

***Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure***  
***Criteria and Procedures***  
***for***  
***The Ohio State University***  
***Department of Chemistry***  
***and Biochemistry***

Last approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee: May 25, 2025

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: August 6, 2025

# APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS AND TENURE

## Criteria and Procedures of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry

### Table of Contents

<b>I. PREAMBLE.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>II. MISSION STATEMENT .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>III. DEFINITIONS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>A. Committee of Eligible Faculty .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1. Tenure-track Faculty.....	5
2. Teaching Faculty .....	5
3. Associated Faculty.....	6
4. Conflict of Interest.....	7
5. Minimum Composition.....	7
<b>B. Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>C. Quorum.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>D. Recommendation from the Committee of Eligible Faculty .....</b>	<b>8</b>
1. Appointment .....	8
2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure.....	8
<b>IV. APPOINTMENTS .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>A. Criteria .....</b>	<b>9</b>
1. Tenure-track Faculty.....	9
2. Teaching Faculty .....	10
3. Associated Faculty.....	11
4. Regional Campus Faculty.....	13
5. Emeritus Faculty.....	13
6. Joint Appointments .....	13
7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty .....	13
<b>B. Procedures.....</b>	<b>13</b>
1. Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....	14
2. Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....	16
3. Transfer from the Tenure Track .....	16
4. TIU Transfer .....	17
5. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....	17
6. Regional Campus Faculty.....	18
7. Joint Appointments .....	18
8. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty.....	19
<b>V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>A. Documentation .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>B. Probationary tenure-track faculty on the Columbus Campus.....</b>	<b>21</b>
1. Fourth Year Review.....	22
2. Extension of the Tenure Clock.....	23
<b>C. Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>D. Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>E. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>F. Regional Campus Faculty .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>G. Salary Recommendations.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>VI. PROMOTION &amp; TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS.....</b>	<b>26</b>

<b>A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion .....</b>	<b>26</b>
1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure .....	27
2. Promotion to Professor .....	31
3. Teaching Faculty .....	32
4. Associated Faculty.....	33
5. Regional Campus Faculty.....	33
<b>B. Procedures.....</b>	<b>33</b>
1. Tenure-Track and Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....	34
a. Candidate Responsibilities.....	34
b. Promotion and Tenure SubCommittee Responsibilities .....	37
c. Committee of Eligible Faculty Responsibilities .....	39
d. Department Chair Responsibilities .....	39
2. Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	40
3. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty .....	40
4. External Evaluations.....	41
<b>VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS.....</b>	<b>443</b>
<b>VIII. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING.....</b>	<b>43</b>
A. Student Evaluation of Teaching .....	44
B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	44
<b>APPENDIX A: MENTORSHIP PLAN .....</b>	<b>48</b>

## I. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the [Rules of the University Faculty](#); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Chapter 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#); and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the department and its faculty are subject.

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

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

The chair of the department will generally consult with Cabinet and/or the Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) on matters pertaining to appointments, merit review and promotion. The composition of the Cabinet and FAC are described in the department's Pattern of Administration (POA) document.

## II. DEPARTMENT MISSION

The Mission of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry is to provide a nurturing environment for innovative teaching, world-class research and dedicated service with an agile, responsive faculty and staff.

To this end, the Vision of the Chemistry and Biochemistry Department will:

Be the pre-eminent location for providing the best undergraduate opportunities to learn the language and concepts of Chemistry and Biochemistry and to participate in the research of the Department.

Be a top-tier location for graduate and postdoctoral research by providing challenging, novel and relevant cutting-edge research opportunities through faculty, staff and students dedicated to exploration, support and excellence and to opening new frontiers to benefit the citizens of Ohio, the nation and the world. Provide leadership to chart the direction of The Ohio State University as a premier center of teaching, research and service to the state of Ohio and the world.

### **III. DEFINITIONS**

#### **A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty**

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

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

##### ***1. Tenure-track Faculty***

#### **Appointment Reviews**

- **Initial Appointment Reviews:** For an appointment (hiring) review of an assistant professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the Department.
- **Rank Review:** A second 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.

##### ***2. Teaching Faculty***

#### **Appointment Reviews**

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

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

### **Reappointment and Promotion Reviews**

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

### **3. *Associated Faculty***

#### **Initial Appointment and Reappointment**

- For the initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all teaching faculty in the department.
- Initial appointments at senior rank (e.g. Sr. Lecturer) require a vote by the eligible faculty (all tenured faculty and all non-probationary teaching faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college dean.
- The reappointment of associated faculty members is decided by the department chair in consultation with the VCU and VCG.

#### **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 and teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Sections III.A.1 or 2 above.
- For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with tenure-track titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section III.A.1 above.
- For the promotion review of a lecturer to senior lecturer, the eligible faculty shall be all tenure-track and nonprobationary teaching faculty at the rank of associate professor and professor.

#### **4. *Conflict of Interest***

##### **Search committee conflict of interest**

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

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

##### **Eligible faculty conflict of interest**

A member of the eligible faculty has a conflict of interest when 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 50% 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.

#### **5. *Minimum Composition***

In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the department chair after consultation with the divisional dean, will appoint one or more faculty members from another department within the College of Arts and Sciences for the review so that the minimum number of three can be reached.

##### **B. Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee**

A subset of the Committee of Eligible Faculty comprises the Promotion and Tenure subcommittee. This subcommittee is responsible for organizing faculty promotion and tenure reviews and presenting each case to the entire Committee of Eligible Faculty.

This subcommittee will be composed of the following members. The Committee Chair: this is a tenured professor appointed by the department chair; a Procedures Oversight Designee (POD): this is a tenured professor whose responsibilities are described [here](#); and an ad hoc member from the eligible faculty (which may include both tenured associate professors and professors in reviews for promotion to associate professor with tenure) whose disciplinary specialty is close to that of the candidate. If the candidate is a member of the Teaching faculty, the eligible faculty also includes nonprobationary associate teaching professors and/or teaching professors as appropriate to the case.

The Promotion and Tenure subcommittee is further described in the Department's Pattern of Administration.

### **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. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining the quorum only if the department chair has approved the off-campus assignment.

Eligible faculty who are away from campus are "present" if they are linked via teleconferencing or video conferencing technology. However, they must participate in the entire discussion to be eligible to vote. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. Faculty who are recused from the review because of conflict of interest are not included in the "2/3" count for the quorum. The department chair is also not counted in computing quorum.

