APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

DEPARTMENT OF ARTS ADMINISTRATION, EDUCATION AND POLICY

College of Arts and Sciences

The Ohio State University

Revised September 2023
Approved by Department Faculty 10/23/2023

Revision Approved by OAA September 29, 2025

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

Table of Contents

I Preamble **4**

II Department Mission Statement **5**

III Definitions **5**

A Committee of the Eligible Faculty *5*
1 Tenure-track Faculty 6
2 Teaching Faculty 6
3 Associated Faculty 7
4 Conflict of Interest 7
5 Minimum Composition 8

B. Quorum *8*

C. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty *8*
1 Appointment 8
2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion 9

IV Appointments **9**

A Criteria *9*
1 Tenure Track Faculty 9
2 Teaching Faculty 11
3 Associated Faculty 12
4 Regional Campus Faculty 13
5 Emeritus Faculty 13
6 Joint Appointments 14
7 Courtesy Appointments 14

B Procedures *14*
1 Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus 15
2 Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus 16
3 Transfer from the Tenure Track 17
4 TIU Transfer 17
5 Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus 17
6 Regional Campus Faculty 18
7 Joint Appointments 18
8 Courtesy Appointments 19

V Annual Performance and Merit Review **19**

A Documentation *20*

B Probationary Tenure Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus *20*
1 First-, Second-, Third-, and Fifth-Year Reviews 21
2 Fourth-Year Review 21
3 Extension of the Tenure Clock 22

C Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus *23*
D Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus *23*
E Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus *23*
F Regional Campus Faculty *23*
G Salary Recommendations *24*

VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews **25**

A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion *25*
1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure 25
2 Promotion to Professor 30
3 Teaching Faculty 35
4 Associated Faculty 35
5 Regional Campus Faculty 36

B Procedures *36*
1 Tenure-Track and Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus 36
2 Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus 42
3 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty 42
4 External Evaluations 42

VII Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals **44**

VIII Seventh Year Reviews **45**

IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching **45**

A Student Evaluation of Teaching *46*
B Peer Evaluation of Teaching *46*
Review Process *47*

I Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty; the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Chapter 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs *Policies and Procedures Handbook*; and other policies and procedures of the College and University to which the Department and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the Department will follow the new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every 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 Department mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 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 and other standards specific to this Department and College; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.

Decisions considering appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the University's policy on equal employment opportunity.

Program Descriptions

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

The scope of the Department's undergraduate offerings includes general education courses in arts criticism and diversity and an art methods course for elementary classroom teachers. The

Department offers a Bachelor of Art Education (BAE) degree program that provides undergraduate students with a well-rounded liberal arts education, intensive studies in visual culture, and significant preparatory course work in the theory, practices, and pedagogy of art education. The Department has taken the lead in the development of an undergraduate minor in entrepreneurship and the arts in collaboration with the Fisher College of Business. An undergraduate Bachelor of Arts in Arts Management (BAAM) was implemented in the Fall Semester, 2012.

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

II Department Mission Statement

The Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy is a robust, innovative, and welcoming community that prepares educators, researchers, administrators, and policymakers in the fields of arts education, arts management, museum education, and cultural policy. We leverage the arts to prepare leaders and critically engaged citizens who generate creative responses to the social and cultural needs of a broad range of stakeholders. Foundational to AAEP's excellence is its recognition of the varying voices and perspectives that make the Arts a vibrant ecosystem.

The core goals of the Department of Arts Administration, Education & Policy are:

- To empower students to function as critically engaged citizens with and through the arts, in ways that improve the well-being of our local, state, national, and global communities
- To prepare leaders for research and practice in arts education and all aspects of the creative economy through integrated, multifaceted programs as well as collaborations within and outside of the University
- To serve as a local, national, and international leader in advancing public interest regarding education, cultural policy, and justice in the arts
- To foster social change and uphold equal rights through collaborative efforts in the areas of research, teaching, and service through the arts and the creative economy

III Definitions

A Committee of the Eligible Faculty

The eligible faculty for all appointments (hiring), reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure reviews must have their tenure home or primary appointment in the Department.

The Department Chair, the Dean and Assistant and Associate Deans of the College, the executive vice president and provost, and the president may not participate as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure.

1 Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** The eligible faculty for an appointment (hiring) review of an assistant professor, associate professor, or professor consists of all tenure-track faculty whose tenure resides in the Department.

- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

- For the reappointment and promotion and tenure reviews of assistant professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors.

- For the promotion reviews of associate professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors.

2 Teaching Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review**. For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an assistant teaching professor; an associate teaching professor; or a teaching professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all teaching faculty in the Department.

- **Rank Review**. A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all nonprobationary teaching faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of assistant teaching professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors, all nonprobationary associate teaching professors, and all nonprobationary teaching professors.

- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of associate teaching professors and the reappointment reviews of teaching professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors and all nonprobationary teaching professors.

3 Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- For the initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all nonprobationary teaching track faculty. For reappointments, the eligible faculty are those with non-probationary teaching titles and tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank than the candidate.

  Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by the eligible faculty (all non-probationary teaching faculty and tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the College Dean.

Promotion Reviews

- Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have adjunct titles, tenure-track titles with service at 49% FTE or below, and lecturer titles.

- For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track, or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Sections III.A.1 or 2 above.

- For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with tenure-track titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section III.A.1.

- For the promotion review of a lecturer to senior lecturer, the eligible faculty shall be all tenure-track and nonprobationary teaching faculty at the rank of associate professor and professor.

4 Conflict of Interest

Search Committee Conflict of Interest

A member of a search committee must disclose to the committee and refrain from participation in any of the interviews, meetings, or votes that comprise the search process if the member:

- decides to apply for the position;
- is related to or has a close interpersonal relationship with a candidate;
- 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 (e.g., dissertation advisor); or
- has collaborated extensively with the candidate or is currently collaborating with the candidate.

Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest

A member of the eligible faculty has a conflict of interest when is or has been to the candidate:

- a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor;
- a co-author on more than 50% of the candidate's publications since appointment or last promotion, including pending publications and submissions;
- a collaborator on more than 25% of projects since appointment or last promotion, including current and planned collaborations;
- in a consulting/financial arrangement with the candidate since appointment or last promotion, including receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services) or is dependent in some way on the candidate's services; or
- in a family relationship such as a spouse, child, sibling, or parent, or other relationship, such as a close personal friendship, that might affect the member's judgment or be seen as doing so by a reasonable person familiar with the relationship.

Such faculty members will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of that candidate.

5 Minimum Composition

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

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. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. 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.

C. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters within the Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy, only ***yes*** and ***no*** votes are permitted. Abstentions are not allowed. Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted but participating fully in discussions and voting via remote two-way electronic connection are allowed.

1 Appointment

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

- In the case of a joint appointment, the Department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment Department prior to his/her/their appointment.

2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion

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

- In the case of a joint appointment, the Department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment Department prior to his/her/their reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure.

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. Important considerations include the individual's record to date in teaching, research and service; the potential for professional growth in each of these areas; and the potential for interacting with colleagues and students in a way that will enhance their academic work and attract other outstanding faculty and students to the Department. No offer will be extended in the event that the search process does not yield a candidate who would enhance the quality of the Department. The search is cancelled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, teaching and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the SHIFT Framework for faculty recruitment.

