Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures

for the
William G. Lowrie Department of
Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering

Approved by CBE Faculty on September 6, 2024
Amended: September 14, 2025

Revision Approved by Office of Academic Affairs: September 18, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS	
1. PREAMBLE	3
2. DEPARTMENT MISSION	3
3. DEFINITIONS	4
3.A. The Eligible Faculty	4
3.A.1. Tenure-track Faculty	4
3.A.2. Professional Practice Faculty	4
3.A.3. Research Faculty	5
3.A.4. Associated Faculty	5
3.A.5. Conflict of Interest	6
3.A.6. Minimum Composition	7
3.B. Promotion and Tenure Committee	7
3.C. Quorum	7
3.D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty	7
3.D.1. Appointment	8
3.D.2. Reappointment, Promotion &Tenure, and Promotion	8
4. APPOINTMENTS	8
4.A. Criteria	8
4.A.1.General Criteria for Tenure-track Faculty	8
4.A.1.1.Criteria: Tenure-track Assistant Professor	9
4.A.1.2.Criteria: Associate Professor with Tenure	10
4.A.1.3.Criteria: Professor with Tenure	10
4.A.1.1.Criteria: Associate Professor without Tenure	10
4.A.1.5.Criteria: Prior Approval	10
4.A.2.Criteria for Professional Practice Faculty	10
4.A.3.Criteria for Research Faculty	11
4.A.4.Associated Faculty	12
4.A.5.Courtesy Appointment for Faculty	13
4.A.6. Joint Appointments	13
4.A.7.Emeritus Faculty	13
4.B. Procedures (Recruitment)	14
4.B.1. Tenure-track Faculty	14
4.B.2 Professional Practice Faculty	16
4.B.3. Research Faculty	16
4.B.4. Transfer from the Tenure-track, Professional Practice Faculty and Research Faculty	17
4.B.5 TIU Transfer	17
4.B.6. Appointments for Associated Faculty	17
4.B.7 Joint Appointments	18
4.B.8. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	18
5. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW	18
5.A. Documentation	19

5.B. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty	20
5.C. Tenured Faculty	21
5.D. Professional Practice Faculty	22
5.E. Research Faculty	23
5.F. Associated Faculty	23
5.G. Salary Recommendations	24
6. PROMOTION&TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS	24
6.A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion	24
6.A.1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	25
6.A.2. Promotion to Professor	27
6.A.3. Promotion of Professional Practice Faculty	28
6.A.4. Promotion of Research Faculty	29
6.A.5. Promotion of Associated Faculty	29
6.B. Procedures	29
6.B.1. Tenure-Track, Professional Practice, and Research Faculty	30
6.B.1.1. Candidate Responsibilities	30
6.B.1.1.1. Dossier	30
6.B.1.1.2 Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document	32
6.B.1.1.3 External Evaluations	32
6.B.1.2. Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities	32
6.B.1.3. Department Chair Responsibilities	34
6.B.2. Procedures for Associated Faculty	35
6.B.3. External Evaluations	35
7. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS	37
8. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS	37
9. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING	38
9.A. Student Evaluation of Teaching	38
9.B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching	38
Appendix I	40
Appendix II	42

1

1. PREAMBLE.

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

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

This document must be approved by the Dean of the College of Engineering 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.

2. DEPARTMENT MISSION.

The Mission of the Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering is:

> To educate undergraduate and graduate students in Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering and foster cross-fertilization with other disciplines.
>
> To advance the state-of-the-art knowledge of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering and allied fields through novel and sustained research.
>
> To serve the public, academic and industrial communities through consultation, collaborative efforts, dissemination of research results, entrepreneurship and participation in conferences and professional societies.

3. DEFINITIONS.

It is understood that the statements below are to be considered within the general framework provided by the Rules of the University Faculty, and are subject to the provisions of that document.

There are seven types of faculty in the Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering: tenure-track, professional practice, research, associated, courtesy, joint, and emeritus. Untenured faculty, as well as professional practice faculty or research faculty during their initial appointment period, are considered probationary.

3.A. Eligible Faculty.

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

The Department Chair, the Dean and Assistant and Associate deans of the College, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President may not participate as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure.

3.A.1. Tenure-track Faculty.

Appointment Reviews

- Initial Appointment Review. For an appointment (hiring) review of an assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the department.
- Rank Review. A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

- For the reappointment and promotion and tenure reviews of assistant professors and the tenure reviews of untenured associate 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.

3.A.2. Professional Practice Faculty.

Appointment Reviews

- Initial Appointment Review. For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a professional practice assistant professor, professional

practice associate professor, or a professional practice professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all professional practice faculty in the department.

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

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

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

3.A.3. Research Faculty.

Appointment Reviews

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

- Rank Review. For appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) at senior rank (research associate professor or research professor), a review is performed and a vote 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 and Promotion Reviews

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

3.A.4. Associated Faculty.

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- For the initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty, all professional practice faculty, and all research faculty in the department.

  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 all non-probationary professional practice and research faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college dean.

- For reappointments, the eligible faculty are all tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank than the candidate and all non-probationary professional practice faculty and research faculty of equal or higher rank than the candidate.

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, professional practice, 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 Associate Chair.

3.A.5. Conflict of Interest.