### **D. Recommendation from the Committee of Eligible Faculty**

In all votes taken on personnel matters, voting is by secret ballot, and votes must be cast prior to the meeting adjournment. Only "yes" and "no" votes are counted. Abstentions are not counted as votes. Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted, but participating fully in discussions and voting via remote two-way electronic connection are allowed.

#### ***1. Appointment***

A positive recommendation from the Committee of Eligible Faculty for appointment is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

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

#### ***2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure***

A positive recommendation from the Committee of Eligible Faculty for reappointment,



promotion and tenure, and promotion is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

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

#### **IV. APPOINTMENTS**

##### **A. Criteria**

The department is committed to making faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the department. Important considerations include the individual's record to date in teaching, research and service; the potential for professional growth in each of these areas; and the potential for interacting with colleagues and students in a way that will enhance their academic work and attract other outstanding faculty and students to the department. No offer will be extended in the event that the search process does not yield 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 same criteria will be applied to joint or partial appointments (less than 1.0 FTE) as for full appointments (1.0 FTE).

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

All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university's system of record for faculty and staff. 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.

##### **1. Tenure-track Faculty**

*Assistant Professor.* Minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of assistant professor include an earned Ph.D. or its equivalent in an appropriate field of study, and evidence of potential for excellence in teaching, service, and distinguished independent research. Also required is evidence of potential to develop into an internationally recognized scholar, to provide high-quality service to the department, the institution, and the profession, and to attain tenure and advance through the ranks in a timely fashion. Such evidence consists of publication in peer reviewed journals, securing external research grants, statement of teaching philosophy, experience as a teaching assistant or lecturer, and letters of recommendation from distinguished academicians familiar with the qualifications of the individual. 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 7<sup>th</sup> year will be the final year of employment. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee 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.

*Associate Professor and Professor.* Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor with or without tenure or Professor with tenure and offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs. Appointment at the rank of associate professor or professor requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to these ranks. Generally, individuals appointed at these levels will have an established record of international distinction in research; an important criterion is whether the appointment will immediately raise the national reputation of the department in the relevant area.

Specific criteria for appointment offers at the rank of associate professor with tenure include:

- National and international recognition for a high-quality body of scholarship
  - Demonstrated excellence in teaching undergraduate and graduate students
  - Demonstrated excellence in training and mentoring undergraduate and graduate students in research
  - Demonstrated excellence in service/outreach to their profession and field as well as locally to the university.
  - Strong potential to advance to the rank of professor in a timely fashion.
- Specific criteria for appointment offers at the rank of professor with tenure include:
    - An established national and international reputation as a leading scholar in their field with an outstanding body of scholarship
    - Demonstrated excellence in teaching at graduate and undergraduate levels
    - Demonstrated excellence in training and mentoring undergraduate and graduate students in research
    - Demonstrated record of leadership and high-quality service to their field and institution.

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

Appointments at the rank of professor without tenure are not possible. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

## **2. Teaching Faculty**

The department supports Teaching Faculty. These appointments exist for faculty members who focus primarily on supporting the educational mission of the department. Teaching Faculty members are expected to contribute to the department's mission as reflected in undergraduate teaching. Teaching Faculty appointments are made in accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-7](#). Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the

department.

Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all other teaching faculty members must be for a period of five years. The initial contract at all ranks is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for assistant and associate teaching professors must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years.

Second and subsequent contracts for teaching professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. These extended appointments are not probationary, and the individual may be terminated only for cause (see rule [3335-5-04](#) of the Administrative Code) or financial exigency (see rule [3335-5-02.1](#) of the Administrative Code).

Tenure is not granted to teaching faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. The terms of a contract may be re-negotiated at the time of reappointment.

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

**Assistant Teaching Professor.** An earned doctorate in the relevant field or equivalent experience are the minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of assistant teaching professor. Evidence of the ability to teach is highly desirable.

**Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor.** Appointment at the rank of associate teaching professor or teaching professor requires that the individual have an earned doctorate in the relevant field or a master's degree and equivalent experience, and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria—in teaching, professional practice and other service, and scholarship—for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at the rank of teaching professor requires production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice.

### ***3. Associated Faculty***

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a few weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. Associated faculty are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching. They are also expected to engage in externally recognized scholarly activity, and participate in department, college, and/or university level service activities commensurate with their faculty appointment. Associated faculty may be reappointed. Appointments of all associated faculty must be reviewed and approved by the College of Arts and Sciences.

*Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor.* Adjunct titles are

used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to tenure-track or teaching faculty of equivalent rank and who give academic service to the department, such as teaching a course. Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. The term of appointment is one year with renewal contingent on continued significant contributions. Adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure track or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure track or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

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

*Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%.* The rank of an associated faculty with a tenure-track title is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure track faculty. Associated faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure). 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 uncompensated. 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 (nontenure-track faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for no more than three consecutive years. Expectations for compensated visiting faculty members will be based on the terms of their appointment and are comparable to that of tenure-track faculty members except that service is not required.

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

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

Regional campus criteria for the appointment of teaching faculty and associated faculty are the

same as those for Columbus campus faculty in each of these categories.

### **5. *Emeritus Faculty***

Emeritus faculty status is an honor given in recognition of sustained academic contributions to the university as described in Faculty Rule [3335-5-36](#).

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the Department Chair (regional campus dean for associated faculty on regional campuses) outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-3) will review the application and make a recommendation to the Department Chair. The Chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the Divisional Dean. Should the Department Chair deny the request, the faculty member may appeal the decision to the dean

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

### **6. *Joint Appointments***

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

### **7. *Courtesy Appointments for Faculty***

Occasionally, the active academic involvement in this department by a tenure-track faculty member from another department at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in this department. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, 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. Courtesy faculty members are not eligible to vote on matters of governance, though their input may be sought. Continuation of the appointment should reflect ongoing contributions. Courtesy appointments do not require formal annual review.

## **B. Procedures**

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

recruitment. All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university's system of record for faculty and staff. 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.