All faculty positions must be posted in Workday, the University's system of record for faculty and staff. Formal interviews are required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in Workday to enable the University to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

1 Tenure Track Faculty

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

Instructor. 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. Procedures for appointments are identical to those for

an assistant professor. The Department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. Promotion to assistant professor occurs without reviewing the semester following completion of the required credentialing. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year, or the appointment will not be renewed, and the third year is the terminal year of employment.

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

Assistant Professor. **A**n earned terminal degree is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor include a Ph.D or an earned terminal degree in an appropriate field of study, evidence of potential to develop into an internationally recognized scholar and to demonstrate scholarly productivity, demonstrated potential for high-quality teaching at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, a willingness to provide high-quality service to the profession, institution, and Department, and a strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the ranks in a timely fashion.

Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the 7th year will be the final year of employment.

Promotion and tenure may be granted at any time during the probationary period when the faculty member's record of achievement merits tenure and promotion. Similarly, a probationary appointment may be terminated at any time subject to the notice provisions of Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 and the provisions of paragraphs (G), (H), and (I) of Faculty Rule 3335-6-03.

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 except through an approved request to extend the probationary period.

Associate Professor: It is expected that an individual appointed as an associate professor with tenure is a nationally recognized researcher with a high-quality body of scholarship, has demonstrated excellence in teaching undergraduate and graduate students, and demonstrated excellence in service/outreach to their profession and field as well as locally to the university. It is expected at the time of appointment to the rank of associate professor that the individual has strong potential to advance to the rank of professor in a timely fashion. On rare occasions, however, individuals may be appointed as associate professor without tenure when joining the faculty.

Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor with or without tenure require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. A probationary appointment at the rank of associate professor 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 Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

Professor. It is expected that an individual appointed as professor with tenure has established a national or international reputation as a leading scholar in their field with an outstanding body of scholarship, has demonstrated excellence in teaching at graduate and undergraduate levels and has demonstrated a record of high-quality service to their field and institution.

Appointments at the rank of professor without tenure are not possible.

Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

2 Teaching Faculty

Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all other teaching faculty members must be for a period of five years. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for assistant and associate teaching professors must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for teaching professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. Tenure is not granted to teaching faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance.

The Department supports teaching faculty. These appointments exist for faculty members who focus principally on the educational needs of students in the Department or College. Teaching faculty members are expected to contribute to the Department's research and education mission as reflected in undergraduate and graduate program development and teaching. Teaching faculty appointments are made in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-7. Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the Department.

Teaching Instructor. Appointment is normally made at the rank of teaching instructor when the appointee has not completed the requirements for the terminal degree. The Department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. As noted above, an appointment at the instructor level is limited to a three-year contract. In such cases, if the instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the penultimate year of the three-year contract period, a new contract will not be considered even if performance is otherwise adequate, and the position itself will continue.

Assistant Teaching Professor. An earned doctorate *[or appropriate terminal degree]* in the relevant field is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant teaching professor. Evidence of ability to teach is highly desirable.

Associate Teaching Professor, Teaching Professor. Appointment at the rank of associate teaching professor, or teaching professor requires that the individual have an earned doctorate or terminal degree in a relevant field and meet, at a minimum, the Department's criteria—in teaching, service, and scholarship—for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at the rank of teaching professor also requires the production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy.

3 Associated Faculty

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a few weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention.

In accordance with University Rule 3335-6-08 (D), decisions regarding the appointment and renewal of associated faculty on year-to-year contracts must be made in accordance with criteria and procedures of the appointing instructional or research unit and in accordance with University policies concerning associated faculty positions. Appointments of all associated faculty must be reviewed and approved by the College of Arts and Sciences.

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct titles are used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to tenure-track or teaching faculty of equivalent rank. The adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct appointments are typically uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who provide compensated or uncompensated academic service to the Department, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees, for which a faculty title is appropriate. The term of appointment is for one year with renewal contingent on continued significant contributions. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track, or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%. Appointment at tenure-track titles is for individuals at 49% FTE or below, either compensated (1 – 49% FTE) or uncompensated (0% FTE). The rank of associated faculty with tenure-track titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

Lecturer. Appointment as lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a Master's degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught. Evidence of ability or potential to provide high-quality instruction is required. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for lecturers cannot exceed three years.

Senior Lecturer. Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a doctorate in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction; or a Master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience with documented high quality performance. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The initial appointment for a senior lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for senior lecturers cannot exceed three years.

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank they hold at their home institution. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for no more than three consecutive years.

4 Regional Campus Faculty

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

Regional campus criteria for the appointment of teaching faculty and associated faculty are the same as those for Columbus campus faculty in each of these categories.

5 Emeritus Faculty

Emeritus faculty status is an honor given in recognition of sustained academic contributions to the University as described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-36. Full-time tenure track, teaching faculty, or associated faculty may request emeritus status upon retirement or resignation at the age of sixty or older with ten or more years of service or at any age with twenty-five or more years of service.

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the Department Chair (regional campus Dean for associated faculty on regional campuses) outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-3) will review the application and make a recommendation to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the Dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the University's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule 3335-5-04, emeritus status will not be considered.

Emeritus faculty may not vote at any level of governance and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters.

6 Joint Appointments

Joint appointments are created to leverage a faculty member's unique expertise to advance the mission areas of the academic units involved and promote cross-disciplinary collaboration. To establish a joint faculty appointment, a memorandum of understanding (MOU) is developed by all affected TIUs, centers, and/or institutes. The MOU will clearly define the distribution of the faculty member's time commitment to the different units. The MOU will also state the sources of compensation directed to the faculty member, distribution of resources, the planned acknowledgement of the academic units in publications, the manner in which credit for any grant funding will be attributed to the different units, and the distribution of grant funds among the appointing units. Unless other arrangements are specified in the MOU, the TIU in which the faculty member's FTE is greater than 50% will be considered that faculty member's TIU. Joint-appointed faculty may vote on promotion and tenure cases only in their TIU.

7 Courtesy Appointments

Occasionally the active academic involvement in this Department by a tenure-track, or teaching faculty member from another unit 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. Courtesy appointments may be initiated by a Department faculty member or self-initiated. Consideration will require a letter explaining the significance of the potential appointee for the Department and a current CV. A positive majority vote is required for appointment. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized. Courtesy appointments can be for multiple years, typically with a review for continuation after three to five years. Courtesy appointees are not expected to participate in departmental meetings and committees. Once appointed, courtesy appointees will be reviewed every three years by the Department Chair for reappointment or termination.

B Procedures

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, teaching faculty, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the SHIFT Framework for faculty recruitment. All faculty positions must be posted in Workday, the University's system of record for faculty and staff. Formal interviews are required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in Workday to enable the University to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

In addition, see the Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments for information on the following topics:

- recruitment of tenure-track, teaching faculty, and associated 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 Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

A national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. This includes all external candidates for all faculty positions. The only exception is for dual career partners, as described in Chapter 5, section 4.1 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection.

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

The Dean of the College, in consultation with the divisional Deans, 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.

Standing Departmental or ad hoc committees appointed by the Chair may request positions to address specific Departmental needs. Position requests may also arise as a consequence of a long-range plan by faculty, from perceived special need opportunities, or from replacement needs.

For each open faculty position, a Search Committee comprised of three or more faculty members and one graduate student will be appointed by the Department Chair.

Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo the training identified in the SHIFT Framework for faculty recruitment. In addition, all employees/faculty involved in the hiring and selection process must review and acknowledge the EEO Recruitment and Selection Guidelines in the BuckeyeLearn system.