- **Search Committee Conflict of Interest**

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

- decides to apply for the position;
- is related to or has a close interpersonal relationship with a candidate;
- has substantive financial ties with the candidate;
- is dependent in some way on the candidate's services;
- has a close professional relationship with the candidate (e.g., dissertation advisor); or
- has collaborated extensively with the candidate or is currently collaborating with the candidate.

- **Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest**

A member of the eligible faculty has a conflict of interest when he/she/they are or have been to the candidate:

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

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

3.A.6. Minimum Composition.

In the event that the Department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the Dean, after consulting with the Department Chair, will appoint a faculty member from another Department within the College.

3.B. Promotion and Tenure Committee.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee consists of all Eligible faculty for voting. The Department chair appoints a chair (or two co-chairs) to manage the process. A Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) is also chosen by the Eligible faculty to oversee the process.

3.C. 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 of absences or serving as Associate Dean in the College may not participate in personnel decisions including promotion and tenure reviews. 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.

3.D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.

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

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted, but participating fully in discussions and voting via remote two-way electronic connection are allowed.

3.D.1. Appointment.

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

3.D.2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion.

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

4. APPOINTMENTS.

Tenure-track, professional practice, research, associated, and emeritus faculty positions require the approval of the Dean. In addition to complying with all University and College rules with respect to the total number of professional practice professors and research faculty, under no circumstance will the combined number of professional practice professors practice and research faculty exceed 30% of the total number of tenure-track faculty. Following is the Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering's criteria for each of the types of faculty.

4.A. CRITERIA.

The department is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance its quality. Important considerations include the individual's record to date in teaching, scholarship and service; the potential for professional growth in each of these areas; and the potential for interacting with colleagues and students in a way that will enhance their academic work and attract other outstanding faculty and students to the department. No offer will be extended in the event that the search process does not yield one or more candidates who would enhance the quality of the department. The search is either cancelled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

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

All faculty positions must be posted in Workday, the university's system of record for faculty and staff. A formal review and selection process, including interviews using pre-designed evaluation rubrics, is required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in Workday to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

4.A.1. General Criteria for Tenure-track Faculty.
The candidate offered a position will:

- have demonstrated through clear and convincing evidence that for the particular appointment the criteria have been met or exceeded in the following areas: teaching, scholarship and service.
- enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the Department.
- have support for the appointment, demonstrated by a strong consensus within the Department as evidenced by an appropriate faculty review and a 66 percent positive vote. Only positive and negative votes of the currently eligible voting faculty are valid and a faculty may remove themselves from the vote if they were not present for a majority of the evaluation/deliberation of the candidate.

4.A.1.1. Criteria: Tenure-track Instructor or Assistant Professor.

The candidate offered a position will:

- have an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience.
- have a potential for excellence in teaching, as demonstrated by a record of teaching and/or excellence in verbal and written communication.
- have a potential for excellence in scholarship as demonstrated by having produced a body of research, scholarship and creative work.
- have a potential to perform effective service.
- have a strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the faculty ranks.

Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but requirements for the terminal degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. Procedures for appointment are identical to those for an assistant professor. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. Promotion to assistant professor occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year, or the appointment will not be renewed and the third year is the terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

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

Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Promotion and Tenure Committee determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of

the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period.

4.A.1.2. Criteria: Associate Professor with Tenure.
The candidate offered a position will:

- Meet or exceed the Department criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure (outlined in Section 6).
- Candidates who have not held a faculty position must demonstrate strong research achievements and recognition, an aptitude and strong interest in teaching and a record of service to the profession.

4.A.1.3. Criteria: Professor with Tenure.
The candidate offered a position will:

- Meet or exceed the Department criteria for promotion to Professor with tenure (outlined in Section 6).
- Candidates who have not held a faculty position must demonstrate international recognition for their research, an aptitude and strong interest in teaching and significant service to the profession.

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

4.A.1.4. Criteria: Associate Professor without Tenure.
Appointment to Associate Professor generally includes tenure. However, in special cases, a probationary period may be granted, in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 , for a period not to exceed four years on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Review for tenure occurs in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

4.A.1.5. Prior Approval
Appointment offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

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

4.A.2. Criteria for Professional Practice Faculty.
Professional practice faculty positions exist in the Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering and will be referred to as "Professional Practice Assistant, Associate, or Professor." Distinctions among ranks are based on the level of distinction attained by the candidate. Reappointment is based on the candidate's performance and on the continued needs of the Department.

There must be clear and convincing evidence that the offeree of an appointment as professional practice assistant, associate, or professor has, at a minimum, (i) exemplary capability in the offeree's areas of specialization, (ii) significant experience in the practice of the discipline, (iii) demonstrated exceptional professional accomplishment, and (iv) potential to support student and program development in the offeree's areas of expertise. Furthermore,

the offeree is required to have either (a) earned master's degree, with a doctoral degree being preferred, or (b) have appropriate professional accomplishments demonstrating expertise in their areas of specialization, a minimum of five years of experience in the workplace, and the required licensure/certification in their areas of specialization. Professional publications or actual teaching experience are not required, but either or both would strengthen the offeree's qualifications.