In addition, see the [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#) and the [Policy on Faculty Appointments](#) for information on the following topics:

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

### ***1. Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus***

A national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure track positions. This includes all external candidates for all faculty positions. The only exception is for dual career partners, as described in Chapter 5, section 4.1 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the 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 Dean of the college, in consultation with the divisional dean, provides approval for the department to commence a search process following the Strategic Hiring Initiative for Faculty Talent ([SHIFT](#)). This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise.

The department chair appoints a faculty search committee (FSC) consisting of three or more faculty members 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 applicant pools, conduct consistent and equitable evaluations, and successfully hire and properly onboard new faculty members who will continue our tradition of academic excellence. This framework consists of six phases, each targeting a specific stage of the

recruitment process:

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

While adhering to the SHIFT guidelines, the FSC screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents to the full faculty a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. With the approval of the divisional dean, on-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the department office.

Candidates invited for on campus interviews present a research-based seminar during their visit, and junior candidates also give a presentation on their proposed research plans. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format. The initial interview is widely announced. The candidate’s curriculum vitae and other documents are shared with all department faculty members and any University faculty members involved in the interview process who have completed the required training. The FSC schedules interviews with department and university faculty who share common scholarly interests. The option to participate in the candidates’ interviews is offered to all department faculty and interviews are scheduled if a department faculty member indicates an interest in participation in the interview process and if time allows. Departmental graduate students are invited to attend the research-



based seminar of each candidate. The FSC will also invite 4-5 graduate students to meet with each candidate for lunch. Both the chair of the department and the division dean or the dean's designee will meet with each candidate during the campus interview. At the conclusion of each candidate's initial visit, all faculty members who have participated in the visit submit evaluative information to the FSC Chair. Responses are shared with members of the FSC committee.

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible voting faculty members vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer involves prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. In both instances, two-thirds of the eligible faculty must vote yes or no, and of those votes two-thirds must be positive for the senior rank or prior service credit to be approved. All offers at the Associate Professor and Professor ranks, and all offers of prior service credit require the prior approval of the college and of the appropriate individual in the Office of Academic Affairs. This approval will be sought by the Chair.

In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the department chair decides, in consultation with the divisional dean, which candidate to approach first. At that time, the department chair will discuss the details of the offer, including compensation with the divisional dean and receive approval before extending an offer.

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

All probationary tenure-track faculty will be assigned a mentoring team. The department's mentoring plan is described in greater detail in Appendix A.

## ***2. Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus***

Searches for teaching faculty generally proceed in a manner similar to that for tenure-track faculty, following the SHIFT guidelines, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the interview will address issues in teaching or professional teaching practice rather than scholarship. The candidates will not be required to present a future research talk.

## ***3. Transfer from the Tenure Track***

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a teaching appointment if appropriate to the individual's circumstances and departmental and college needs, and if funding for the salary has been identified. Tenure or tenure eligibility is lost upon transfer, though rank is retained. Such 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 teaching appointment to the tenure track are not permitted. Teaching faculty



members may apply for tenure-track positions and compete in regular national searches for such positions.

#### ***4. TIU Transfer***

Faculty requests to move from one TIU to another must be approved by a simple majority of eligible faculty in the receiving TIU, by both TIU heads, the college dean(s), and the Office of Academic Affairs. The eligible faculty in such cases are the tenure-track faculty eligible to vote on faculty appointments at the transferee's rank. See Section III.A.1 above.

Approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements for the change have been made and requires the establishment of mutually agreed-upon arrangements among the affected TIU heads, 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. 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 College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs can provide guidance to non-tenure-track faculty about the process for transferring from one unit to another.

#### ***5. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus***

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

The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair in consultation with the VCU and VCG.

Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one to three years.

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

Adjunct status will automatically be recommended for one year by the chair to faculty who resign from the University but have graduate students finishing research projects in the Department.

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

Senior Lecturer appointments are typically multi-year, while lecturer appointments are usually made on an annual or term-by-term basis.

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

## **6. *Regional Campus Faculty***

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

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

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, the divisional dean in the College of Arts and Sciences or their designee, the department chair, and either the regional campus search committee or a broader representation of the regional and Columbus faculties. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document.

On completion of the interviews, the committee will provide a description of the preferred candidate(s) to the faculty of the department at the Columbus campus. An appointment vote on the candidates by the eligible department faculty will occur. The same quorum and appointment rules for Columbus-based tenure-track faculty will be applied to these decisions. The results of the vote and the candidate's curriculum vitae will be reported to the College of Arts and Sciences and also to the regional dean. A hiring decision requires agreement by the department chair and regional campus dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the department chair and the regional campus dean.

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

## **7. *Joint Appointments***

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

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

## **8. *Courtesy Appointments for Faculty***

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track or teaching 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. The candidate will typically present an open seminar to the department faculty. If the proposal is approved by the eligible faculty (at least two-thirds positive vote of faculty whose TIU is CBC), the department chair extends an offer of appointment. The chair and FAC review courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified, and the chair takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular faculty meeting. Courtesy faculty appointments may be renewed only when the academic service for which the appointment was made continues.

Sample uncompensated service/teaching justifying courtesy appointments:

- 5 formal hours of lecture/year
- Service on faculty search committees
- Service on other committees (e.g., strategic planning, safety)
- Contributing to collaborative (center) grant applications
- Developing summer workshops that benefit our research and teaching missions
- Representing the department on IGP committees, such as OSBP

## **V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW**

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the [Policy on Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment](#), which stipulates that such reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for probationary faculty, an opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all other compensated faculty members, as well as a written assessment. According to the policy, the purpose of such a review is to:

- Assist faculty in improving professional productivity through candid and constructive feedback and through the development of professional development plans that meet the joint needs of the department and the faculty member.
- Establish the goals and metrics against which faculty performance will be assessed in the foreseeable future.
- Document faculty performance in the achievement of previously stated goals and metrics 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.
- In addition, annual reviews and fourth-year reviews for probationary tenure-track faculty serve to monitor progress toward tenure and determine whether the probationary appointment will be continued for another year or terminated, subject to the relevant standards of notice.

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, unless the Office of Academic Affairs has granted an exception to a large unit, the 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 the chair's designee must be provided to all tenured and non-probationary faculty.

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

Depending on 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 in the Pattern of Administration; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. Responsibility for the annual review process rests with the department chair.

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.

