

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure

Criteria and Procedures for The Ohio State University Department of Astronomy

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: July 28, 2022

Revision Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: November 17, 2025

Table of Contents

I PREAMBLE	3
II DEPARTMENT MISSION.....	3
III DEFINITIONS.....	4
A Faculty Advisory Committee	4
1 <i>Tenure Track Faculty</i>	4
2 <i>Research Faculty</i>	5
3 <i>Associated Faculty</i>	5
4 <i>Conflict of Interest</i>	6
5 <i>Minimum Composition</i>	6
B Quorum.....	6
C Recommendation from the Faculty Advisory Committee	6
1 <i>Appointment</i>	7
2 <i>Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal</i>	7
IV APPOINTMENTS.....	7
A Criteria	7
1 <i>Tenure Track Faculty</i>	7
2 <i>Research Faculty</i>	8
3 <i>Associated Faculty</i>	9
4 <i>Regional Campus Faculty</i>	10
5 <i>Emeritus Faculty</i>	10
6 <i>Courtesy Appointments for Tenure-Track Faculty</i>	11
B Procedures	11
1 <i>Tenure Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus</i>	11
2 <i>Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus</i>	12
3 <i>Transfer from the Tenure Track</i>	12
4 <i>Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus</i>	13
5 <i>Regional Campus Faculty</i>	13
6 <i>Courtesy Appointments for Tenure Track Faculty</i>	14
V ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW.....	15
A Documentation	15

B Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus	16
1 <i>Fourth-Year Review</i>	17
2 <i>Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period</i>	18
C Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus	18
D Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus	18
E Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	18
F Regional Campus Faculty	19
G Salary Recommendations	19
VI PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS	20
A Criteria and Documentaion that Support Promotion	20
1 <i>Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure</i>	20
2 <i>Promotion to Professor</i>	22
3 <i>Research Faculty</i>	23
4 <i>Associated Faculty</i>	23
5 <i>Regional Campus Faculty</i>	23
B Procedures	23
1 <i>Tenure-Track and Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus</i>	24
a Candidate Responsibilities	24
b Departmental Review Committee Responsibilities	26
c Faculty Advisory Committee Responsibilities	27
d Department Chair Responsibilities	28
e Procedures for Joint Appointees	29
2 <i>Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus</i>	30
3 <i>Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty</i>	30
4 <i>External Evaluations</i>	30
VII APPEALS	31
VIII SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS	31
IX PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING	32
A Student Evaluation of Teaching	32
B Peer Evaluation of Teaching	32

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 Volume 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 review is conducted by the department chair, who consults with the vice chair for administration and the steering committee as needed, and any substantive changes are reported to the full faculty for comment before the revised document is submitted for approval.

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

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule [3335-6-01](#) 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](#).

II DEPARTMENT MISSION

The mission of the Department of Astronomy is to carry out astronomical research at a level competitive with that of the best universities in the country, to provide world class graduate education, and to provide excellent undergraduate teaching at the introductory and major levels. Outstanding service at the department, university, and national levels, including outreach activities that share the excitement of our field with the general public, is essential to accomplishing this mission.

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

Excellence in teaching involves (1) presenting engaging and content-rich astronomy undergraduate General Education (GE) courses that teach the principles and value of science as well as the specifics of astronomy, (2) providing courses for astronomy and physics majors that convey sufficient understanding of modern astronomy to prepare a strong student for graduate study in the field, (3) continuously updating our upper level undergraduate and graduate courses to present state-of-the-art information to our students in exciting and stimulating ways, (4) helping to develop excellent research and workplace skills for

students through mentoring their work on research and dissertations, and (5) evaluating teaching quality, by peers and by students, to maintain our teaching at a consistently high level, individually and collectively.

Excellence in service involves (1) serving responsibly on committees within our department, College, and University; (2) serving on professional committees at state, national, and international levels, providing service in the form of peer-reviewing documents for journals and funding agencies, and evaluating colleagues at other universities involved in the promotion and tenure process; (3) promoting excellence within the department, the College, the University, and the broader astronomy and STEM communities; and (4) sharing the fruits of our educational and research endeavors with the community outside of the university, especially through formal outreach programs.