The SHIFT Framework serves as a centrally coordinated guideline and toolkit to support the entire process of faculty recruitment with clear engagement from all participating stakeholders involved in the faculty hiring process. This framework is intended to provide faculty engaged in search committees and staff providing support services with the tools and support needed to attract excellent applicant pools, conduct consistent and equitable evaluations, and successfully hire and properly onboard new faculty members who will continue our tradition of academic excellence. This framework consists of six phases, each targeting a specific stage of the recruitment process:

- “Phase 1 | Search Preparation & Proactive Recruitment” is the earliest stage in the search process. Key steps during this phase include determining faculty needs for the unit, creating a search strategy (including timeline), establishing a budget, and identifying additional partners to include in the process. The steps in this phase provide guidance on forming committees, detail training requirements for search committee members, and innovative approaches to advertising and outreach. This section also includes ideas and resources for developing

qualified talent pools to ensure alignment with University and unit EEO goals and advance the eminence of the institution.

- "Phase 2 | Preliminary Review of Applicants" focuses on best practices for the application review and candidate screening processes. The guidelines and resources in this section support consistency and fairness in the review, assessment, and selection of candidates moving forward in the recruitment process. This section also outlines how to select a list of candidates for on-campus interviews.
- "Phase 3 | Finalists Interviews & Evaluations" provides guidance and tools for conducting interviews and campus visits, requesting reference letters (if not requested earlier in the application stage), and collecting feedback from everyone who interacted with the candidates. Adherence to the guidelines outlined in this section has a direct impact on enhancing the candidate experience and ensuring a consistent evaluation process. This phase concludes with the submission of a letter from the search committee to the TIU Chair/director.
- "Phase 4 | Extend Offer" provides guidance and resources related to effectively selecting the most qualified candidate(s) for the position(s) and successfully negotiating to result in an accepted offer.
- "Phase 5 | Preboard and Onboard" offers resources to help prepare and support new faculty as they transition to Ohio State. The suggestions in this phase focus on creating a seamless transition for incoming faculty and their partners/families, if applicable.
- "Phase 6 | Reflect and Assess the Search" is a process supported by OAA to reflect on the hiring cycle each year and evaluate areas that may need improvement and additional support.

After the interviews, the eligible faculty meets to discuss perceptions and preferences and to vote on each candidate. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on each candidate advisory 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, in consultation with the divisional Dean, which candidate to approach first. At that time, terms of the offer will be discussed, including salary and other features of the recruitment; the relevant divisional Dean must be consulted at this time.

If an offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If an offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the Department Chair. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor, with or without tenure, or professor, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs.

The Department is advised to discuss the potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status with the Office of International Affairs. A MOU must be signed by faculty eligible for tenured positions who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees.

2 Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Searches for teaching faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the virtual or on-campus interview is on teaching, as relevant, rather than scholarship.

3 Transfer from the Tenure Track

a. Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a teaching appointment if appropriate to the individual's circumstances and departmental and college needs, and if funding for the salary has been identified. Tenure or tenure eligibility 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.

b. Transfers from a teaching appointment to the tenure track are not permitted. Teaching faculty members may apply for tenure-track positions and compete in regular national searches for such positions.

4 TIU Transfer

Tenure-track faculty requests to voluntarily move to another TIU must be approved by the TIU heads, the college dean(s), the Office of Academic Affairs, and a simple majority of eligible faculty in the receiving TIU. The eligible faculty in such cases are the tenure-track faculty eligible to vote on faculty appointments at the transferee's rank. See Section III.A.1 above Approval by the college dean(s) and the Office of Academic Affairs is dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements for the change have been made and requires the establishment of mutually agreed-upon arrangements among the affected TIU heads and the faculty member. An MOU signed by all parties, including the Office of Academic Affairs, must describe in detail the arrangements of the transfer.

The Office of Academic Affairs can provide guidance to non-tenure-track faculty about the process for transferring from one TIU to another.

5 Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

The appointment of compensated associated faculty follows a formal search following the SHIFT Framework, which includes a job posting in Workday (see Section IV.B above) and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the Department Chair following a vote of the eligible faculty and based on the recommendation from the search committee. The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the Department Chair following a vote of the eligible faculty.

Associated appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances. All associated faculty appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued.

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the Department and are decided by the Department Chair following a vote of the eligible faculty.

Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three years.

Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are made on an annual basis and rarely semester by semester. After the initial appointment, and if the Department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment may be offered.

6 Regional Campus Faculty

The appointment of all compensated regional campus faculty follows a formal search following the SHIFT Framework, which includes a job posting in Workday and candidate interviews.

The Dean/director of the regional campus, in consultation with the Dean and divisional Deans and the Department Chair, will authorize a search.

The regional campus has primary responsibility for determining the position description for a tenure-track faculty search, but the regional campus Dean 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, divisional Dean or their designee, Department Chair, and either the regional campus search committee or a broader representation of the regional and Columbus faculties. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. A hiring decision 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.

Searches for regional campus teaching and associated faculty are the same as those described above for tenure-track faculty.

7 Joint Appointments

The department may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another OSU TIU as described in Section IV.A.6. The potential for a joint appointment is typically evaluated during the recruitment process and, as such, is subject to all criteria outlined above for each faculty category.

Approval of the joint appointment by the Office of Academic Affairs is dependent on establishing a mutually agreed-upon arrangement between the TIU heads, college dean(s), and the faculty member. An MOU signed by all parties, including the Office of Academic Affairs,

must describe in detail the arrangements of the joint appointment. Administrative approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements have been made.

8 Courtesy Appointments

Any Department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track or teaching faculty member from another Ohio State tenure-initiating unit. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this Department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the eligible faculty, the Department Chair extends an offer of appointment. The Department Chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

V Annual Performance and Merit Review

The Department follows the requirements for the annual performance and merit review as set forth in the Policy on Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment, which stipulates that such reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all probationary faculty, an opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all other compensated faculty members, as well as a written assessment. According to the policy, the purposes of the review are to:

- Assist faculty in improving professional productivity through candid and constructive feedback and through the establishment of professional development plans;
- Establish the goals against which a faculty member's performance will be assessed in the foreseeable future; and
- Document faculty performance in the achievement of stated goals in order to determine salary increases and other resource allocations, progress toward promotion, and, in the event of poor performance, the need for remedial steps.

The department chair may designate the responsibility for annual performance and merit reviews to appropriate unit administrators. The designee or a subcommittee of the eligible faculty may provide a written assessment to the chair. However, unless the Office of Academic Affairs has granted an exception to a large unit, the department chair must schedule a face-to-face meeting with all probationary faculty as part of the review. An opportunity for a face-to-face meeting with the chair or the chair's designee must be provided to all tenured and non-probationary faculty.

In all cases, accountability for the annual review process resides with the department chair.

Depending on their appointment type, the annual performance and merit review of faculty members is based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the Department's guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.

The review of faculty with budgeted joint appointments must include input from the joint appointment TIU head for every annual evaluation cycle. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on goals specific to the individual in the joint unit.

Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.

The Department Chair is required (per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35) to include a reminder in the annual performance and merit review letter that all faculty have the right to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

A Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to the Department Chair by the date designated by the Chair, but usually by the end of the first month of Spring Semester of each year:

- Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline (*required for probationary faculty*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments in the annual faculty activity report (*non-probationary faculty*)
- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)

Other documentation for the annual performance and merit review will be the same as that for consideration for promotion and/or tenure. That documentation is described in Section VI of this document.