Annual review letters should not merely be descriptive summaries of activities but should evaluate performance in relation to the unit's mission and the faculty member's assigned workload and previously articulated goals and expectations for the year. The annual review should also describe, when appropriate, actions the unit or its head will undertake to support the faculty member in achieving goals. When relevant, annual review letters should recognize engagement with partners beyond the university, which may take the form of research/creative work, teaching, or service. The department chair may also comment upon and/or recognize ways in which individual faculty members exemplify and reinforce the university's shared values, including creating unit cultures that are supportive and characterized by civility and mutual respect. The full range of activities assigned to a faculty member should be formally recognized and, when done well, rewarded. Annual review letters should describe each faculty member's workload allocation for the upcoming year in accordance with the university's [faculty workload guideline](#).

#### **A. Documentation**

For their annual performance and merit review, compensated faculty members must submit the following documents to the Department Chair no later than February 1:

- Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#) (required for probationary faculty and recommended for associate professors) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (non-probationary faculty)
- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (all faculty)
- Other documentation for the annual performance and merit review will be the same as that for consideration for promotion and/or tenure. That documentation is described in Section VI of this document.

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

## **B. Probationary tenure-track faculty on the Columbus campus**

At the time of appointment, probationary tenure-track faculty members shall be provided with all the pertinent documents detailing the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry promotion and tenure policies and criteria. If these documents are revised during the probationary period, probationary faculty are provided copies of the revised documents. Each probationary faculty member is reviewed by three separate groups each year (mentoring committee, committee of eligible faculty, and the FAC) and by the department chair.

The members of the FAC review the annual reports of every faculty member in the department (assistant professors, associate professors, and professors for both the Columbus campus and the regional campuses). This review is based on the faculty member's annual report as well as those for the last three years. This review is thorough and typically occurs within three – four meetings in February and March. The Chair and the VCR take notes during this review and also ask questions during the FAC's review. The Chair and VCR are responsible for writing the draft reviews.

The members of the Committee of Eligible Faculty meet during the spring semester (typically March) to review the progress of the probationary tenure-track faculty. For each probationary tenure-track faculty member, the chair of the mentoring committee of his/her designee leads the discussion with the mentoring committee's annual review. The chair of the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee takes notes during this meeting. During the meeting the Committee of Eligible Faculty also provides opinions to the P and T subcommittee on junior faculty who are ready for an early nonmandatory promotion review based on their performance. The chair of the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee forwards a written performance review to the department chair with recommendations of potential candidates for an early nonmandatory promotion review. The promotion and tenure subcommittee also works with the chairs of the mentoring committees to make certain that there is follow through on key decisions on mentoring.

The department chair conducts an independent assessment of performance; meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and, as appropriate, future plans and goals; and

prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

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. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review and the department chair may respond in writing if warranted. The department chair's letter (along with the faculty member's written 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 written comments, if provided).

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.

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

The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by electronic ballot 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, who 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.

Renewal of the appointment of a probationary faculty member for the fifth year requires the approval of the divisional dean. In cases where the divisional dean concurs with the department's recommendations to approve the renewal of the appointment, review by the College of Arts and Sciences Divisional Promotion and Tenure Review Panel is optional and at the divisional dean's discretion. The divisional review panel, however, must review negative departmental reappointment recommendations. If either the department chair or the divisional 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, in consultation with the divisional dean, makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

## ***2. Extension of the Tenure Clock***

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

## **C. Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

Associate Professors are reviewed annually by the members of the FAC and the Committee of Eligible Faculty as described above. The mentor meets annually with the associate professor before the meeting of the Committee of Eligible Faculty.

In consultation with the FAC, VCR, VCG and VCU, the chair conducts an independent assessment; meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may opt to provide written comments on the review and the department chair may respond in writing if warranted.

Professors are reviewed annually by the chair in consultation with the FAC, VCR, VCG and VCU (see [Department Policies](#) document, section XII). The chair provides each faculty member with a written evaluation and an opportunity to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals with the chair. The faculty member may opt to provide written comments on the review and the department chair may respond in writing if warranted.

The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the Department, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the Department, the College, the University, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, in civil and collegial interaction with colleagues, staff, and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest-ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty. The department chair prepares a written evaluation of performance against these expectations.

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



#### **D. Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

The annual performance and merit review process for teaching probationary and nonprobationary faculty is identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty respectively, except that non-probationary teaching faculty may participate in the review of teaching faculty of lower rank. Additionally, teaching faculty at all ranks are reviewed annually by the Associated and Teaching Faculty Mentoring Committee, a subset of whom will meet individually with each associated faculty and teaching faculty member to discuss progress toward reappointment and promotion.

In the penultimate contract year of a teaching faculty member's appointment, the department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed.

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review generally proceeds in the same manner as the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure track faculty. All reappointment decisions are at the discretion of the college dean. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

Curriculum development and improvements in classroom/laboratory teaching are counted as teaching accomplishments rather than research, unless those innovations lead to one or more of the outcomes on the above list.

Each year teaching faculty members will complete an annual report to document their contributions in teaching, research and service, using the same template as tenure-track faculty.

#### **E. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The department chair, or VCU, 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. A positive vote by two-thirds of the faculty is required for the appointment. If the decision is to renew, the department chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment are reviewed annually by the department chair, or VCU, who prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their performance, future plans, and goals. No later than October 15 of the final year of the appointment, the department chair head will decide whether or not to reappoint. A positive vote by two-thirds of the faculty is required for the reappointment. The department chair's decision on reappointment is final.



## **F. Regional Campus Faculty**

Regional campus tenure-track faculty are reviewed according to the process established on the campus, with the review focused on teaching and service. The review then moves to the Department and proceeds as described above. The regional faculty members are included in same annual evaluation as the Columbus faculty. Following the review by the regional campus and Columbus campus, the regional campus dean meets with the department chair for evaluation of the faculty member's research during the review period. The regional campus dean provides an annual performance and merit review letter. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice. For probationary tenure-track faculty, in the event that the regional campus dean recommends renewal and the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the case shall be reviewed by the college dean or their designee, with the college dean's or their designee's judgment prevailing. The department chair will provide the opportunity for a meeting with each regional faculty member annually to discuss performance specifically in scholarship.

Regional campus teaching faculty are reviewed according to the process established on that campus, with the review focusing on teaching and service. The regional campus dean will provide the department chair a copy of the teaching faculty member's annual performance and merit review letter.

