

#### **5 Regular Research Track Faculty**

**Promotion to Research Associate Professor.** For promotion to research associate professor, a faculty member must have a substantial record of high-quality focused research consistent with an appointment devoted solely to research. Publications must appear in high-quality peer-reviewed venues and be judged by external evaluators as having substantial positive impact on the field. A record of continuous peer reviewed funding is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation.

**Promotion to Research Professor.** For promotion to research professor, a faculty member must have a national and international reputation built on an extensive body of high-quality publications and with demonstrated impact on the field. A record of continuous peer-reviewed funding is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding.

### **B Procedures**

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

#### **1 Candidate Responsibilities**

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

Upon request by the department chair, candidates may submit a short list of potential external evaluators. Normally, the candidate should suggest no more than three names unless specifically requested, but is not required to submit any names. The candidate also may also provide the names of no more than two individuals from whom the candidate would request that the department not solicit external evaluations and provide the reasons for the request. The department chair decides whether removal is justified.

While the Departmental Review 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. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

## 2 Departmental Review Committee Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Departmental Review Committee are as follows:

- To consider annually, in spring term, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. The Departmental Review Committee will pass on its recommendation to the Faculty Advisory Committee, as described below.
  - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
  - A tenured faculty member who requests and is denied a promotion review for three consecutive years must be granted the review in the fourth year per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04, [www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php](http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php). If the three denials are based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the fourth year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
  - Consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policy, only faculty members who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non-mandatory tenure review. The committee must confirm with the department chair that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident (has a "green card"). Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.
- A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
  - **Late Spring–Summer:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines. See <http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>.
  - **Late Spring–Summer:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair.
  - **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with

candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.

- Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, research and service to provide to the Faculty Advisory Committee with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.
- Revise the draft analysis of each case following the faculty meeting, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
- Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure initiating unit is another department. The Faculty Advisory Committee does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure initiating unit substantially earlier than the Committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

### **3 Faculty Advisory Committee Responsibilities**

The department chair, dean, associate and assistant deans, executive vice president and provost, and president may not be members of the department's Faculty Advisory Committee. The department chair may attend meetings at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and may respond to questions, but may not vote.

The responsibilities of the members of the Faculty Advisory Committee are as follows:

- To consider requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and the recommendation of the Departmental Review Committee. The Faculty Advisory Committee will vote on whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
- To consider annual recommendations from the Departmental Review Committee on whether or not an associate professor should be considered for promotion to professor during the following academic year. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed,
- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.

- To attend all meetings of the Faculty Advisory Committee except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.

#### 4 Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- Where relevant, to verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty members who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure will not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.
- **Summer–Autumn:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Departmental Review Committee, the chair and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the Faculty Advisory Committee at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To remove any member of the Faculty Advisory Committee from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the Faculty Advisory Committee at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting.
- **Autumn:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the Faculty Advisory Committee's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the Faculty Advisory Committee to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
  - Of the recommendations by the Faculty Advisory Committee and department chair
  - Of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the Faculty Advisory Committee and department chair
  - Of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier.

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

## 5 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

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

The regional campus dean/director forwards the written evaluation and recommendation of the regional campus review to the department chair, from which point the review follows the procedures described for the Columbus campus faculty.

## 6 External Evaluations

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

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to 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. This department will only solicit evaluations from tenured professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State or senior researchers at research institutes. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, at least twice as many letters are sought as are required, and they are solicited no later than the beginning of the autumn term to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Faculty Advisory Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. 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, [www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php](http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters

in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The department follows 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 (requesting permission from the Office of Academic Affairs to exclude that letter from the dossier). It is in the candidate's self-interest to assure that there is no ethical or procedural lapse, or the appearance of such a lapse, in the course of the review process.

All solicited external evaluation letters that are received must be included in the dossier. If concerns arise about any of the letters received, these concerns may be addressed in the department's written evaluations or brought to the attention of the Office of Academic Affairs for advice.

## C Documentation

As noted above under Candidate Responsibilities, every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. While the Faculty Advisory 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.

The complete dossier, including the documentation of teaching noted in bold below, is forwarded when the review moves beyond the department. The documentation of research 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 faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

## 1 Teaching

For the time period since the last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less:

- **cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class**
- **peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in the Appendix to this document)**
- 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 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 including
  - 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 Research

For the time period since the last promotion:

- copies of all books, articles, and scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed.
- documentation of grants and contracts received
- other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted)
- research activities as listed in the core dossier including
  - documentation of creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus including but not restriction to, for example, artwork, multimedia, radio, recordings, television, and websites
  - documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options and commercial licenses
  - list of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work

## 3 Service

For the time period since the last promotion:

- service activities as listed in the core dossier including
  - involvement with professional journals and professional societies
  - consultation activity with industry, education, or government
  - administrative service to department
  - administrative service to college
  - administrative service to 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

## VIII Appeals

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05, [www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php](http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05, [www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php](http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php).

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**

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05, [www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php](http://www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php) sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a Seventh Year Review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year (mandatory tenure) review.

## **X Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

### **A Student Evaluation of Teaching**

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) form is required in every course offered in this department. Faculty should choose a day late in the academic term when attendance is likely to be high to distribute the form. A graduate teaching associate, staff member, or other faculty member should administer the evaluation forms to the class and return them to the Office of the University Registrar as instructed. This individual should encourage a high completion rate by explaining to the class the significance of the evaluation. When a small proportion of the class completes the evaluation, the resulting information has little value either for improving instruction or for performance evaluation.

### **B Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

The department chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process.

Annually the department chair appoints a Departmental Review Committee for each teaching faculty member below the rank of professor. Each Departmental Review Committee is normally comprised of three full professors; associate professors may also serve on Departmental Review Committees for assistant professors, at the discretion of the department chair. The term of service is one year, with reappointment possible. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the tenured faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the department. The Departmental Review Committee is responsible for obtaining peer reviews of teaching; although there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible.

The responsibilities of the Departmental Review Committee are as follows:

- to review the teaching of probationary tenure track at least once for each course, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned in the course of each probationary year
- to review the teaching of tenured associate professors and auxiliary faculty at least once per year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned
- to review, upon the department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.

- to review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the University Center for the Advancement of Teaching ([www.ucat.osu.edu](http://www.ucat.osu.edu)).

Reviews conducted upon the request of the department chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the chair or faculty member.

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluation (the first three situations listed above) is comprehensive and includes, in addition to classroom visitation, review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and exams. Classroom visitation is conducted by two or more committee members attending together and is unannounced. However, at the beginning of the quarter, the committee will request from the faculty member a list of dates on which visitation would be inappropriate because exams are being given, guest speakers are scheduled, etc.

Peer review focuses particularly on aspects of teaching that students are less qualified than faculty to evaluate, such as appropriateness of curricular choices given the goals of the course (survey as opposed to required major course), implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and appropriateness of approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. As part of its evaluation the committee examines copies of the faculty member's SEI summaries from recent years, and where student opinion is mixed to negative, the committee attempts to ascertain the reasons. In so doing, members are to bear in mind that they have observed only one or a few classes out of the quarter, and moreover have a very different level of knowledge compared to students. Consequently their assessment may differ considerably from that of the majority of students.

Written peer reviews should be submitted to the department chair who will keep them on file. These reports will be made available to the Departmental Review Committee when they prepare their annual report to the Faculty Advisory Committee each spring. The Faculty Advisory Committee report goes on file in the department office and a copy, along with copies of classroom peer reviews, are to be provided to the faculty member prior to the faculty member's annual meeting with the department chair.