Professional practice faculty appointments are for three to eight years with the possibility of renewal. The length of the contract depends on rank and probationary status. Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all other professional practice faculty members must be for a period of five years and is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for assistant and associate professional practice faculty are non-probationary and entail a three-to-five-year contract. Second and subsequent contracts for professional practice professors may entail a three-to-eight-year contract. Tenure is not granted to professional practice 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.

Appointments at the rank of Professional Practice Associate Professor or Professional Practice Professor require evaluation by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and a discussion and vote by the eligible faculty. The Department Chair and/or the Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair may request external evaluation letters.

4.A.3. Criteria for Research Faculty.

Research faculty in the College of Engineering will be referred to as "Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research Professor." Distinctions among ranks are based on the level of distinction attained by the candidate as described below. Reappointment is based on the candidate's performance and on the continued needs of the department.

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.

Appointments at the rank of Research Associate Professor or Research Professor require evaluation by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and a discussion and vote by the eligible faculty. The Department Chair and/or the Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair may request external evaluation letters.

Research Assistant Professor. Appointment at the rank of research assistant professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and 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. Appointment at the rank of research associate professor or research professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria for promotion to these ranks (outlined in Section 6).

Research faculty may participate in matters of governance and committee service in the Department and at the College level, except that they cannot participate as voting members of the department promotion and tenure committee when voting on tenure-track faculty or faculty of practice.

4.A.4. Associated Faculty.

Associated faculty include: lecturers, senior lecturers, faculty with tenure-track titles having appointments less than 50%, and adjunct and visiting faculty. Associated appointments are made for up to three years at a time, and can be renewed. Associated faculty are not eligible for tenure in the Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering.

An associated faculty member should hold a Ph.D. or, alternatively, have had significant, industrial and or practical experience comparable to a terminal degree. Visiting faculty may not be appointed for more than three consecutive years at 100% FTE.

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct titles are used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty of equivalent rank. The adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give academic service to the department, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

Lecturer. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is required. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure, but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for lecturers cannot exceed three years.

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

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

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 (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. They may not be reappointed for more than three consecutive years.

4.A.5. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty.

A no-salary appointment for tenure-track faculty, professional practice, or research faculty from another TIU is a courtesy appointment. Appropriate active involvement in the department by such faculty 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 for a term not exceeding five years.

4.A.6. Joint Appointments

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

4.A.7. 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, professional practice, 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 outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section 3.A.1-4) will review the application and make a recommendation to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will decide

upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the Dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule 3335-5-04, emeritus status will not be considered.

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

4.B. Procedures (Recruitment).

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, professional practice, research, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the SHIFT Framework for faculty recruitment. All faculty positions must be posted in Workday, the university's system of record for faculty and staff. A formal review and selection process, including interviews using pre-designed evaluation rubrics, is required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in Workday to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

See the Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments for information on the following topics:

Recruitment of Tenure-track Faculty, Professional Practice Faculty, Research Faculty, and Associated Faculty
Appointments at Senior Rank or with Prior Service Credit
Hiring Faculty From Other Institutions After April 30
Appointment of Foreign Nationals
Letters of Offer

The dean of the college provides approval for the department to commence a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to track, salary, rank, and field of expertise, and may or may not include guidance on faculty with the potential for appointments to more than one TIU.

4.B.1. Tenure-track Faculty.

A national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. This includes all external candidates for all faculty positions. The only exception is for dual career partners, as described in Chapter 5, section 4.1 of the *Policies and Procedures Handbook*. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the Dean of 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.

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.

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

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

- "Phase 1 | Search Preparation & Proactive Recruitment" is the earliest stage in the search process. Key steps during this phase include determining faculty needs for the unit, creating a search strategy (including timeline), establishing a budget, and identifying additional partners to include in the process. The steps in this phase provide guidance on forming committees, detail training requirements for search committee members, and innovative approaches to advertising and outreach. This section also includes ideas and resources for developing qualified talent pools to ensure alignment with the university's commitment to EEO principles and advance the eminence of the institution.
- "Phase 2 | Preliminary Review of Applicants" focuses on best practices for the application review and candidate screening processes. The guidelines and resources in this section support consistency and fairness in the review, assessment, and selection of candidates moving forward in the recruitment process. This section also outlines how to select a list of candidates for on-campus interviews.
- "Phase 3 | Finalists Interviews & Evaluations" provides guidance and tools for conducting interviews and campus visits, requesting reference letters (if not requested earlier in the application stage), and collecting feedback from everyone who interacted with the candidates. Adherence to the guidelines outlined in this section has a direct impact on enhancing the candidate experience and ensuring a consistent evaluation process. This phase concludes with the submission of a letter from the search committee to the TIU chair/director.
- "Phase 4 | Extend Offer" provides guidance and resources related to effectively selecting the most qualified candidate(s) for the position(s) and successfully negotiating to result in an accepted offer.
- "Phase 5 | Preboard and Onboard" offers resources to help prepare and support new faculty as they transition to Ohio State. The suggestions in this phase focus on creating a seamless transition for incoming faculty and their partners/families, if applicable.

- "Phase 6 | Reflect and Assess the Search" is a process supported by OAA to reflect on the hiring cycle each year and evaluate areas that may need improvement and additional support.

Following completion of on-campus interviews, the eligible voting faculty meet to discuss perceptions and preferences, and to vote on each candidate.

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible voting faculty vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer involves prior service credit, the eligible faculty vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor, with or without tenure, or professor with 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. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the Department Chair.