Regional campus associated faculty are reviewed according to the process established on that campus, with the review focusing on teaching and service, as applicable.

## **G. Salary Recommendations**

It is the responsibility of the Chair to make annual salary recommendations to the Dean or designee, who may modify them. The recommendations are based on the three-year average performance of the faculty during the immediate three-year period.

Except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increases, all funds for annual salary increases are 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. To the extent possible given financial constraints, attention is also given to assuring that salaries are aligned with the market and are internally equitable.

Meritorious performance in research/creative work, teaching, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. Faculty with high quality performance in all three areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

The recommendation of the Chair will follow consultation with the VCA, VCG, VCU and the FAC, and if warranted, an external advisory committee. In addition, 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.

Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation (see Section V-A above) for an annual performance and merit review at the required time will receive no salary increase in the year for which documentation was not provided, except in extenuating circumstances, and may not expect to recoup the foregone raise at a later time.

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.

Recommendations to the dean on specific merit raises will be based on a weighting of teaching, service, and research as detailed below. At the discretion of the Chair, the weightings of these categories may vary between individuals, to reward extraordinary accomplishment in a particular area.

## **VI. PROMOTION & TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS**

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

*In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the university enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established academic patterns. In such cases care must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.*

### **A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion**

In the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, excellence in research will be given the highest priority in evaluating tenure-track faculty performance. Excellence in teaching and service are required for promotion.

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

A commitment to these values and principles is demonstrated, for example, by participation in

faculty governance and community outreach; activities related to the University's [Shared Values](#); adherence to principles of the responsible conduct of research; constructive conduct and ethical behavior during the discharge of responsibilities and authority; and the exercise of rights and privileges consistent with the [American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

This department is committed to assessing the practice of these values and principles as part of all performance evaluations.

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

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

*The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a scholar, and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the university. Examples of criteria and types of documentation that demonstrate impact and show that criteria have been met are provided below.*

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

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

Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Accepting weakness in any aspect of performance in making a tenure decision is tantamount to deliberately handicapping the department's ability to perform and to progress academically. Above all, candidates are held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. If a candidate's primary teaching role is and will continue to focus on 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.

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

Excellence in research/creative work means attainment of measurable national or international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of high-quality published research and/or other relevant creative endeavors. A successful candidate will have an emerging national reputation as a scholar or creative artist. Excellence in teaching means the provision to all

students of the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning and, to the most capable and motivated students, an enhanced learning experience. Excellence in service means the provision of a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more publics – including the university, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations. The service contribution during the probationary period of assistant professors is limited by design. The most important judgment is that the candidate will achieve excellence in service in the future.

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

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](#).

### Teaching

TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidates must demonstrate:	
Provision to all students of the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning and, to the most capable and motivated students, an enhanced learning experience.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer evaluations of instruction</li> <li>• Student evaluation of instruction (SEI) reports for every course</li> <li>• Completion of advanced degrees by graduate students</li> <li>• Mentoring undergraduate students in research with the potential completion and defense of undergraduate theses</li> <li>• Participation in evaluation of candidacy, PhD, and MS exams</li> <li>• Publication of student research in high quality, high impact peer reviewed journals*</li> <li>• Timely progress of graduate students to graduation and to appropriate employment and/or additional training of the student upon graduation.</li> <li>• Letters of evaluation from current and former graduate and undergraduate students and teaching assistants if solicited by the chair</li> <li>• Pedagogical publications (e.g., peer-reviewed papers, books)*</li> <li>• Teaching narratives in dossier including a statement of the instructor's approach to and</li> </ul>
High quality of teaching at all levels of instruction, including high-enrollment undergraduate courses and graduate courses	
Success in directing the research of graduate and undergraduate students	

	<p>goals for teaching, self-assessment, and description of specific strategies for improvement—past, current, and planned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of new learning resources and/or a new course or instructional laboratory experiment</li> <li>• Student awards and recognitions for their accomplishments in research</li> <li>• Recognition of teaching and mentoring through awards</li> </ul>
<p>* 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.</p>	

### Research and Scholarship

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidates must demonstrate:	
Development of a coherent program of independent research which serves to create new chemical and/or biochemical knowledge and that make significant contributions to published chemical knowledge that can be directly attributable to the faculty member.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publications in peer-reviewed journals and their impact (based on journal impact factor and citations)</li> <li>• Invitations to present one's work at national/international conferences and at major universities</li> <li>• Be the principal investigator for major funding from federal agencies to support research efforts</li> <li>• Engagement with business entrepreneurship, including (but not limited to) invention disclosures, patents, corporate licensing, startup companies, and other business activities</li> <li>• Copies of all scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed.</li> <li>• Documentation of grants submitted and contracts received, including outcome of review for unfunded applications.</li> <li>• Documentation of invention disclosures, submitted and awarded patents, options and commercial licenses.</li> <li>• External evaluations of scholarship</li> <li>• Other relevant documentation of research as</li> </ul>
High level of productivity in scholarship	
Excellence in independent work which serves as a vehicle for instruction of graduate students in their Thesis or Dissertation research. Excellence in clearly and significant independent contributions to collaborative work.*	
National and international visibility as a scholar	

	<p>appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognition of scholarly activity through awards</li> </ul>
<p>*Independent research is defined as that conducted primarily (but not necessarily exclusively) on the Columbus campus of The Ohio State University with undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral students. Faculty do not collaborate with students, rather they instruct and mentor them. Collaborative research is defined as research conducted with at least one other faculty member at The Ohio State University or at another institution, or with a senior scientist in an academic, government, or industrial laboratory. Collaborative research may or may not involve students. Research conducted solely with OSU undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral students is considered as independent research. Collaborative works and funding should clearly indicate the contribution from the candidate.</p>	

## Service

Each probationary tenure-track faculty member has a responsibility to render service to the department, university, the profession, and the university community including other local and regional educational institutions and to the chemical and biochemical industries.

Service includes work done or duties performed for others, including faculty governance of the department, college and university, administrative and student services at all levels within the university and professional services to government, industry and professional associations.