III DEFINITIONS

A Faculty Advisory Committee

Faculty appointments and reviews are carried out by the Faculty Advisory Committee which is comprised of all faculty who are eligible to consider a particular case, as described below. As described in Section VII.B, for each assistant and associate professor there is a Departmental Review Committee (typically comprised of three eligible faculty) that has responsibility for organizing peer reviews of teaching and drafting an annual review for consideration by the Faculty Advisory Committee.

The eligible faculty for all appointment (hiring), reappointment, contract renewal, promotion, or promotion and tenure reviews must have their tenure home or primary appointment in the department. In the remainder of this section, “tenure-track faculty in the department,” “tenured faculty,” and “tenured associate professors and professors” refer specifically to faculty with primary appointments in Astronomy.

The department chair, the college dean, divisional deans, 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, promotion and tenure, or contract renewal.

1 *Tenure Track Faculty*

Initial Appointment Reviews

- For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an assistant professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the department.
- For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review at senior rank (associate professor or professor), the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the department.
- 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 Research Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a research assistant professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all research faculty in the department.
- For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review at senior rank (research associate professor or research professor), the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track and all research faculty in the department.
- 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 research faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews

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

3 Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment, Reappointment, and Contract Renewal

- Initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type), reappointment, and contract renewal of associated faculty members are decided by the department chair in consultation with the Steering Committee.

Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by the eligible faculty (all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college.

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 research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Sections III.A.1, 2, or 3 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.

The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the department chair in consultation with the Steering Committee.

4 *Conflict of Interest*

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

5 *Minimum Composition*

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

B *Quorum*

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. 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.

Eligible faculty may participate in personnel discussions via teleconferencing technology. However, they must participate in the entire discussion in order to be eligible to vote, and in person participation in hiring, review, and promotion meetings is preferred whenever possible.

C *Recommendation from the Faculty Advisory Committee*

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

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted.

1 Appointment

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

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

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

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

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

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. The appointment of tenure-track faculty must meet the highest possible standards of excellence, consistent with the mission of the Department of Astronomy, and must be based on criteria that reflect strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the faculty ranks. No offer will be extended in the event that the search process does not yield one or more candidates who would enhance the quality of the department. The search is either canceled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

1 Tenure Track Faculty

Instructor. Appointment at the rank of instructor can be made 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 appointment are identical to that of 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 review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. When an instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment.

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

Assistant Professor. An earned doctorate is required for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Faculty Advisory Committee determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting

of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to exclude time from the probationary period.

To be appointed as assistant professor, a candidate must

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

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

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

Appointments at the rank of professor without tenure should not occur.

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

2 Research Faculty

The titles of research professor, research associate professor, and research assistant professor are for researchers appointed for fixed term contracts that do not entail tenure. Research faculty are not eligible to vote in department matters, except as described in section III.A.2. The salary, benefits and overhead for research faculty are normally to be paid entirely by extramural funds through grants and contracts obtained by the faculty member, although in unusual circumstances the salary may be paid temporarily from University resources other than those generated from tuition and subsidy, subject to the availability of such funds. The expectation is that research faculty generally will be devoted to full-time research.

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

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

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

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

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

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. Associated faculty may be reappointed. Associated faculty are not eligible to vote in department matters.

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who provide considerable academic service to the department, such as teaching a course, serving on graduate student committees, or serving as a co-investigator on a research project for which a faculty title is appropriate. Adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure track faculty. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure track or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

Lecturer. Appointment as lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a Master's degree in astronomy or a related field. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is desirable. 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 should generally not exceed one year.

Senior Lecturer. Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a doctorate in astronomy or a related field, along with evidence of ability to provide high-quality

instruction; or a Master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience with documentation of high quality. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The initial appointment for a senior lecturer should generally not exceed one year.

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

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other 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. They may not be reappointed for more than three consecutive years at 100% FTE.