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

4.B.2. Professional Practice Faculty.

Searches for professional practice faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the on-campus interview is on teaching rather than research. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the SHIFT Framework.

Appointments at the rank of Professional Practice Associate Professor or Professional Practice Professor require evaluation by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, as well as a discussion and vote by the eligible faculty. This process must include external evaluation letters that focus on the candidate's credentials in teaching and/or professional practice, as opposed to the external letters for traditional tenure-track faculty which emphasize teaching and research credentials.

4.B.3. Research Faculty.

Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the SHIFT Framework.

4.B.4. Transfer from the Tenure-track, Professional Practice Faculty and Research Faculty.

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a professional practice or 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 a professional practice faculty appointment and from a research faculty appointment to the tenure-track faculty appointment are not permitted. Professional practice faculty members and research faculty members may apply for tenure-track positions and compete in regular national searches for such positions.

4.B.5. TIU Transfer

Following consultation with the department chair and college dean(s), a tenure-track faculty member may voluntarily move from one TIU to another upon approval of a simple majority of the eligible faculty in the receiving TIU. The eligible faculty in such cases are the tenure-track faculty eligible to vote on faculty appointments at the transferee's rank. See Section III.A.1 above.

The transfer must be approved by the Office of Academic Affairs and is dependent on the establishment of mutually agreed-upon arrangements among the affected TIU heads, college dean(s), and the faculty member. An MOU signed by all parties, including the Office of Academic Affairs, must describe in detail the arrangements of the transfer. Approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements for the change have been made. Since normally the transferring faculty member will fill an existing vacancy in the receiving unit, the MOU will describe the resources supporting the position, including salary, provided by the receiving unit.

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

4.B.6 Appointments for Associated Faculty.

The appointment of all compensated associated faculty follows a formal search following the SHIFT Framework, which includes a job posting in Workday (see Section 4.B.1 above) and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the department chair based on a vote of the eligible faculty.

The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair in consultation with the faculty. Compensated associated faculty hiring must follow the appropriate SHIFT Framework, including an open search.

The Department Chair determines the details of the offer.

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department and are decided by the department chair in consultation with the Associate Chair.

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

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

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

4.B.7. Joint Appointments

A TIU may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another OSU TIU as described in Section 4.A.6. The potential for a joint appointment is typically evaluated during the recruitment process and, as such, is subject to all criteria outlined above for each faculty category.

Approval of the joint appointment by the Office of Academic Affairs is dependent on establishing a mutually agreed-upon arrangement between the TIU heads, college dean(s), and the faculty member. An MOU signed by all parties, including the Office of Academic Affairs, must describe in detail the arrangements of the joint appointment. Administrative approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements have been made.

4.B.8 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty.

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

5. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW.

The Department follows the requirements for annual performance and merit 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 for all probationary faculty, an opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all other compensated faculty members, as well as a written assessment. As part of this written assessment a rating will be provided in the following categories: "exceeds expectations", "meets expectations", and "does not meet expectations". The expected standard for faculty performance is "meets expectations" in the relevant areas of teaching, scholarship, and service that is determined as part of the faculty member's duties.

According to the policy, the purposes of the review are to:

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

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

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

Depending on a faculty member's appointment type, the annual performance and merit review is based on expected performance in teaching, research, and/or service as set forth in the Department's guidelines on Faculty Duties, Responsibilities, and Workload; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. For jointly appointed faculty, including Discovery Theme appointments, additional assignments and goals related to the joint appointment will also be part of the evaluation. Specific documentation requirements in the areas of teaching, research, creative work, scholarship and service will be determined by the primary appointment TIU, with the understanding that joint appointments may require some agreed flexibility with the consensus of the TIU Chair or Director. The review of faculty with budgeted joint appointments must include input from the joint appointment TIU head for every annual evaluation cycle. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on goals specific to the individual in the joint unit.

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.

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

5.A. Documentation.

A template, given to faculty members each year to assist in the collection and presentation of data for this review is included in Appendix I. For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to the Department Chair no later than January 31st.

- An activity report prepared using the template
- The OAA dossier outline (required for probationary faculty)

- An updated CV
- Student Evaluation of Instruction reports
- Future plans

Other documentation for the annual performance and merit review will be the same as that for consideration for promotion and/or tenure. That documentation is described in Section 6 of this document.

The annual performance review will follow the College policy, but changes in that policy will be communicated to the faculty at least 2 months before the due date of the activity report.

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.

5.B. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty.

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the Chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals; and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the Chair's discretion, comments from other faculty with regard to the probationary faculty performance may be solicited. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, the face-to-face meeting is to include the TIU Chairs or Directors and/or designees for all the TIUs to which the faculty member is appointed, while the written evaluation is to be prepared by the primary TIU Chair or Director or designee and may be signed by all of the TIU Chairs or Directors or designees present at the meeting.

If the Department Chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this 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. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, this letter should include input from all of the appointed TIUs. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, this evaluation is to be signed by all Directors and Chairs of TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed if within the College. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The Department Chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the Dean of the College. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments).