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

B Probationary Tenure Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

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

In accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (C), probationary tenure-track faculty will be reviewed annually by the Department Chair. The purpose of this review is to assess the performance of the faculty member in the three areas of research, teaching, and service and to form the basis for a decision on renewal of the appointment and possible merit salary increments

for the upcoming year. The performance of each probationary faculty member is evaluated relative to the Department's published criteria for appointment, promotion, and tenure.

Normally the reviews are conducted during the spring semester. Each probationary faculty member must receive a written evaluation of performance from the Department Chair, with sufficient detail for meaningful feedback. The Department Chair will offer a tenure-track faculty member a scheduled opportunity to discuss the review, the faculty member may respond in writing to the Department Chair's performance evaluation, and the Department Chair may respond in writing if warranted. Annual reviews and any written comments will be sent to the college and added to faculty personnel files. 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).

1. First-, Second-, Third-, and Fifth-Year Reviews

Following the reviews conducted during the first, second, third, and fifth years, when the Department Chair recommends renewal of the appointment of a faculty member, the Department Chair will notify the divisional dean and dean of this decision. The Department Chair's recommendation is final in such cases. If the Department Chair recommends against renewal, the dean, in consultation with the divisional dean, will make the final decision about the appointment using the fourth-year review procedures listed below. A probationary faculty member must be informed in writing of a decision for nonrenewal according to standards of notice set forth in University Rule 3335-6-08, and in keeping with instructions from the Office of Academic Affairs. Non-renewal letters must be approved by the dean in advance of being sent.

2 Fourth-Year Review

In accordance with University Rule 3335-6-03(3), during the fourth year of the probationary period, the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review including the comments process, with the exception that external letters of evaluation are optional**,** and the Dean (not the Department Chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. The review is conducted during the Spring Semester.

External evaluations are solicited only when either the Department Chair or the eligible faculty determine that they are necessary to conduct the Fourth-Year Review. This may occur when the candidate's scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input.

The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate, votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment, and 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. The review thus results in two letters of evaluation: one from the eligible faculty and a separate letter from the Department Chair. At the conclusion of the Department review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04) is followed, and the case is forwarded to the College for review, regardless of whether the

Department Chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal. If either the Department Chair or the Dean recommends nonrenewal of a faculty member's probationary contract, the case will be referred to the college's Promotion and Tenure Committee, which will review the case, vote and make a recommendation to the Dean. The Dean makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.Renewal of the appointment of a probationary faculty member for the fifth year also requires the approval of the divisional dean.

3 Extension of the Tenure Clock

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure-track faculty member may extend the probationary period. Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (E) does likewise for reducing the probationary period. A faculty member remains on duty regardless of extensions or reductions to the probationary period, and annual reviews are conducted in every probationary year regardless of time extended or reduced. Approved extensions or reductions do not limit the department's right to recommend nonrenewal of an appointment during an annual review.

C Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the professors in the Department, who submit a written performance review to the Department Chair along with comments on the faculty member's progress toward promotion. The Department Chair conducts an independent assessment; meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review and the Department Chair may reply in writing if warranted. If an associate professor has an administrative role, the impact of that role and other assignments will be considered in the annual review.

Professors are reviewed annually by the Department Chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their performance and future plans and goals and prepares a written evaluation of performance against these expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review and the Department Chair may respond in writing if warranted. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the Department, as demonstrated by ongoing national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and ongoing outstanding service to the Department, the College, the University, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, in civil and collegial interaction with colleagues, staff, and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty.

If a professor has an administrative role, the impact of that role and other assignments will be considered in the annual review.

D Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

In the penultimate contract year of a teaching faculty member's appointment, the Department Chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If the position 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 must be observed.

If the position continues, 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. This review generally proceeds in the same manner as the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty.

There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

E Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

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

F Regional Campus Faculty

Regional campus tenure-track faculty are reviewed according to the process established on that campus, with a focus on teaching and service. Following the review by the regional campus, the regional campus Dean meets with the Department Chair for evaluation of the faculty member's research and creative activity during the review period. The regional campus Dean provides an annual performance and merit review letter. 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.

The annual performance and merit review of regional campus teaching faculty is conducted according to the process established on the regional campus, with the review focusing on teaching and service. The regional campus Dean will provide the Department Chair a copy of a teaching faculty member's annual performance and merit review letter.

The annual performance and merit review of regional campus associated faculty is conducted according to the process established on the regional campus, with the review focusing on teaching and service, as applicable.

G Salary Recommendations

The Department Chair makes annual salary recommendations to the Dean, who may modify them. The recommendations are based on the current annual performance and merit review as well as on the performance and merit reviews of the preceding 12 months.

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. The Department Chair should proactively engage in equity audits of faculty salary to ensure faculty salaries are commensurate both within the Department and across the field or fields represented in the Department. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation (see Section V-A above) for an annual performance and merit 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.

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

The criteria employed for determining recommendations for merit salary increases to Arts Administration, Education and Policy Department faculty are based on contributions in the areas of research, teaching, and service in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.

Faculty with high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

Faculty 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.

VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 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.

A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

Although institutional citizenship and collegiality are expected, they cannot be used as an independent criterion for promotion or tenure. The department recognizes, however, that these positive attributes define the ability of a faculty member to contribute effectively to exemplary teaching, scholarship, and service.

A commitment to these values and principles is demonstrated, for example, by participation in faculty governance and community outreach; activities related to the University's Shared Values; adherence to principles of the responsible conduct of research; constructive conduct and ethical behavior during the discharge of responsibilities and authority; and the exercise of rights and privileges consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics.

This department is committed to assessing the practice of these values and principles as part of all performance evaluations. Except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increase, all funds for annual salary increases will be directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and the active promotion of an enriching working and learning environment through collegiality, civility, and openness to diverse ideas and opinions.

1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

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

> *The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a scholar, and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high quality teaching, scholarship, and service*

relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the university.

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

Consistent with these guidelines, promotion to associate professor with tenure in the College of Arts and Sciences requires excellence in both research/creative work and teaching. Evidence of service to the unit and the promise of excellence in service beyond the unit are desirable.

Excellence in research/creative work means attainment of measurable national or international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of high-quality published research and/or other relevant creative endeavors. A successful candidate will have an emerging national reputation as a scholar or creative artist. Excellence in teaching means the provision to all students of the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning and, to the most capable and motivated students, an enhanced learning experience. Excellence in service means the provision of a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more publics – including the university, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations. The service contribution during the probationary period of assistant professors is limited by design. The most important judgment is that the candidate will achieve excellence in service in the future

The substantial probability that a high rate of quality research/creative work and excellence in teaching and service will continue needs to be established. The claim that awarding tenure to the candidate will improve the overall quality and standing of the unit needs to be supported.

The award of tenure is an acknowledgement of excellence and future potential for preeminence. 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. Above all, candidates are held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. For example, 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 scholarship, teaching, and service is moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics.

The Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy accounts for and encourages flexibility in faculty production, in keeping with the university's statement of context for tenure and promotion reviews: "*…as the University enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established academic*

patterns. In such cases care must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances, ***superior intellectual attainment****, in accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions.*"

Essentially, in addition to what we are calling "Traditional" Research, Teaching and Service expectations, we also qualify the "Public Sphere" and "Creative Activities" as significant to the discovery and transmission of knowledge in our department's fields of study and therefore in considering qualification for tenure and promotion. Faculty members pursuing the "public sphere" or "creative activities" path toward promotion and tenure are encouraged to work closely with senior faculty in developing a portfolio or research impact narrative with evidence of meeting expectations. A candidate for promotion and tenure will be evaluated for their national reputation for **superior intellectual attainment** in their field of study, as evidenced by their Scholarship, Teaching and Service.