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, or 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 research 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, research, 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 tenured associate professors and professors on the Faculty Advisory Committee will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair, who will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the college dean or designee. 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.

See the OAA [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) Volume 1, Chapter 1, for information about the types of perquisites that may be offered to emeritus faculty, provided resources are available.

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

6 Courtesy Appointments for Tenure-Track Faculty

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

B Procedures

See the [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#) and the [Policy on Faculty Appointments](#) for information on the following topics:

- recruitment of tenure track, research, 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. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and 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 or designee provides approval for the department to commence a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise.

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

The search committee:

- Develops a search announcement for internal posting in the university Job Postings through the [Office of Human Resources](#) and external advertising, subject to the department chair's approval. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.
- Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications.

- Screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents to the full faculty a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. If the faculty agrees with this judgment, virtual or on-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the department office. If the faculty does not agree, the department chair in consultation with the faculty determines the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, cancel the search for the time being).

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

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

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

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

The department is advised to discuss potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status with the Office of International Affairs. The university will not grant tenure unless an individual is (1) a U.S. citizen or national; (2) a permanent resident (“green card” holder); (3) an asylee or refugee; or (4) an individual otherwise described as a “protected individual” pursuant to Title 8 U.S. Code Section 1324b(a)(3)(b). The department will therefore be cautious in making such appointments and vigilant in seeking residency status for the appointee promptly and diligently.

2 Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that during the virtual or on-campus interview the candidate is not asked to teach a class, and exceptions to a national search require approval only by the college dean or designee. In the Department of

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

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

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

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

3 Transfer from the Tenure Track

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

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

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

4 Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

Appointment, review, and reappointment of all compensated associated faculty are decided by the department chair in consultation with the department Steering Committee.

Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one to three years, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances.

Appointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department. The proposal is considered at a faculty meeting and if approved by the faculty, the department chair extends an offer. Adjunct appointments may be renewed only when the uncompensated academic service for which the appointment was made continues. Visiting appointments are limited to three consecutive years at 100% FTE.

Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are usually made on a term by term or annual basis. After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment.

All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued.

5 Regional Campus Faculty

The regional campus has primary responsibility for determining the position description for a tenure track faculty search, but the dean/director or designee consults with the department chair to reach agreement on the description before the search begins. The regional campus search committee must include at least one representative from the department.

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

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

Associated faculty are appointed by the regional campus associate dean, in consultation with the dean/director, department chair, program coordinators, and other relevant faculty members.

6 Courtesy Appointments for Tenure Track Faculty

Any Astronomy Department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure track or research faculty member from another Ohio State department. Courtesy appointments should be in the mutual interest of the faculty member being appointed and the Department of Astronomy. Considerations favoring a courtesy appointment will vary from case to case and may include:

- Some or all of the faculty member's research falls within the field of astronomy and astrophysics, and a courtesy appointment extends and strengthens the department's research portfolio.
- The faculty member collaborates with Astronomy faculty on research.
- The faculty member wishes to pursue funding opportunities in collaboration with Astronomy faculty.

- The faculty member wishes to team teach courses with Astronomy faculty.
- The faculty member wishes to advise or co-advise Astronomy graduate students.

Upon request, the case for a courtesy appointment will be considered and discussed at an Astronomy faculty meeting. A positive vote of two-thirds of participating faculty, conducted by secret ballot, is required for approval. Courtesy appointments are made for a period of one to five years and must be renewed at the end of that period by a two-thirds vote of the faculty and the agreement of the faculty member holding the courtesy appointment. Courtesy appointments may be canceled at any time on the request of the faculty member holding the appointment or on a two-thirds vote of the Astronomy faculty.

Faculty holding courtesy appointments will be listed as faculty on the Department of Astronomy web page, and they have the right (and are encouraged) to list themselves as Astronomy faculty at whatever rank they hold in their home departments. They may attend Astronomy faculty meetings if invited, but they do not have voting rights on Astronomy faculty decisions.

V ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews 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 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.