If 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 Dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

Fourth Year Review.
During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exceptions that external evaluations are

optional, and the Dean (not the Department Chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

External evaluations are only solicited when either the Department Chair or the eligible faculty determine that they are necessary to conduct the Fourth-Year Review. This may occur when the candidate's scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, the Department Chair or School Director of the secondary appointment TIU should be consulted as an additional source of evaluation in determining whether outside letters should be solicited.

The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate and a vote is taken by the eligible faculty on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

The eligible faculty 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.

If either the department chair or the dean recommends nonrenewal of a faculty member's probationary contract, the case will be referred to the college's Promotion and Tenure Committee, which will review the case, vote and make a recommendation to the dean. The dean makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

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

5.C. Tenured Faculty.

Associate Professors are reviewed annually by the Department Chair or designee, who conducts an independent assessment; may meet with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, these reviews should include assessments from all TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed within the College. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

Professors are reviewed annually by the Department Chair or designee, who may meet with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals. 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 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. The Department Chair or designee prepares a written evaluation of performance against these expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

5.D. Professional Practice Faculty.

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

In the penultimate contract year of a professional practice faculty member's appointment, the Department Chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 must be observed.

Probationary professional practice faculty must undergo a review no later than the beginning of the penultimate year of their contract, so the department may determine whether it is appropriate to renew that individual's appointment for a new term. The review will follow the same procedures as the fourth-year review process for probationary tenure-track faculty described above and concurrently with the probationary tenure-track faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. The college dean has the final approval on the reappointment. Positive decisions will be approved by OAA without a review, and this decision is communicated to OAA using only the Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank/Tenure/Reappointment Form with no attachments. The Board of Trustees (BOT) has final approval, after which the faculty member is no longer probationary.

If the individual will not be renewed, the faculty member should be so informed, subject to the relevant standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08. There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

Non-probationary professional practice faculty must be informed as to whether the new appointment will be extended by the end of the penultimate year of their appointment period. The normal annual performance and merit review will serve as the basis for evaluation. An initial decision from the department chair to reappoint is final. A copy of the annual review, a draft renewal letter, the Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank/Tenure/Reappointment Form with no attachments, and a recommendation letter from the department chair will be sent to the college for review. An initial decision not to reappoint requires a review by a departmental standing committee and requires the concurrence of the dean. All reappointment decisions are at the discretion of the dean. There is no presumption of contract renewal.

5.E. Research Faculty.

The annual review process for probationary and non-probationary research faculty is identical to that for probationary and tenured/ tenure-track faculty, except that non-probationary research faculty 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. If it will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 must be observed.

Probationary research faculty must undergo a review no later than the beginning of the penultimate year of their contract, so the unit may determine whether it is appropriate to renew that individual's appointment for a new term. The review will follow the same procedures as the fourth-year review process for probationary tenure-track faculty as described above and concurrently with the probationary tenure-track faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. The college dean has the final approval on the reappointment. Positive decisions will be approved by OAA without a review, and this decision is communicated to OAA using only the Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank/Tenure/Reappointment Form with no attachments. The Board of Trustees (BOT) has final approval, after which the faculty member is no longer probationary.

If the individual will not be renewed the faculty member should be so informed, subject to the relevant standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08. There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

Non-probationary research faculty must be informed as to whether the new appointment will be extended by the end of the penultimate year of the contract. The normal annual performance and merit review will serve as the basis for evaluation. An initial decision from the department chair to reappoint is final. A copy of the annual review, a draft renewal letter, the Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank/Tenure/Reappointment Form with no attachments, and a recommendation letter from the department chair will be sent to the college for review. An initial decision not to reappoint requires a vote of a departmental standing committee and requires the concurrence of the dean. All reappointment decisions are at the discretion of the dean. There is no presumption of contract renewal.

5.F. Associated Faculty.

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

The chair takes recommendations for non-renewal before the faculty vote at a faculty meeting. Reappointment letters for associated faculty on annual appointments should summarize the faculty member's previous year of service.

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.

The Department Chair does not review associated tenure-track faculty with a joint appointment in another department. The procedure for tenure-track faculty with joint appointment in another department is outlined in the offer letter and is not included in the above description.

5.G. Salary Recommendations.

The Department Chair recommends annual salary increases to the Dean, who may modify these recommendations. 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 reviews the Annual Reports provided by the faculty and uses them as a basis for his/her recommendations. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the Department Chair divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) and considers market and internal equity issues. The Department Chair should proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in it. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

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

Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation (see Section 5-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.

6. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS.

6.A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion.

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 provides the following context for promotion & 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.*

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

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

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

6.A.1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.
Faculty Rule 3335-6-02(C) provides the following general criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure:

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

Tenure is not awarded below the rank of Associate Professor at The Ohio State University. 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.

Criteria and evidence identified as supporting promotion to associate professor with tenure.