Candidates should meet the department's expectations for excellence, as described below, for Scholarship, Teaching and Service to be awarded tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Have a focused research agenda that is consistent with department, college, and university mission statements	Dossier narrative description of research and research impact
Gain an emerging national reputation as a scholar and/or creative artist	External letters; research impact narrative, citations, and awards
Display superior intellectual attainment in traditional scholarship or in a combination of traditional scholarship along with public scholarship and/or creative scholarship. The criteria and evidence for each of the three types of scholarship is outlined below. Note that expectations for the quantity of traditional scholarship will be lower for those who demonstrate superior intellectual attainment through a combination of traditional scholarship along with high engagement in public scholarship and/or creative scholarship.	Dossier report of scholarship and narrative description of research and research impact. Candidate statements therein about norms and expectations for scholarship in their area of expertise, including publication types/outlets, creative work, collaboration, and other information as relevant will be considered.
Traditional Scholarship	
Criteria: Candidates who demonstrate superior intellectual attainment in traditional scholarship:	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Produce several high-quality peer reviewed publications in the field of study in reputable journals and/or with reputable publishers	Dossier; external letters, research impact narrative and quality indicators
May further demonstrate superior intellectual attainment in traditional scholarship through one or more of the following: Book chapters, books and/or book contracts with reputable publishers, grants,	Dossier; external letters, national scholarship awards, research impact narrative and quality indicators

research awards with reputable academic organizations, citations of publications.	
Public Scholarship	
Criteria: Candidates who demonstrate superior intellectual attainment through a combination of public scholarship and traditional scholarship:	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Meet the criteria for superior intellectual attainment in traditional scholarship, though the number of peer reviewed publications is lower for those who also use public scholarship criteria	See evidence for traditional scholarship criteria in the traditional scholarship section.
Demonstrate superior intellectual attainment through heavy involvement in public scholarship which may include grants, public/collaborative art works, government reports, program evaluations, state and national curriculum development, multimedia projects, fellowships/residencies, curatorial work, and alternative publications and productions, and collaborative projects with community and other partners that co-construct knowledge, engage in meaningful partnerships in a long-term process, and include researcher-to-community relationships that allow all participants to meet common goals. Partnerships may include community organizations and neighborhoods; government agencies; cultural organizations; arts institutions and small organizations; and social justice organizations.	External letter by an expert in the field who specializes in public scholarship. Publication of public practices in traditional scholarly outlets is also considered evidence if the publication venue is peer-reviewed by an appropriate field of study (such as community engagement journals, field-specific journals, public practice journals, and the like), and national grants or large community grants that produce scholarship and/or public impacts. Description in the dossier research narrative.
Creative Scholarship	
Criteria: Candidates who demonstrate superior intellectual attainment through a combination of creative scholarship and traditional scholarship:	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Meet the criteria for superior intellectual attainment in traditional scholarship, though the number of peer reviewed publications is lower for those who also use creative scholarship criteria	See evidence for traditional scholarship criteria in the traditional scholarship section.
Demonstrate superior intellectual attainment in creative scholarship through heavy involvement in creative scholarship, which may include one or more of the following: juried or invited group or solo exhibitions; performances; novels; creative nonfiction books; essays; poetry; artwork published in literary, academic, or arts-based journals and catalogues; visual essays; multimedia and website projects; curatorial projects; museum multimedia exhibits; and animation and visual effects.	Prestige and reputation of the venues for exhibition, performance, and/or production, such as a solo art exhibit, a published poem in a reputable literary publication, and the like; Evaluation through an external letter by an expert in the field who specializes in the type of creative work specific to the candidate. Publication of creative activities in traditional peer-reviewed scholarly outlets in an appropriate field of study.

TEACHING	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Successfully teach a total of four courses per year unless otherwise stipulated in institutional rules, contract, or course releases.	Dossier; annual review letters
Effectively perform regular teaching duties including class preparation, grading, and periodic revision of course syllabi, revisions to course content, student supervision, and mentorship	Dossier; annual review letters, peer reviews of teaching, teaching materials and/or student narrative comments
Serve on at least one Ph.D. and three M.A. Thesis or Project Committees;	Dossier; annual activities report
Chair at least one M.A. Thesis or Project	Dossier; annual activities report
Develop new and effective instructional techniques and materials appropriate to the objectives and level of the course (as evident in	peer reviews of teaching, teaching materials and/or student narrative comments
Demonstrate continuing growth in subject matter knowledge	peer reviews of teaching and teaching materials
Demonstrate the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm	peer reviews of teaching, teaching materials, SEI items and/or student narrative comments
Demonstrate creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom or online technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment	peer reviews of teaching, teaching materials, SEI items and/or student narrative comments
Engage students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, critical thinking, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process	peer reviews of teaching, teaching materials, SEI items and/or student narrative comments
Provide appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process	student narrative comments that do not indicate problems in meeting this criterion
Treat students with respect and courtesy	peer reviews of teaching and/or student narrative comments that do not indicate problems in meeting this criterion.
Success in developing student interest and competence in art education, arts administration and/or cultural policy	Dossier; peer reviews of teaching, teaching materials and/or student narrative comments

SERVICE	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Demonstrate excellence in professional and community service, including to the department and university, with commitment, leadership, quality, and competence being more important than number of activities. Professional activities	Dossier; annual report of activities

may include support of administrative tasks, committee work, performance of duties as an officer in professional organizations, organizing colloquia, symposiums, conferences and exhibitions, lecturing to local audiences and/or providing support to local teachers and arts organizations.	
Emerging leadership responsibilities in local, national, and/or international organizations, recognizing that leadership in local organizations may be most important depending on the candidate's area of research focus.	Dossier: annual report of activities
Active participation in department faculty meetings	Dossier; annual review letter (collegiality section)
Actively serving on and participating in departmental committees as appointed by the chair of the department	Dossier; annual report of activities
Actively participating in professional organizations (e.g., art, art education, cultural policy, arts administration, education, and/or interdisciplinary organizations	Dossier; annual report of activities
Actively serving on editorial review boards or serving as an article reviewer for reputable journals or book series (or the equivalent).	Dossier; annual report of activities

2 Promotion to Professor

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 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.*

The College of Arts and Sciences establishes these related criteria:

> *Promotion to professor in the College of Arts and Sciences takes the pursuit of research and creative excellence as our core value. The college also recognizes that a career may consist of various phases in which a concentration on research/creative work, teaching, or service creates a composite professional life. Promotion to professor typically requires excellence in scholarship/creative work. Where a candidate has made truly extraordinary contributions in the areas of teaching or service, that record may warrant promotion in combination with a less extensive, though excellent, record of continued productivity in scholarship/creative work.*

Excellence in scholarship/creative work means attainment of measurable national or international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of high-quality published research and/or other relevant creative endeavors. A successful candidate will have achieved national distinction as a researcher or creative artist and have an emerging international reputation. Excellence in teaching means the provision to all students of the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning and, to the most capable and motivated students, an enhanced learning experience. It can be measured by the attainment of national or international recognition, as evidenced by pedagogical publications, awards, honors, and/or critical student outcomes.