Depending on their appointment type, the annual reviews of faculty members are based on expected performance in teaching, research, and/or service as set forth in the department's Pattern of Administration document, which outlines policy on faculty duties and responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.

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

A Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the documents listed below to the department chair no later than the deadline given by the chair, generally no earlier than the final day of autumn term classes and no later than the end of March of the following year. The time period covered by this documentation is the previous calendar year. This documentation is collectively referred to in this document as the Annual Report.

- Office of Academic Affairs, [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), Volume 3 (*required for probationary faculty*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (*non-probationary faculty*)

- an updated CV, which will remain on file in the department office and will be available to any faculty member through the department chair's assistant
- A short narrative describing progress made since the last Annual Review and plans for the upcoming academic year (*all faculty*)

Other documentation for the annual performance and merit review will be the same as that for consideration for promotion and/or tenure, including:

- A list of all scholarly papers submitted, published, or accepted for publication since the previous year's report.
- SEI reports for every class taught since the previous Annual Performance and Merit Review, and other relevant documentation of teaching, such as student narrative evaluations, as appropriate.
- A list of current grants and contracts, including project title, role of the faculty member (e.g., PI or Co-PI), funding agency, grant identifier used by the funding agency, funded period, dollar amount, and OSP project number.
- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate, e.g., grants and contract proposals that have been submitted, telescope time awarded, etc.
- A list of service contributions, including committees at the international, national, state, university, college, and department levels, membership on scientific organizing committees, participation in reviews (as a referee of research papers or TAC member, for example), etc.

The documentation for promotion and/or tenure is described in full in Section VI of this document.

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

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

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

The department chair will be responsible for providing the respective Departmental Review Committee of each assistant and associate professor a copy of the submitted Annual Report, copies of the previous year's Annual Report and Annual Review, as well as cumulative student evaluations of instruction (SEIs) and copies of submitted peer evaluations of teaching (see Section IX, Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching).

The Departmental Review Committee's report shall assess the faculty member's performance and professional development, and should include both strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate. After presentation to the Faculty Advisory Committee, the report may be revised before being formally accepted. Once accepted this report, now formally that of the Faculty Advisory Committee, becomes part of the faculty member's dossier for subsequent Annual Reviews during the probationary period, including the review for tenure or for promotion and tenure. In the case of untenured faculty, the Faculty Advisory Committee report should include one of the following evaluations/recommendations:

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

In the absence of an explicit statement in the report, evaluation (2) is presumed. These assessments from the Faculty Advisory Committee are advisory to the chair. The Faculty Advisory Committee report is provided to the probationary faculty member as well as the department chair's annual review letter, and the faculty member may provide written comments on either or both. The department chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the college dean. In addition, both the annual review letter and the Faculty Advisory Committee report become part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments, if provided).

If the chair recommends that an eligible faculty member be reappointed to another probationary year of service, that recommendation is final. The department chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals.

If the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#)) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the college dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

1 *Fourth-Year Review*

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review described below, except that external letters are not solicited and the college dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

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

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

In the absence of a two-thirds majority, option 2 is the default recommendation.

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

2 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

Under normal circumstances, review for promotion and tenure is mandatory during a probationary faculty member's sixth year of service.

Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#) (D) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period. Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

C Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus

The annual review of tenured associate professors includes peer teaching reviews and report of the Departmental Review Committee to the Faculty Advisory Committee. The deliberations of the Faculty Advisory Committee will include consideration of whether or not the faculty member should be considered for promotion to professor during the following academic year. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

For professors, the annual review consists of the faculty member's Annual Report, the meeting with the chair, and the letter from the chair. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

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 tenure initiating unit, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and 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, interaction with colleagues 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 Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

In the penultimate contract year of a research faculty member's appointment, the department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. The department chair will consult with faculty as needed in reaching this determination, which will be based on the research faculty member's performance (as documented in annual reports and annual review letters), on the continuing

match between his or her research program and the goals of the department, and on the prospects for continued funding of the position.