TEACHING	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates must	Candidates may be asked to submit
• Provide up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and demonstrate continuing growth in subject matter knowledge. • Demonstrate the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm. • Demonstrate creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment. • Engage students actively in the learning process and encourage independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process. • Provide appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process. • Treat students with respect and courtesy. • Improve curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs. • Serve 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. • Engage in documentable efforts to improve teaching.	• Development of syllabi, examinations, problem sets • Student evaluations of teaching • Peer evaluations of teaching • Any documents that show efforts to improve teaching, such as those through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning
SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates must:	Candidates may be asked to submit

• Demonstrate that he/she has achieved excellence as a scholar • Demonstrate that they have attained national reputations as scholars based on high-quality original research as evidenced by publications, research grants and contracts, invitations to present seminars or invited lectures on their research, and research awards and other recognitions. • Have a body of work in peer reviewed journals, or other journals consistent with the standards of the unit, and/or conferences of high quality that clearly demonstrates creation of an independent research/scholarship/creative program over time.	• Complete publication record including archival journal papers, conference papers and posters (both refereed and otherwise), monographs, books, book chapters, textbooks based on scholarship, magazine articles and on-line publications, patents and invention disclosures. • A list of sustained grants and contracts from foundations, federal agencies, major industry, or private sector – may be as Primary Investigator or Co-Investigator with documented focused contribution on multiple grants or projects • Research awards (internal and external) • Keynote presentations at national and international conferences • Invited talks at symposia, conferences, other field specific venues that demonstrate the recognition of the thought leadership of the candidate.

SERVICE	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates must have:	Candidates may be asked to submit
• Demonstrated excellence in service to the department • Demonstrated excellence in service to the University • Demonstrated excellence in service to the profession or the local or national communities Examples include but not limited to o Active participation in or leadership of professional societies and/or conferences, o Serving as a Peer Reviewer of proposals for granting agencies, or of manuscripts, books, inventions o Consulting o Participation in short courses, workshops, panels, etc. that are oriented toward training, assessing or unifying research goals, or addressing technical issues of significance. o Offices in Professional Research Societies or Committees, Editorial Board Memberships, Organizing Committee Memberships for International Conferences, etc. o Promotion of technical awareness o Outreach activities for K-12	• Annual evaluations documenting excellent service to department, university, profession or communities

6.A.2. Promotion to Professor.

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02(C) 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 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 a record of continuing professional growth. Promotion standards in CBE 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 is to 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 a visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the TIU and The Ohio State University.

6.A.3. Promotion of Professional Practice Faculty.

Promotion to Professional Practice Assistant Professor. Promotion to professional practice assistant professor should be based on the candidate's

-Having completed his or her terminal degree

-Accomplishment in the area of teaching

- Contribution to the scholarly mission of the Department, College, and University,
- Promise of continued professional growth

Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Professional Practice Associate Professor. Promotion to Professional Practice Associate Professor should be based on the candidate's

- Accomplishment in the area of teaching
- Contribution to the scholarly mission of the Department, College, and University,
- Promise of continued professional growth

Subject to the different emphasis for professional practice faculty in teaching, scholarship and service described in this section, the criteria for promotion are similar to those for promotion to Associate Professor for tenure-track faculty. It is recognized that teaching activities of the professional practice faculty (in contrast to those of tenure-track faculty) may show greater emphasis in areas such as laboratory development (e.g. lab manual authorship), design project supervision, supervising student teams in project competitions, advising student organizations, or interactions with industry.

Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Professional Practice Professor. Promotion to Professional Practice Professor should be based on the candidate's

- Sustained accomplishment in the area of teaching

- Continued contributions to the scholarly mission of the Department, College, and University

Subject to the different emphases for faculty of practice in teaching, scholarship and service described in this section, the criteria for promotion are similar to those for promotion to Professor for tenure-track faculty. It is recognized that teaching activities of faculty of practice (in contrast to those of tenure-track faculty) may show greater emphasis in areas such as laboratory development (e.g. lab manual authorship), design project supervision, supervising student teams in project competitions, advising student organizations, or interactions with industry. Such contributions when present should be sustained and outstanding for successful promotion to Professional Practice Professor.

Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

6.A.4. Promotion of Research Faculty.

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 will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Research Professor. A faculty member must have a national or 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.

Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

6.A.5. Promotion of 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, professional practice, 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 4.A.4.

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

6.B. PROCEDURES.

The Department's procedures for promotion & 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 Chapter 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook.

6.B.1. Tenure-Track, Professional Practice, and Research Faculty

6.B.1.1. Candidate Responsibilities.

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

6.B.1.1.1. Dossier.

Every candidate must submit a complete, accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline, including but not limited to those highlighted on the Checklist.

While the Promotion and Tenure Committee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by the candidate.

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, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is less, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

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 or reappointment 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.

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, reappointment, 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 or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

Teaching and other department-suggested teaching documentation.

- Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class.
- a year-by-year summary of the SEI reports (both quantitative and narrative components) prepared by a faculty member other than the candidate.
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the Department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in the Appendix II in 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.
- Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.

Research.

- Copies of representative scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a notification from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed. Collaborative work is encouraged, and the candidate's intellectual contributions to the collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described to allow an accurate assessment. It is also recognized that synergism can result from collaborations; therefore, an assessment of contribution based solely on a linear fractionation of contribution among collaborators can be misleading and inappropriate, and a more holistic assessment of the candidate's contribution must be made.
    - Documentation of grants and contracts received. It is recognized that funding is a means to an end, and the ultimate objective of funding is scholarship. Consequently, less evaluation is placed on the source or amount of funding, and more on the impact of that funding on scholarship.
    - Involvement in the start-up of new commercial enterprises is a further example of scholarship.
    - Documentation of national/international reputation. Examples of metrics include: invitations to make technical presentations, review panels, citations of candidates' published work, etc.
    - Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate, e.g. published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, or grants and contract proposals that have been submitted.
    - Appendix I, which summarizes topics for a faculty member's annual report on scholarship is an example of topics considered as scholarship.