Excellence in service means the provision of a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more publics – including the university, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations.

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. Promotion should reflect the reality that (a) not all faculty members have the same distribution of assignments (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence equally in all evaluation dimensions; and (c) there is a multi-faceted institutional responsibility that must be achieved by the skills of the faculty collectively. Promotion to professor should be awarded to faculty who have demonstrated impact in their scholarship or research and creative inquiry, teaching and learning, and service.

The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar for those to promotion to associate professor with tenure, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national or international reputation in the field.

To **meet expectations for scholarship** for promotion to professor, a candidate may choose to focus on traditional, public, and creative scholarship. At this level of promotion, a combination with traditional scholarship is not necessary. However, a candidate focused on public and/or creative scholarship must still present evidence of exceptionality as described above in the section on promotion to associate professor. In contrast to the scholarship requirements for promotion to associate professor, a candidate for promotion to professor may instead opt for a combination of any of these areas of scholarship (traditional, public, and/or creative, and/or leadership). Additional expectations include keynote presentations, research awards, and fellowships.

To **meet expectations for teaching** for promotion to professor, a candidate should meet expectations outlined in the section on promotion to associate professor. Promotion to professor requires demonstrating a sustained commitment to students to support them in realizing their full capabilities for learning and providing an enhanced learning experience.

For purposes of promotion to professor, candidates who meet expectations for teaching participate in the following:

- Earned "P" status with the Graduate School
- Serve on or Chairing above the minimum expectations of Ph.D. and M.A. committees;
- Collaborate and actively engage with other faculty in program development;
- Support overall academic programs in the Department.
- Develop innovative teaching methods;
- Receive honors, awards, or grants for teaching, national or international recognition
- Create new course(s) that reflect developments in the field that enhance and advance the Department's Mission Statement and programming;
- Involvement/support in external student exhibitions, presentations, activities, and publications;
- Distinction of student accomplishments – recognition and awards;
- Supervise of Graduate Teaching Associates;
- Involvement in interdisciplinary and collaborative pedagogical efforts with colleagues from other Departments and institutions.

To **meet expectations for service** for promotion to professor, a candidate should continue expectations outlined in the section on promotion to associate professor, providing a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more publics. For this Department, the role of faculty in the public sector is especially important and therefore carries great weight in consideration for promotion to professor.

For purposes of promotion to professor, candidates who meet expectations for service participate in the following:

- Appointment as the Undergraduate Chair, Graduate Studies Committee Chair, Distance Learning Committee Chair, Director of the Barnett Center, or Chair of the Eligible Faculty in the Department;
- Appointment as Chair to other Departmental or University committees;
- Serve on College of Arts and Sciences and/or University committees and/or other ad hoc committees and task forces;
- Maintain contact with area art teachers and/or community arts organizations and institutions and serving as a resource and/or mentor;
- Serve as a liaison between the Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy and arts-related groups and/or organizations inside and/or outside the University;
- Elected or appointed to leadership roles in University, College and/or school committees and/or assignments;
- Elected or appointed to leadership roles in professional arts or educational organizations;
- Participate on organizational boards related to the field;
- Senior editorships, book reviews, academic press leadership, book series editor
- Coordinate and/or advise professional arts-related organizations inside/outside the University;
- Organize conferences and symposia relevant to current topics or new directions in the field;
- Involvement in interdisciplinary/collaborative outreach and service efforts with colleagues from other Departments and institutions;
- Serve as a leader, mentor, and/or advisor to students, faculty, staff, community;
- Participation in advisory or other roles with student groups and organizations.

3 Teaching Faculty

Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor

For promotion to associate teaching professor, a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service; must have a documented high level of competence in professional practice; and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of this Department. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to associate professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor on the tenure-track. Scholarship activity is not expected but will be recognized as professional contributions appropriate to the teaching faculty member's role. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

TEACHING	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Successfully teach a total of eight course per year unless otherwise stipulated in institutional rules, contract, or administrative course releases	Dossier; annual review letters
Effectively perform regular teaching duties including class preparation, grading, and periodic revision of course syllabi, revisions to course content, student supervision, and mentorship	Dossier; annual review letters, peer reviews of teaching, teaching materials and/or student narrative comments
Serve on at least one Ph.D. and three M.A. Thesis or Project Committees;	Annual activities report
Develop new and effective instructional techniques and materials appropriate to the objectives and level of the course (as evident in	Peer reviews of teaching, teaching materials and/or student narrative comments
Demonstrate continuing growth in subject matter knowledge	Peer reviews of teaching and teaching materials
Demonstrate the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm	Peer reviews of teaching, teaching materials, SEI items and/or student narrative comments
Demonstrate creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom or online technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment	Peer reviews of teaching, teaching materials, SEI items and/or student narrative comments
Engage students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, critical thinking, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process	Peer reviews of teaching, teaching materials, SEI items and/or student narrative comments
Provide appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process	Student narrative comments that do not indicate problems in meeting this criterion
Treat students with respect and courtesy	Peer reviews of teaching and/or student narrative comments that do not indicate problems in meeting this criterion.

Success in developing student interest and competence in art education, arts administration and/or cultural policy	Dossier; peer reviews of teaching, teaching materials and/or student narrative comments

SERVICE	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Demonstrate excellence in professional and community service, including to the department and university, with commitment, leadership, quality, and competence being more important than number of activities. Professional activities may include support of administrative tasks, committee work, performance of duties as an officer in professional organizations, organizing colloquia, symposiums, conferences and exhibitions, lecturing to local audiences and/or providing support to local teachers and arts organizations.	Dossier; annual report of activities
Emerging leadership responsibilities in local, national, and/or international organizations, recognizing that leadership in local organizations may be most important depending on the candidate's area of research focus.	Dossier: annual report of activities
Active participation in department faculty meetings	Dossier; annual review letter (collegiality section)
Actively serving on and participating in departmental committees as appointed by the chair of the department	Dossier; annual report of activities
Actively participating in professional organizations (e.g., art, art education, cultural policy, arts administration, education, and/or interdisciplinary organizations	Dossier; annual report of activities

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Have a focused research agenda that is consistent with pedagogy and/or professional practice; curricular development and/or other teaching related foci	Dossier narrative description of research and research impact

Display intellectual attainment in traditional scholarship or in a combination of traditional scholarship along with public scholarship and/or creative scholarship, i.e. traditional publications and/or scholarly presentations and publication of pedagogical expertise, white papers and policy papers, grants and contracts, creative works pertinent to pedagogy and/or the candidate's focus area	Dossier report of scholarship and narrative description of research and research impact. Candidate statements therein about norms and expectations for scholarship in their area of expertise, including publication types/outlets, creative work, collaboration, and other information as relevant will be considered

Promotion to Teaching Professor

The specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to teaching professor are similar for those to promotion to associate teaching professor, with the added expectation of a sustained record of excellence in teaching, a sustained record of continuing professional growth, leadership in service to the Department and the provision of high-quality and impactful service at a local, state, or national level. In addition, the production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice is required.

Teaching

Additional expectations for candidates for teaching professor include carrying a greater load of advising PhD and MA students, serving on several PhD and MA committees, having earned "M" status with the Graduate School, and supporting overall academic programs in the Department. Promotion to teaching professor further requires demonstration of a sustained commitment to students to support them in realizing their full capabilities for learning and providing an enhanced learning experience. These teaching accomplishments can be measured by the attainment of University, local, national or international recognition, as evidenced by pedagogical publications, awards, honors, and/or critical student outcomes.