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

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

The annual performance and merit review of a regional campus probationary tenure-track or tenured faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then moves to the department and proceeds as described above for probationary tenure-track and tenured faculty, respectively, on the Columbus campus. 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 research faculty is conducted by the department and proceeds as described above for Columbus campus research faculty. The department chair will provide the regional campus dean/director a copy of the faculty member's annual performance and merit review letter.

The annual performance and merit review of regional campus associated faculty is conducted entirely on the regional campus.

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 24 months.

In formulating recommendations, the department chair may consult with the Steering Committee except for members of the Steering Committee. The department chair should proactively assess the equity of

faculty salaries within the department, considering career stage and total contributions to the department's research, teaching, and service mission. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations and with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries.

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.

VI PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

A Criteria and Documentation that Support Promotion

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.

1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) provides the following general criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure:

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

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

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

excellent performance in another aspect of teaching that is a significantly smaller part of the individual's responsibilities.

Excellence in teaching, research, and service are moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the [American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

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

Teaching

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

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

Research

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

- Published a body of work in high-quality peer-reviewed venues that is thematically focused, contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and is beginning to be favorably cited or otherwise show evidence of influence on the work of others. The following attributes of the body of work are considered:
 - quality, impact, quantity
 - unique contribution to a line of inquiry

- rigor of the peer-review process and degree of dissemination of publication venues. Archival journal publications and monographs are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published research more than unpublished research, and original works more than edited works.
- while collaborative work is encouraged, and indeed is essential to some types of inquiry, the candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described to permit accurate assessment.
- A demonstrated ability to obtain and potential to sustain research program funding. Competitive peer-reviewed funding is weighted more favorably than other types, since it serves as a quality indicator of research programs, and grants requiring the exercise of intellectual creativity are weighted more heavily than those that largely dictate the work to be done. Research funding is a means to an end; funding is important to the extent that it leads to research productivity. Engagement with business entrepreneurship, including (but not limited to) invention disclosures, patents, corporate licensing, startup companies, and other business activities, is also valued.
- A developing national/international reputation in the candidate's field as evidenced by external evaluations, invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals, and a beginning trend of positive citations in other researchers' publications. A reputation based on the quality of the research contribution is distinguished from one based mainly on familiarity through the faculty member's frequent attendance at national and international conferences.
- Demonstrated a high degree of ethics in the conduct of research including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators.

Service

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

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

2 Promotion to Professor

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) establishes the following general criteria for promotion to the rank of professor:

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

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

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

In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#), assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another. 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 not only to those faculty who have demonstrated impact in their scholarship of research and creative inquiry, teaching and learning, and service, but also to those who have exhibited excellence in the scholarship of leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the department, college, and university.

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

3 Research Faculty

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

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

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 research 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.4.

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

5 Regional Campus Faculty

The primary function of the regional campuses is to provide high-quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities. With this consideration in mind, in evaluating regional campus tenure-track faculty for promotion and tenure or promotion, the department will give greater

emphasis to the quality of teaching and service relative to scholarship. Recognizing that the character and quantity of scholarship by regional campus faculty may differ from that of Columbus campus faculty, due to the weight of other responsibilities and lack of access to comparable resources, the department nevertheless expects regional campus faculty to establish a program of high-quality scholarly activity.

In evaluating regional campus research faculty and associated faculty for promotion, the department will use the same criteria as described above for the promotion of faculty in each of these categories.

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](#) and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

1 Tenure-Track and Research 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 external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators compiled for their case according to departmental guidelines. Each of these elements is described in detail below.

- **Dossier**

Candidates are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs 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 Faculty Advisory Committee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by the candidate.

Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

1 *Teaching*

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 tenured or nonprobationary 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.

- cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction, computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class

- peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in Section IX to this document)
- Copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed beyond review of publisher-supplied proofs.
- teaching activities as listed in the core dossier including
 - involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research
 - mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers
 - extension and continuing education instruction
 - involvement in curriculum development
 - awards and formal recognition of teaching
 - presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences
 - adoption of teaching materials at other colleges or universities
- other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate

2 Research

For 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.