Service

- Any available documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier.

The complete dossier, including the SEI and peer evaluation documentation of teaching noted below, is forwarded when the review moves beyond the Department. Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

6.B.1.1.2. Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document.
Candidates must indicate the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. A candidate may be reviewed using the department's current APT document, or they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion (or last reappointment in the case of professional practice and research faculty), whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, for tenure-track faculty the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year.

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

6.B.1.1.3. External Evaluations
If external evaluations are required: to review, upon request to the Department Chair, the list of potential external evaluators developed by the Department Chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names. The Department Chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS below.).

6.B.1.2. Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities.
The Department's Committee of Eligible Faculty serves as its Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Chair or Co-chairs are appointed by the Department Chair. The Chair or Co-chairs of the Committee provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below. The responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are as follows:

- To review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in Spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only Professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of Professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
    - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (e.g., 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 only once. Faculty Rules 3335-7-08 and 3335-7-36 make the same provision for non-probationary professional practice and research faculty, respectively. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
- A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.

- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
  - **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.
  - **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the Department Chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section 6.B.3 below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.
  - **Late Spring:** Receive names of external evaluators from the candidate.
  - **Late Spring:** In consultation with the Department chair, finalize the list of external evaluators and request letters.
  - **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
  - Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. (This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.)
  - Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, research and service to provide to the Committee of the Eligible Faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.
  - Consider the interdisciplinary work of a candidate across multiple units as part of the whole work, especially if the candidate has a joint appointment in another unit or is a member of a Discovery Theme.
  - Revise the draft analysis of each case following the 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 to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
  - Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure initiating unit is another Department. The full Committee of the Eligible Faculty does not vote on these cases since the Department's

recommendation must be provided to the other TIU substantially earlier than the Committee begins meeting on this Department's cases.

- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- To attend all committee meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.

6.B.1.3. Department Chair Responsibilities.

The responsibilities of the Department Chair are as follows:

- To charge each member of the eligible faculty to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- 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. For tenure-track assistant professors, TIU heads are to confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an MOU at the time of promotion with tenure.
- **Late Spring Semester**: To finalize the list of external evaluators from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the candidate and the chair. (Also see EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS below.) For faculty on joint appointment, to solicit names from the other TIU or centers involved in the candidate's appointment.
- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this department. The department chair will seek a letter of evaluation from the TIU head of the joint appointment unit. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.
- To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To remove any member of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- **Mid Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the Committee of the Eligible Faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the Committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the Department review process:
  - of the recommendations by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty and Department Chair.
  - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty 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.
- To receive the Promotion and Tenure Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the Department Chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the Department Chair of the other TIU by the date requested.

6.B.2. Procedures for Associated Faculty

Adjunct faculty and associated faculty with tenure-track titles for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed in Section 6.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).

6.B.3 External Evaluations.

This department will seek external evaluations predominately from evaluators in the following programs:

Peer Programs: University of Michigan, Pennsylvania State University, Rice University, University of Colorado, North Carolina State University, University of Illinois, Texas A&M University, University of Washington, Cornell University, University of Pennsylvania.

Aspirational Peer Programs: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of California, Berkeley, University of California, Santa Barbara, University of Delaware, University of Wisconsin, University of Minnesota, Northwestern University, California Institute of Technology, Stanford University, University of Texas at Austin.

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 & tenure or promotion reviews, all research contract renewal and promotion reviews. In cases of jointly appointed faculty, additional evaluators may be suggested by the Department Chair of the secondary appointment TIU as appropriate. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for professional practice or associated faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations for a professional practice or associated faculty member will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Evaluations that assess the quality and impact of the teaching and service of professional practice faculty candidates under consideration for promotion are to be obtained. It is recognized that external letters for professional practice faculty are not the based on the same criteria as for typical tenure-track positions, or research faculty positions. In this case, the goal is to solicit letters that demonstrate that the candidate is of sufficient expertise/knowledge to be qualified for their position. Evaluations should address the extent and quality of teaching as characterized by internal and external evaluations of instruction and the quality of contributions through outreach and engagement with industry, the educational community, and the broad community of practitioners as appropriate for the individual under review. Evaluations should also address the extent and quality of professional service to the department, College, and University. Such letters provide outside verification of the Department's decision for promotion.

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

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

- is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarly accomplishments (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will solicit evaluations only from professors with institutional affiliations predominately in the programs listed above. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.
- provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

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

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department Chair, and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, letters are requested from those persons. Section B(3) of 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 and research faculty can be found here. A sample letter for professional practice 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, e.g., requesting permission from the Office of Academic Affairs to exclude that letter from the dossier. It is in the candidate's self-interest to assure that there is no ethical or procedural lapse, or the appearance of such a lapse, in the course of the review process.

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

7. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS.

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

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

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (A) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05 . Disagreement with a negative decision is not grounds for appeal. In pursuing an appeal, the faculty member is required to document the failure of one or more parties to the review process to follow written policies and procedures.

8. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS.

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

9. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING.