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidates must demonstrate:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service to the department, college, and/or university</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List of departmental, college, and university service, such as service as an active member of one or more departmental committees, including graduate admissions, graduate recruiting, safety, or coordinating divisional seminars</li> <li>• Serving as the PI of a training grant for graduate or undergraduate students; serving as director of a summer research program</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service to the professional community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognition (awards and prizes) for service to the department or the university</li> <li>• List of professional service, such as reviewing manuscripts for high-impact scientific journals and major proposals, participation as a member of the editorial board of a major journal, organizing symposia at a national/international meeting, or service in a formal role in a professional society.</li> </ul>
---	--

The criteria listed above are expected of faculty for promotion to associate professor with tenure. In the evaluation of untenured associate professors for tenure that can result from external hires, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time the tenure-track associate professor appointment without tenure was offered.

## 2. *Promotion to Professor*

According to Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) (C):

*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 and internationally; and has demonstrated leadership in service.*

In addition, a Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry faculty member who is ready for promotion to professor should serve as a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. He/she should also be a good citizen of the Department and the University and should contribute in a significantly positive manner to the external reputation of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry.

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 quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national and international reputation and leadership in the field.

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

In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another. Promotion should reflect the reality that (a) not all faculty members have the same distribution of assignments, (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence

equally in all evaluation dimensions, and (c) there is a multi-faceted institutional responsibility that must be achieved by the skills of the faculty collectively. Promotion to professor should be awarded not only to those faculty who have demonstrated impact in their scholarship of research and creative inquiry, teaching and learning, and service, but also to those who have exhibited excellence in the scholarship of leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the Department, College and University.

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

In reviewing promotion from associate professor to professor, the department will be receptive to cases in which the faculty member has demonstrated excellence in teaching or in areas of scholarship outside traditional research. In such case, less weight may be placed on original research. For a faculty member to be promoted under such circumstances, the contributions in other areas must be substantial and of high quality, as demonstrated by recognition at local and national levels. External letters documenting the quality of this work will be sought.

### ***3. Teaching Faculty***

**Promotion to Assistant Teaching Professor.** For promotion to assistant teaching professor, a faculty member must hold a doctoral or other terminal degree in the relevant field or hold a Master's degree along with equivalent experience and be performing satisfactorily in teaching and service. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

**Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor.** Promotion from assistant teaching professor to associate teaching professor requires convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service; have a documented high level of competence in professional practice; and display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of the department. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to associate teaching professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

**Promotion to Teaching Professor.** Promotion from associate teaching professor to teaching professor requires a sustained record of excellence in teaching and/or practicum supervision; leadership in service to the department and to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. External letters to evaluate the scholarship portion of the dossier are required for the promotion from associate teaching professor to teaching professor. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.



#### ***4. Associated Faculty***

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

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

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

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

#### ***5. Regional Campus Faculty***

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

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

Professional development and scholarship on the regional campus requires a broader, more flexible definition. Less than optimal laboratory resources, limited access to graduate students and few uninterrupted blocks of time necessarily limit the type of research problems which can be studied. Expectation of the quantity (but not quality) of scholarly activity will be adjusted to reflect the regional campus culture. Collaborative work with Columbus campus colleagues, pedagogical research, and development of teaching materials are all legitimate avenues of scholarly activity for regional campus faculty. The chair will facilitate collaborative research between regional and Columbus campus faculty whenever possible.

#### **B. Procedures**

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rules [3335-6-04](#) for tenure-track faculty, [3335-7-05](#) for teaching faculty, and the Office of Academic Affairs' annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Chapter 3 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

## ***1. Tenure Track and Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus***

### ***a. Candidate Responsibilities***

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

#### **Dossier**

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

While the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee 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 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.

Examples of teaching documentation include:

- cumulative SEI reports for every class or departmentally approved reports
- peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in Section IX of this document)
- list 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
- Mentoring undergraduate students in research with the potential completion and defense of undergraduate theses
- Participation in evaluation of candidacy, PhD, and MS exams
- Publication of student research in high quality, high impact peer reviewed journals
- Timely progress of graduate students to graduation and to appropriate employment and/or additional training of the student upon graduation.
- Recognition of teaching and mentoring through awards
- candidate's Self-Evaluation, to include a statement of the instructor's approach to and goals

for teaching, self assessment, and description of specific strategies for improvement—past, current, and planned

- other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.

For scholarship documentation, a full history of publications and creative work should be included, as this 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.

Examples of scholarship documentation include:

- Copies of all scholarly papers published or accepted for publication in high-quality peer-reviewed journals. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed.
- Invitations to present one's work at national/international conferences and at major universities.
- Be the principal investigator for major funding from federal agencies to support research efforts
- Documentation of grants submitted and contracts received, including outcome of review for unfunded applications.
- Documentation of invention disclosures, submitted and awarded patents, options and commercial licenses.
- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted)

Candidates will footnote their co-authors on each publication cited in their dossier as follows:

- a. OSU undergraduate
- b. OSU graduate student
- c. OSU postdoctoral student
- d. OSU faculty collaborator
- e. non-OSU student
- f. non-OSU collaborator

For each publication with a collaborator, the candidate will provide a short explanation of his or her independent contribution to the work and an indication of the importance of that contribution to the overall intellectual significance of the work. At his/her discretion, the chair may solicit a letter from each collaborator asking him/her to detail his/her contributions and those of the candidate to the published work.

For collaborative research grants on which the candidate is listed as a co-principal investigator,

the candidate should clearly document his/her unique role in the proposed program of work, his/her unique contribution to the preparation of the proposal, and the fraction of the funding that will, or has been, administered by him/her for work carried out independently in his/her laboratory. At his/her discretion, the chair may solicit a letter from each collaborator asking him/her to detail his/her contributions and those of the candidate to the design of the program of study, the preparation of the proposal, and the administration of funds.

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.

Examples of documentation of service include:

- List of departmental, college, and university service, such as service as an active member of one or more departmental committees, including graduate admissions, graduate recruiting, safety, or coordinating divisional seminars
- Serving as the PI of a training grant for graduate or undergraduate students; serving as director of a summer research program
- Recognition (awards and prizes) for service to the department or the university
- List of professional service, such as reviewing manuscripts for high-impact scientific journals and major proposals, participation as a member of the editorial board of a major journal, organizing symposia at a national/international meeting, or service in a formal role in a professional society. any available documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier

The complete dossier is forwarded when the review moves beyond the department. The documentation of research and service is for use during the department review only, unless reviewers at the college and university levels specifically request it.