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

3 Service

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.

- service activities as listed in the core dossier including
 - involvement with professional journals and professional societies
 - consultation activity with industry, education, or government
 - administrative service to department
 - administrative service to college
 - administrative service to university and Student Life
 - advising to student groups and organizations
 - awards and prizes for service to profession, university, or department
- any available documentation (e.g. letters from committee chairs) of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier

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 departmental review only, unless reviewers at the college and university levels specifically request it.

- **Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document**

Candidates must also submit a copy of the APT under which they wish to be reviewed. Candidates may submit the department's current APT document; or, alternatively, 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, whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, 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. This must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the department.

- **External Evaluations** (see also External Evaluations below)

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

b Departmental Review Committee Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Departmental Review Committee are as follows:

- To consider annually, in spring term, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. The Departmental Review Committee will pass on its recommendation to the Faculty Advisory Committee, as described below.
 - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for

a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.

- A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) for only one year. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
- A recommendation by the committee to proceed with a review in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
 - **Late Spring–Summer:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs guidelines.
 - **Late Spring–Summer:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair.
 - **Early Autumn:** Review the candidate's dossier 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 the candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
 - Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, research and service to provide to the Faculty Advisory Committee with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.
 - Revise the draft analysis of each case following the faculty meeting, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
 - Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.

c Faculty Advisory Committee Responsibilities

The department chair, college dean, divisional deans, associate and assistant deans, executive vice president and provost, and president may not be members of the department's Faculty Advisory

Committee. The department chair may attend meetings at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and may respond to questions, but may not vote.

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

- To consider requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review, to either associate professor or professor, in the following academic year, informed by the recommendation of the Departmental Review Committee. The Faculty Advisory Committee will vote on whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed. As previously noted, a tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) for only one year.
- To consider annual recommendations from the Departmental Review Committee (not necessarily originating with a faculty member's request) on whether or not an associate professor should be considered for promotion to professor during the following academic year. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed. As noted above, a tenured faculty member's request to be considered for promotion to professor may only be denied for one year.
- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- To attend all meetings of the Faculty Advisory Committee except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.

d 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.)
- **Summer–Autumn:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Departmental Review Committee, the chair and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To make adequate copies of the candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the Faculty Advisory Committee at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To charge each member of the Faculty Advisory Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To remove any member of the Faculty Advisory Committee from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.

- To attend the meetings of the Faculty Advisory Committee at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- **Autumn:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for the candidate, following receipt of the Faculty Advisory Committee's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the Faculty Advisory Committee to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform the candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
 - Of the recommendations by the Faculty Advisory Committee and department chair
 - Of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the Faculty Advisory Committee and department chair
 - Of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline.

e *Procedures for Joint Appointees*

For joint appointees whose tenure-initiating unit (TIU) is another department, the Astronomy Department Chair will provide a letter evaluating the candidate's research, teaching, and service contributions from the perspective of the Department of Astronomy. The expectations underlying such an evaluation will depend on the candidate's fractional appointment in Astronomy.

For a joint appointee whose TIU is the Department of Astronomy, the chair will solicit an evaluation from the chair of any other departments in which the candidate has a fractional (not courtesy) appointment. This letter will be provided to the Faculty Advisory Committee as input for its considerations.

The Department of Astronomy will not provide input for the promotion or promotion and tenure reviews of those holding courtesy appointments unless specifically requested to do so by the TIU.

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), and does not proceed to the executive vice president and provost if the college dean's recommendation is negative.

3 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

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

The regional campus dean/director forwards the written evaluation and recommendation of the regional campus review to the department chair, from which point the review follows the procedures described for the Columbus campus faculty. Regional campus evaluation materials are included in the materials considered by the Faculty Advisory Committee. A request to promote requires agreement by the dean/director and the department chair.

The review of regional campus research faculty takes place on the Columbus campus and follows the same procedures as those described above for Columbus campus research faculty. Following the review, the department chair will consult with the regional campus dean/director. A request to promote requires agreement by the regional campus dean/director and the department chair.