9.A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI), including collection of open-ended narrative comments, is required in every course offered in this department, with the exception of courses with no lecture section. Courses with no lecture section may use the SEI or an alternative, self-administered evaluation of instruction appropriate to the course activities and learning objectives.

9.B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

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

The curriculum committee will serve as the Peer Review of Teaching Subcommittee with one member of the curriculum committee taking the lead on identifying suitable peer reviewers and ensuring that the summary of the review is reported to the Department Chair and faculty member. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute peer review service among the tenured faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the department. 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 Peer Review of Teaching Subcommittee are as follows:

- to review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and professional practice faculty at least once during the first two years of service, and at least once per year during the remainder of the probationary period, 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 non-probationary professional practice associate professors at least once every two years, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a three-year period, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a six year period and of having at least four peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion review.

- 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 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 evaluations (the first two situations listed above) are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instruction materials. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, the class visitation is conducted by one or more senior peers whom the promotion and tenure chair has identified in consultation with the candidate. The peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to establish a time for the visit and to understand the goals of the course and the candidate's teaching philosophy. If possible, the peer reviewer should attend two different class sessions over the course of the semester.

In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should focus on such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the class visits, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give feedback and also submits a written report to the Department Chair, copied to the candidate. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if he/she wishes. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

Appendix II contains example forms used for peer review.

APPENDIX I

Annual activity report for (name):

Period: January 1, 20xx- December 31, 20xx

Probationary faculty and associate professors must submit the annual activity report following OAA dossier format (instead of Appendix I)

Professional recognition

Honors and Awards during the report period

Research

1. Books and Book Chapters
2. Refereed Papers
3. Patents
4. Grant Support

4a. Grants active during the reporting period
(Title, Sponsor, Budget, Name(s) of PI and co-PIs , Start Date, End Date, Budget)

4b. Proposals submitted during the reporting period (indicate status as "funded", "not funded" or "pending"
(Title, Sponsor, Budget, Name(s) of PI and co-PIs , Start Date, End Date, Budget)

5. Proceeding Publications
6. Technical Reports
7. Invited Lectures, Seminars and Short Courses

7a.Invited Lectures at Universities and Corporate Research Center

7b. Invited or Keynote Lectures at Conferences

8. Additional Paper Presentations
9. Any collaborative activities

Advising

1. PhD students advised during the report period (indicate graduation date or expected graduation date)
2. MS students advised during the grant period(indicate graduation date or expected graduation date)
3. Post-doctoral researchers advised during the grant period
4. Undergraduate researchers advised during the report period
5. Undergraduate Honors students who completed their Honors theses during the report period

Teaching

1. Courses Taught (Semester, Number of Students)
   Please attach the SEI reports
2. New course development

Activities that demonstrate your commitment to fostering university's shared values. (Guidelines for Documenting University Shared Values in Faculty Annual Reviews can be found in the attached document)

Service

University Service (Department, College, University

Service External to University

Other

Other Important Accomplishments Made in Either the University or the Professional Arena That Were Not Covered Above

Goals

Please provide a list of your professional goals for the next year

CV

Please provide a current CV as a separate document. Please include all the SEI reports for the year 20XX.

APPENDIX II

Table 1
Class Observation Checklist

Course: __Instructor: Date:

Circle your responses to each of the 10 questions and then add comments below the table.

The instructor	**Extremely**	**Very well**	**Adequately**	**Inadequately**	**Not at all**
1 – was well prepared for class	5	4	3	2	1
2 – was knowledgeable about the subject matter	5	4	3	2	1
3 – was enthusiastic about the subject matter	5	4	3	2	1
4 – spoke clearly, audibly, and confidently	5	4	3	2	1
5 – used a variety of relevant illustrations/examples	5	4	3	2	1
6 – made effective use of the board and/or visual aids	5	4	3	2	1
7 – asked stimulating and challenging questions	5	4	3	2	1
8 – effectively held students' attention	5	4	3	2	1
9 – encouraged and achieved active student involvement	5	4	3	2	1
10 – treated students impartially and with respect	5	4	3	2	1

Overall rating (add circled responses and divide by 10): _

<u>What worked well in the class?</u> (Continue on back if necessary)

<u>What could have been improved?</u> (Continue on back if necessary)

Evaluator(s) _____

Table 2
Course Material Checklist

Course: **Instructor:** **Date:**

Circle your responses to each of the 10 questions and then add comments below the table.

	Extremely	Very well	Adequately	Inadequately	Not at all
1. Course content includes the appropriate topics	5	4	3	2	1
2. Course content reflects the current state of the field	5	4	3	2	1
3. Course learning objectives are clear and appropriate	5	4	3	2	1
4. Course policies and rules are clear and appropriate	5	4	3	2	1
5. Lecture notes are well organized and clearly written	5	4	3	2	1
6. Supplementary handouts and web pages are well organized and clearly written	5	4	3	2	1
7. Assignments are consistent with objectives and appropriately challenging	5	4	3	2	1
8. Tests are consistent with learning objectives and appropriately challenging	5	4	3	2	1
9. Tests are clearly written and reasonable in length	5	4	3	2	1
10. Student products demonstrate satisfaction of learning objectives	5	4	3	2	1

Overall rating (add circled responses and divide by 10):

What are the strengths of the course materials? (Continue on back if necessary)

What could have been improved? (Continue on back if necessary)

Evaluator(s)