Service

Additional expectations for teaching professor include serving as a leader, mentor, and/or advisor to students, faculty, staff, community, or professional organizations, and/or participating with University wide service to demonstrate a commitment to the field, actively serving on and participating in Departmental committees as appointed by the Chair of the Department;

Scholarship: Traditional, Public and Creative

Scholarship can be identified as traditional, public, creative or a combination of the three. Evidence of excellence in scholarship can include traditional publications and/or scholarly presentations, curated exhibitions, exhibiting artwork, presentations, and publication of pedagogical expertise, white papers and policy papers, grants and contracts, creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus.

4 Associated Faculty

Promotion to Adjunct Associate Professor and Adjunct Professor. The relevant criteria for the promotion of adjunct faculty members shall be the same as those for the promotion of tenure-track, or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, above.

Promotion to Associate Professor and Professor with FTE below 50%. The relevant criteria for the promotion of associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are those for the promotion of tenure-track faculty above.

Promotion to Senior Lecturer. Lecturers may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank as described in Section IV.A.3.

Promotion of Visiting Faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for promotion.

5 Regional Campus Faculty

Expectations for regional campus faculty differ somewhat from those for faculty on the Columbus campus. The primary mission of the regional campuses is to provide high quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities. The relative emphasis on teaching and service of regional campus faculty will, therefore, ordinarily be greater. The Department expects regional campus tenure-track faculty members to establish a program of high quality scholarship, however, that the greater teaching and service commitments of regional campus faculty require a different set of expectations. The judgment whether a particular body of work meets Departmental standards for tenure and/or promotion will take into consideration the regional campuses' different mission, higher teaching expectation and lesser access to teaching and research resources.

In evaluating regional campus teaching faculty for promotion, the Department will use the same criteria as described above.

Regional campus associated faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean. The decision of the regional campus dean is final.

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 for tenure-track faculty 3335-7-05 for teaching faculty, and the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Chapter 3 of the *Policies and Procedures Handbook*.

1 Tenure-Track and Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus

a. Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier and providing a copy of the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed, if other than the Department's current document. If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators compiled for their case according to Department guidelines. Each of these elements is described in detail below.

Dossier

Every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. 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.

While the Committee of the Eligible Faculty 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 him/her/them.

The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

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

For scholarship documentation, a full history of publications and creative work should be included, as this information provides context to the more recent and relevant research record and/or demonstrates scholarly independence. Information about scholarship produced prior to the start date (for probationary faculty) or date of last promotion (for tenured or nonprobationary faculty) may be provided. Any such material should be clearly indicated. However, it is the scholarship performance since the start date or date of last promotion that is to be the focus of the evaluating parties.

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

The time period for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated. The complete dossier is forwarded to the College and the Office of Academic Affairs after completion of the Departmental review. Documentation of scholarship and service is used within the department unless the college or university requests it.

Service documentation should include:
- Involvement with professional societies
- Consultation activity
- Administrative service to the Department, College or University
- Advising to student groups and organizations
- Awards for service
- Any available documentation (e.g. letters from Committee Chairs) of the quality of service that characterizes the list of service activities in the dossier

The complete dossier is forwarded when the review moves beyond the Department. The documentation of teaching is forwarded along with the dossier. The documentation of scholarship and service is for use during the Department review only, unless reviewers at the College and University levels specifically request it.

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document

Candidates must indicate the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. A candidate may be reviewed using the Department's current APT document, or they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion (or last reappointment in the case of teaching faculty), whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, for tenure track faculty the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year.

If a candidate wishes to be reviewed under an APT other than the current approved version available here, a copy of the APT document under which the candidate has elected to be reviewed must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the Department.

External Evaluations (see also External Evaluations below)

If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed according to Department guidelines. The candidate may add no more than three additional names but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The Department Chair decides whether removal is justified.

b Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the eligible faculty are as follows:

- To review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.

- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. 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.

- The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.

- A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04A(3) only once. Faculty Rule 3335-7-08 makes the same provision for nonprobationary teaching faculty. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.

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

- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.

- **Late Spring:** 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 here.

- **Late Spring**: Suggest names of external evaluators to the Department Chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the institutions and programs described in Section VI.B.4 below.

- **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 provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his/her/their dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.

- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.

- Consider the interdisciplinary work of a candidate across multiple units as part of the whole work, especially if the candidate has a joint appointment in another unit or is a member of a Discovery Theme.

- Revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of the full eligible faculty, 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 from another tenure-initiating unit. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the Department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this Department's cases.

- 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 eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.

c Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Department Chair are as follows:

- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. The Department must ensure that such questions are asked of all candidates in a non-discriminatory manner. For tenure-track assistant professors, Department Chairs are to confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an MOU at the time of promotion with tenure.

- **Late Spring Semester**: To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Eligible Faculty, the Department Chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this department, and to solicit an evaluation from a Department Chair of any Department in which the candidate has a joint appointment, from a Discovery Theme director in which the candidate is a member of the core faculty, and from an interdisciplinary center or institute in which the candidate plays an active role. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.

- To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted upon.

- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on department, college, and university criteria.

- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.

- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, a Department Chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.

- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.

- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.

- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the Department review process:

    - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and Department Chair;
    - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and Department Chair; and
    - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten calendar 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/she/they will submit comments.

- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.

- To forward the completed dossier to the College office by that office's deadline.

- To receive the eligible faculty's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units or core faculty members of a Discovery Theme, and to forward this material, along with the Department Chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the head of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

2 Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Adjunct faculty and associated faculty with tenure-track titles for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed in Section VI.B above, with the exception that the review does not proceed to the College level if the Department Chair's recommendation is negative (a negative recommendation by the Department Chair is final in such cases).

3 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

The responsibilities of regional campus candidates are the same as those of a Columbus campus candidate as described above.

Regional campus tenure-track 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. A request to promote requires agreement by the Dean/director and the Department Chair.

Regional campus teaching faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus Dean/director. Following the review, the Dean/director consults with the faculty member's Department Chair. A request to promote follows the same procedures as tenure-track faculty except that external letters are not needed unless scholarship is a component of the assigned role.

Associated faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus Dean/director. The decision of the regional campus Dean/director is final.

4 External Evaluations

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

or promotion reviews, all adjunct faculty promotion reviews, and all teaching faculty promotion reviews to the level of Teaching Professor. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor or for associated faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor or for an associated faculty member will be made by the Department Chair after consulting with the candidate and the Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.

A conflict of interest for external reviewers exists if the reviewer is or has been to the candidate: a) a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor; b) a research collaborator, which includes someone who has been a coauthor on a publication within the past 3 years, including pending publications and submissions; c) a collaborator on a project within the past 3 years, including current and planned collaborations; d) in a consulting/financial arrangement with the candidate within the past 3 years, including receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services); e) a relative or close personal friend; or f) in any relationship, personal or professional, that could reduce the reviewer's objectivity. Also excluded are reviewers from the same institution, or those who had previous employment in the same institution within the past 12 months, or those who are being considered for employment at that institution.

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 scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This Department will solicit evaluations only from professors with institutional affiliations as listed just below. 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.