Any published materials presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints downloaded directly from the publisher's website, photocopies of journal articles, or other final form that documents actual publication. An author's manuscript does not document publication.

### **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 their last reappointment in the case of teaching faculty), whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, for tenure-track faculty, the current APT document must be used if

the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year.

If the 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. The deadline for doing so will be the unit's regular deadline for receiving the dossier and other materials for the review in question. If a previous APT document is used for a review, only the criteria for evaluation from the earlier document are to be used. All processes and procedures for the review are to align with the currently approved APT document, regardless of whether a previous or current APT document is being used to define criteria for evaluation.

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

If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair and the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee. 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. Under no circumstances should a candidate solicit evaluations from any party for the purposes of the review.

#### *b. Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee Responsibilities*

The responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee 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 subcommittee 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 subcommittee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's curriculum vitae or annual report and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
- A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) only once. Faculty Rule [3335-7-08](#) makes the same provision for non-probationary teaching faculty. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.

- A decision by the subcommittee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the Committee of 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 term, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
  - **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 VI.B.4 below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.
  - **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 with 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 full Committee of Eligible Faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The subcommittee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.
  - 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.
  - 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. The revised document must specify each of the unit's criteria in teaching, scholarship and service, summarize the faculty perspectives on whether the candidate has met each criterion, and include the sources of evidence in the dossier on which these perspectives are based. The completed written evaluation and recommendation is forwarded to the department chair.
  - Provide a written response, on behalf of the Committee of Eligible Faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
  - Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure initiating unit is another department. The full Committee of Eligible Faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure initiating unit substantially earlier than the Committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

*c. Committee of Eligible Faculty Responsibilities*

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

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

*d. Department Chair Responsibilities*

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. For tenure-track assistant professors, the department chair will confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an [MOU](#) at the time of promotion with tenure.
- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee, the chair and the candidate. (Also see EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS below.)
- 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 and from an interdisciplinary center or institute in which the candidate plays an active role. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.
- To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the Committee of Eligible Faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted upon.
- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the committee of 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 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 Eligible Faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To explain to the Committee of Eligible Faculty 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 Eligible Faculty and department chair
  - Of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the Committee of 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 forward the Committee of Eligible Faculty's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure initiating units, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the department chair of the other tenure initiating unit by the date requested.

## ***2. Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus***

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

## ***3. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty***

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

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

The regional campus dean forwards the written evaluation and recommendation of the regional campus review to the department chair, from which point the review follows the procedures



described for the Columbus campus faculty. A request to promote requires agreement by the dean and the department chair.

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

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

#### **4. *External Evaluations***

External evaluations of research and scholarly activity are obtained for all promotion reviews that require research and scholarly activity. These include all tenure track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews and teaching faculty promotion reviews from associate teaching professor to teaching professor. Promotion to teaching professor requires program development, such as the creation of new laboratory experiments publishable in a peer-reviewed journal, and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. External evaluations will be sought for faculty seeking promotion to teaching professor engaged in scholarship pertinent to pedagogy and professional practice. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for promotion of associated faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations in these cases will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee.

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 at an appropriate peer or aspirational institution. In keeping with college guidelines, the department will generally obtain evaluations from faculty at R01 institutions that are members of the [Association of American Universities \(AAU\)](#) and the [Big Ten Academic Alliance \(BTAA\)](#). Justification will be provided in each case in which a

suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's research (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or postdoctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will solicit evaluations 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 as 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 Subcommittee, the department chair, and the candidate. All potential evaluators must be approved by the College of Arts and Sciences through the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. No written justification is required for tenured professors at peer or near peer institutions as defined above. If the potential evaluator is from an academic institution that is not clearly a peer or aspirational peer for Ohio State, or if the potential evaluator is from a nonacademic institution (e.g., a public policy think tank, a private art academy or music conservatory, a museum, a biomedical company, or a governmental agency), a brief written justification is required. The department's justification should be based on the prestige of the institution, the credentials and experience of the evaluator, and/or the specific relevance of the evaluator's expertise to the candidate's activities. International evaluators from strong institutions are allowed. The research credentials of the evaluators should generally mirror those of a professor at the professor rank at Ohio State. As noted 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. The department should provide justification if more than a minority of the evaluations are from associate professors (e.g., candidate's work is in a small or new field for which more senior people are not available, evaluators have gained prominence as national or international experts in the field). For reviews of associate professors, all evaluators must be professors (or equivalent). Emeritus professors are acceptable as long as they are active researchers.

If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that none of the person(s) suggested by the candidate agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators

suggested by the candidate.

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format for letters requesting external evaluations. A sample letter for tenure-track faculty can be found [here](#). A sample letter for teaching faculty can be found [here](#).

Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit external evaluations or initiate contact in any way with external evaluators for any purpose related to the promotion review. If an external evaluator should initiate contact with the candidate regarding the review, the candidate must inform the evaluator that such communication is inappropriate and report the occurrence to the department chair, who will decide what, if any, action is warranted (requesting permission from the Office of Academic Affairs to exclude that letter from the dossier). It is in the candidate's self-interest to assure that there is no ethical or procedural lapse, or the appearance of such a lapse, in the course of the review process.

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

## **VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS**

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

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

## **VIII. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS**

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

## **IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

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

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

In no case should the evaluation of teaching rely exclusively on quantitative instruments (such as the SEI), which have been shown to be unreliable indicators of overall performance in the classroom and to work systematically to the disadvantage of women, non-native English speakers, and faculty of color.

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

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

Student evaluation of teaching data is an important instrument that can be used to measure student satisfaction and to uncover ineffective teaching methods. Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) is required in every course offered in the department. Faculty may supplement the mandated student evaluation of teaching form with their own forms in any course offering. Faculty should encourage a high completion rate by explaining to the class the significance of the evaluation. When a small proportion of the class completes the evaluation, the resulting information has little value either for improving instruction or for performance evaluation. The faculty member should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and to provide feedback that can be taken into account in future teaching.

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

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

In the spring semester, the department chair will request from the chair of the mentoring committee of each assistant and associate professor a schedule that includes who will be peer reviewed during the next academic year and who will provide the reviews.