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 research and scholarly activity are obtained for all promotion reviews in which research must be assessed. These include all tenure track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews and all research faculty promotion reviews. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for associated faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations for an associated faculty member will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate. At the chair's discretion, external evaluations may also be solicited for research faculty contract renewals.

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's research (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will only solicit evaluations from tenured professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State or senior researchers at research institutes. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.
- Co-authorship of papers does not automatically disqualify a potential evaluator if these papers constitute a small fraction of the candidate's work or if the co-authorship is a result of joint membership in a large collaboration rather than direct collaboration with the candidate.

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

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

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Faculty Advisory Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) 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](#).

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 APPEALS

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

A Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) form is required in every course offered in this department. Faculty should remind students that on-line SEIs should be filled out on line. Faculty members should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if s/he is going to provide in-class time for students to complete the evaluation using a mobile application. The faculty member must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation. The faculty member should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and to provide feedback that can be taken into account in future teaching.

In addition to numerical SEI evaluations, discursive evaluations can be very valuable for improvement of teaching. Faculty can either request students to submit discursive comments with online SEI forms or provide in-class or take-home evaluations. For in-class evaluations, someone other than the instructor should distribute and collect evaluations while the instructor is out of the room, and completed evaluations should be held in the department or school office until the faculty member has turned in grades. The use of discursive student evaluations is strongly encouraged but not required.

B Peer Evaluation of Teaching

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

As noted in the OAA [Handbook](#), Volume 1, Chapter 1, Section 2.8.2

Peer evaluation should focus on those aspects of teaching that students cannot evaluate, such as appropriateness of curricular choices, implicit and explicit goals of instruction, choice of examination/evaluation materials by the faculty member, and consistency with the highest standards of disciplinary knowledge. Assessment of these aspects can be made by peers within the unit or external reviewers as determined by procedures established by the department.

Periodic peer evaluation is required for all tenure-track and clinical/teaching/practice faculty who deliver formal course instruction and recommended for any associated faculty with multiple-year appointments. In case of professors, such evaluation can take the form of peer review without a formal written evaluation. In addition, peer evaluation for promotion should include at least two different evaluations, with the exact number to be determined by the TIU in line with college guidelines.

The College of Arts & Sciences provides more specific expectations for peer reviews of teaching: at least one per year for probationary tenure-track faculty (for a total of five before being considered for promotion and tenure), at least every other year for tenured associate professors, and at least once every four years for tenured professors. Reviews should be conducted at all levels at which the faculty member teaches.

Annually the department chair appoints a Departmental Review Committee for each teaching faculty member below the rank of professor. Each Departmental Review Committee is normally comprised of three professors; associate professors may also serve on Departmental Review Committees for assistant professors, at the discretion of the department chair. The term of service is one year, with reappointment possible. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the tenured faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the department. The Departmental Review Committee is responsible for obtaining peer reviews of teaching; although there is no

presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible.

The responsibilities of the Departmental Review Committee are as follows:

- to review the teaching of probationary tenure track faculty at least once a year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned in the course of each probationary year
- to review the teaching of tenured associate professors and associated faculty at least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned
- to review, upon the department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.
- to review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the [Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#).

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

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluation (the first three situations listed above) is comprehensive and includes, in addition to classroom visitation, review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and exams. Multiple class visits should be conducted per course if possible, but individual visits need not last for the full duration of the class. Class visits will typically be unannounced. However, at the beginning of the academic term, the committee will request from the faculty member a list of dates on which visitation would be inappropriate because exams are being given, guest speakers are scheduled, etc.

As stated in the OAA guidelines quoted above, peer review focuses particularly on aspects of teaching that students are less qualified than faculty to evaluate. As part of its evaluation the committee examines copies of the faculty member's SEI summaries from recent years, and where student opinion is mixed to negative, the committee attempts to ascertain the reasons. In so doing, members are to bear in mind that they have observed only one or a few classes out of the academic term, and moreover have a very different level of knowledge compared to students. Consequently their assessment may differ considerably from that of the majority of students.

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