All potential evaluators must be approved by the college through the associate dean for academic affairs. Typically, the majority of letters in the final dossier will be from professors at institutions in the Association of American Universities (AAU) or Big 10 Academic Alliance (BTAA) who are in the same field as the candidate. No written justification is required for individuals in this category. If the potential evaluator is from an academic institution that is not clearly a peer or aspirational peer for Ohio State (defined as AAU or BTAA), or if the potential evaluator is from a nonacademic institution (e.g., a public policy think tank, a private art academy or music conservatory, a museum, a biomedical company, or a governmental agency), a brief written justification is required. The department's justification should be based on the prestige of the

institution, the credentials and experience of the evaluator, and/or the specific relevance of the evaluator's expertise to the candidate's activities. International evaluators from strong institutions are allowed. The research credentials of the evaluators should generally mirror those of a professor at the professor rank at Ohio State. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors. The department should provide justification if more than a minority of the evaluations are from associate professors (e.g., candidate's work is in a small or new field for which more senior people are not available, evaluators have gained prominence as national or international experts in the field). For reviews of associate professors, all evaluators must be professors (or equivalent). Emeritus professors are acceptable as long as they are active researchers.

Since the Department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters are sought than are required, and they are solicited no later than the end of the spring semester prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, 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 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 for letters requesting external evaluations. A sample letter for tenure-track faculty can be found here. A sample letter for teaching faculty can be found here.

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.

VII Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals

Only the candidate may appeal a negative tenure, promotion, or reappointment decision.

Faculty members who believe they have been evaluated improperly for tenure, promotion, or reappointment may appeal a negative decision to the University Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

Performance that is adequate for annual reappointment may not be adequate for the granting of promotion or tenure with promotion for faculty on the tenure track or, in the case of clinical/teaching/professional practice or research faculty, for securing a reappointment.

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (A) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05.

Disagreement with a negative decision is not grounds for appeal. In pursuing an appeal, the faculty member is required to document the failure of one or more parties to the review process to follow written policies and procedures.

VIII Seventh Year Reviews

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (B) sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a Seventh Year Review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year (mandatory tenure) review.

IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The College of Arts and Sciences values excellence in teaching across disciplines and at all levels of instruction. Student and peer evaluations of teaching provide tools for assessing faculty teaching effectiveness and for providing faculty with regular opportunities for improvement.

Evaluation of teaching should be holistic, taking into account a wide variety of kinds of evidence of accomplishment in the classroom: for example, student evaluations (quantitative and narrative), peer evaluations, examples of curricular or pedagogic innovation, and efforts to improve teaching by taking advantage of college or university resources.

In no case should the evaluation of teaching rely exclusively on quantitative instruments (such as the SEI), which have been shown to be unreliable indicators of overall performance in the classroom.

Evaluation of teaching should also be contextual, taking into account the particular challenges of teaching different kinds of material to different kinds of audiences, and situating each year's performance in relation to previous years and to goals set by the department.

Evaluation of teaching in the Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy attempts both to assess the degree to which particular teaching activities contribute to or enhance the teaching mission of the Department at large and to balance this with the individual instructional goals of the faculty as stated in syllabi, other contractual arrangements with students, and the faculty member's own statement of instructional goals. Adequate evaluation should allow some

distinction between the evaluation of a course as such and a more specifically focused assessment of individual instructors and methods. We expect that the most serious and useful evaluative instruments will be tailored to the specific shapes and goals of particular courses.

A Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) form or an equivalent end-of-course teaching assessment survey/tool is required. Faculty members are moreover required to use the Departmental student evaluation questionnaire for students to make narrative comments. These evaluation forms will be distributed and collected by a responsible person (student or staff member) other than the course instructor. That person will deliver the forms to the Departmental staff member. Copies of the narrative evaluations will be provided to the faculty member on request by the Department; the Chair's summary of the original forms will be kept on file and will be included in the appendix to the dossier for fourth year and promotion reviews. Both SEI and narrative evaluations become a part of each faculty member's annual activity report. That report will be considered incomplete if the required student SEI evaluation summaries have not been provided.

B Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Peer evaluation of teaching is required for all faculty members in the College of Arts and Sciences. Peer evaluation should fulfill two basic goals: 1) provide constructive feedback to faculty on both the content and the quality of their instruction, and 2) help faculty to continually improve the overall effectiveness of their teaching at all levels. The department chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process. The following minimum guidelines apply:

<u>Probationary faculty</u>

- The teaching of probationary tenure-track faculty and teaching faculty, and associated faculty with multiple year appointments must be reviewed at least once per year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. When tenure-track assistant professors are reviewed for tenure and promotion, and when probationary teaching faculty are reviewed for reapointment or promotion, they are required to have a minimum of five peer evaluations of teaching from the probationary period. No more than two evaluations should be prepared by the same colleague. The review itself will be scheduled in such a way as to allow adequate opportunity for classroom observation.

- Peer evaluations of teaching for probationary faculty are comprehensive and include, in addition to classroom visitation (or the equivalent for an online course), review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and exams. Faculty under review should provide peer reviewers with the course syllabus and other materials well in advance of the classroom visit or visits. They should also provide reviewers with a list of preferred visitation dates. The college encourages the reviewer to meet with the faculty member

under review to discuss the instructor's teaching philosophy, goals and expected outcomes for the course, and any challenges related to instruction (including previous feedback from previous evaluations of teaching). In addition to preparing a written report for the faculty member's dossier, the reviewer should meet with the faculty member following the classroom visitation for a more informal consultation about their teaching effectiveness. Although there is no requirement that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model should be followed to the extent possible.

Tenured and non-probationary faculty

- The teaching of tenured associate professors and nonprobationary assistant teaching professors and nonprobationary associate teaching professors is reviewed at least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. When tenure-track associate professors are reviewed for promotion to professor and when non-probationary assistant and associate teaching professors are reviewed or reappointment or promotion, they will be required to have three peer evaluations of teaching. Reviews should follow the format described above for probationary faculty.

- The teaching of tenured professors and nonprobationary teaching professors is reviewed at least once every four years. For each reappointment, nonprobationary teaching professors are required to have a minimum of two peer evalutions of teaching with the goal of assessing teaching at all levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.

Additional peer reviews of teaching

- The Department Chair may request peer reviews of the teaching of any faculty member who, in the Department Chair's judgment, would benefit from review. Typically, such reviews are in response to low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance to improve teaching.

- Any faculty member may request additional peer review of teaching. 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 may also seek the services of the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning.

Evaluation of a regional campus faculty member's teaching is ordinarily performed by Regional Campus faculty. However, when the regional campus faculty member teaches on the Columbus Campus, members of the Columbus campus Committee of the Eligible Faculty will conduct a review.

Review Process

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

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

- Faculty evaluators must not be of lower rank than the person being reviewed. As far as possible, these duties will rotate equitably through the faculty, so that the widest range of faculty suggestions and comments may be obtained.

- In general, the review is to be informed by documentation submitted by the faculty member under review, including course syllabi and supplemental class materials as specified above. The faculty reviewer includes in the report an assessment of these materials, including their appropriateness, usefulness, currency, and consistency with the objectives stated in the syllabus. An adequate review may also include a pattern of class visitation allowing substantive comment on the teaching of one or more courses and such relevant conversations, as many develop as part of this process.

- The faculty reviewer will prepare a written report of findings and recommendations. This report should assess teaching, considering the teaching mission statement, and the terms of evaluation set out above. The report is submitted to the Chair of the Eligible Faculty and Department Chair, who, in consultation with the Chair of the Eligible Faculty and the faculty member under review, draft a plan to respond to the recommendations, if needed. Such a plan would be revisited as part of their annual review as long as necessary.