The department chair is responsible for coordinating peer review of teaching with the following goals:

- to review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and teaching faculty and all associated faculty with multiple-year appointments at least once per year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. When assistant professors are reviewed for tenure and promotion and when probationary teaching faculty are reviewed for reappointment or promotion they are required to have a

minimum of five peer evaluations of teaching from the probationary period. No more than two evaluations should be prepared by the same colleague.

- to review the teaching of tenured associate professors, nonprobationary assistant teaching professors, and nonprobationary associate teaching professors generally once per year, and at least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a three-year period and of having at least two peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion or reappointment review.
- to review the teaching of tenured professors and nonprobationary teaching professors at least once every four years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the 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 providing assistance in improving teaching.
- to review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the [Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#).

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

### Focus of the Review

Regularly scheduled reviews are both summative and formative (they provide both an assessment of the faculty member's teaching for use in annual and promotion reviews, and advice to improve the faculty member's teaching). Such reviews are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instruction materials (e.g., assignments and exams). Faculty under review should provide peer reviewers with the course syllabus and other materials well in advance of the classroom visit or visits. They should also provide reviewers with a list of preferred visitation dates. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, the peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to discuss the candidate's goals and expected outcomes for the course, teaching philosophy, and any challenges related to instruction including feedback from previous evaluations of teaching. In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should focus particularly on aspects of teaching that students are less qualified than faculty to evaluate, such as appropriateness of curricular choices given the goals of the course (survey as opposed to required major course), implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and appropriateness of approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. The

peer reviewer will also review the faculty member's scores from student evaluations of instruction (SEIs) in each course since the date of appointment or last promotion. In places where student opinion is mixed to negative, the reviewer is to ascertain the reasons based on scores related to specific questions and/or student comments and provide comment/feedback.

Peer evaluation of teaching will include analysis of the teaching portfolio of the candidate. The teaching portfolio will include course materials such as syllabi, exams, quizzes, handouts and other instructional materials including textbooks. Evaluations will include internal review of contributions to curriculum and observations of classroom teaching, the development of a new instructional laboratory experiment or the maintenance of an instructional laboratory. Peer review will also include classroom visitations by senior faculty. Reviewers and times of reviews will be selected by the chair or the chair's designee.

The chair may seek other measures of the teaching effectiveness of the candidate. These could include assessment of the success of the candidate's former students and post-docs, the extent to which pedagogical materials developed by the candidate are used by other faculty here and at other institutions, the extent to which the candidate is invited to provide expertise on teaching, teaching awards, evidence of student learning based on testing or other forms of evaluation, and other innovations in instruction that enhance learning.

### Written Report

Each review should result in a written report to the department chair, copied to the faculty member by the end of the semester of review. Written reports of peer evaluation of teaching should focus not only on classroom performance but also on curricular choices, implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and engagement with current disciplinary knowledge. For probationary faculty, the reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier. The faculty member may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond in writing if desired. All are appended to the report for inclusion in the faculty member's promotion and tenure dossier, unless the faculty member requests that the comments be excluded.

The following information will be included in the evaluation report:

1. Name of instructor
2. Name and number of course being evaluated
3. Academic term and date of evaluation
4. Name of evaluator
5. Number of lectures/lab sessions attended by the evaluator.

The following topics should be addressed in the report:

Subject matter, organization, clarity, and pace of presentation; mechanics of presentation (voice, volume, speed, mannerisms); use of multi-media teaching aids (demonstrations, PowerPoint slides, animations, etc.); student interactions and innovations in teaching methods (questions/answers, clickers, active learning strategies); syllabus, handouts, and examinations (if

available); suggestions for improvements.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Mentorship Plan**

Every newly appointed probationary tenure-track professor is assigned a committee that consists of a committee chair and of two other tenure-track faculty members to advise mentees on strategic approaches to meeting expectations in research, teaching, and service and to offer regular, candid, and supportive feedback on the full scope of the mentee's responsibilities throughout the entire probationary period. This may include reviews and comments on manuscripts and funding proposals, teaching plans and materials, advice on managing courseloads and classroom issues, and guidance on professional skills and opportunities. Mentors should also serve as a resource partner to help their mentees navigate the procedures and policies in the department, college, and university.

Members of these mentoring committees monitor the classroom instruction and study the annual reports, publications, and proposal submissions of the assistant professor. For classroom instruction mentoring, individual members of the committee meet with the assistant professor after visiting his or her classroom to provide feedback on possible improvements or to document innovations observed during the visit. At the request of the assistant professors, members of the advisory committee review proposals and provide advice on relevant funding agencies for the faculty member's research program. As the probationary faculty member's research program expands, the department's awards committee is responsible for identifying and nominating assistant professors for appropriate awards.

Mentors should initiate meetings with their mentees at least twice each semester and are also expected to respond to additional requests from their mentees as needed. Mentors who will be on leave should ask the department chair to assign another tenure-track faculty member to the mentee until they return.

Mentees who would like additional mentorship support or otherwise believe that their current mentoring relationship is not meeting their needs should discuss the issue with the department chair or designee (e.g., P&T committee chair). The department chair or designee will seek a resolution, which may include assigning a new mentor or adding an additional mentor to the mentorship team. If the probationary faculty member's concerns are not resolved through this process, they should schedule a meeting with the Divisional Dean or the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs in the College of Arts and Sciences.

After promotion and tenure, an associate professor is assigned a single mentor to assist with further development of his/her career.

The Chair, in consultation with the VCU, will appoint a mentor for each teaching faculty member. A departmental mentoring committee for teaching faculty will include the individual mentors of each teaching faculty member and at least three other faculty members who are integrally involved in the instructional mission of the Department. This committee will be chaired by the VCU. The mentors will provide guidance to teaching faculty throughout the year and will conduct and/or organize peer review of instruction for each teaching faculty member. These peer reviews of instruction are expected at least annually. One goal for the mentoring committee is to ensure uniform and thorough support of the teaching faculty. The committee is responsible for providing reviews of the progress of the teaching faculty to the Chair. This committee is expected to work with the teaching faculty member in charting a



path toward success in scholarship, teaching and research.

Each spring semester, the faculty of higher rank than then mentee meet to discuss progress and to provide additional feedback. At these meetings, members of the mentee's mentoring committee present the accomplishments of the mentee and any concerns to the faculty. Feedback from the faculty is communicated to the mentee by the mentor or the chair of the mentoring committee following the meeting.