

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE

Criteria and Procedures for the Department of Classics

Adopted February 14, 1997;

Modified May 4, 1997

Modified April 24, 1998

Modified October 15, 1998

Modified December 21, 1998

Modified January 27, 1999

Modified May 4, 2001

Modified October 5, 2001 (corrected Dec. 17, 2001)

Modified May 27, 2004

Modified April 6, 2007

Modified March 15, 2013

Redrafted February 7, 2015

Modified July 11, 2017

OAA Approved August 29, 2025

Table of Contents

I. PREAMBLE.....	4
II. DEPARTMENT MISSION.....	4
III. DEFINITIONS	5
A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty	5
1. Tenure-Track Faculty	5
2. Teaching Faculty	5
3. Associated Faculty.....	6
4. Conflict of Interest.....	6
5. Minimum Composition.....	7
B. Promotion and Tenure Committee	7
C. Quorum	7
D. Recommendation From the Committee of the Eligible Faculty	8
1. Appointment	8
2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion	8
IV. APPOINTMENTS.....	8
A. Criteria	8
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. Procedures	14
1. Tenure-Track Faculty—Columbus Campus.....	14
2. Teaching Faculty—Columbus Campus.....	16
3. Transfer From the Tenure Track	16
4. TIU Transfer	16
5. Associated Faculty—Columbus Campus	17
6. Regional Campus Faculty.....	17
7. Joint Appointments.....	18
8. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	18

V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEWS	19
A. Documentation	20
B. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty—Columbus Campus.....	20
1. Procedures	21
2. Fourth-Year Review	22
3. Extension of the Tenure Clock	23
C. Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus	23
D. Teaching Faculty—Columbus Campus	24
E. Associated Faculty—Columbus Campus.....	25
F. Regional Campus Faculty	25
G. Salary Recommendations.....	25
VI. PROMOTION AND TENURE, AND PROMOTION REVIEWS	26
A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion	20
1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	27
2. Promotion to Professor	30
3. Teaching Faculty	31
4. Associated Faculty.....	32
5. Regional Campus Faculty.....	32
B. Procedures	32
1. Tenure-Track and Teaching Faculty—Columbus Campus	32
2. Procedures for Associated Faculty—Columbus Campus.....	40
3. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty	40
4. External Evaluations.....	40
VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS.....	42
VIII. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS	43
IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING	43
A. Student Evaluation of Teaching	43
B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching	44
X. APPENDIX A: MENTORING	46

I. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the [Rules of the University Faculty](#), the Office of Academic Affairs procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Chapter 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), and any additional policies established by the college and the university. Should those rules and policies change, the department will follow those 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 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 can be implemented. It sets forth the department's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the college and university, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the dean and the Office of Academic Affairs accept the mission and criteria of the department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to department mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule [3335-6-01](#) of the Administrative Code. In particular, all faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) and other standards specific to this department and college; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.

Decisions considering appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the university's [policy on equal employment opportunity](#).

The chair may also ask the committee of the Eligible Faculty or an *ad hoc* committee to recommend alterations, deletions, and additions to this document. Such recommendations will be discussed and voted on by the faculty in a meeting.

II. DEPARTMENT MISSION

The academic mission of the Department of Classics is to promote the study of the languages, literatures, and cultures of Greeks and Romans in all periods from antiquity to the present, specifically through the publication of original research that engages directly with broader philosophical debates about the constitution of knowledge in the Humanities. The teaching of this knowledge, its sources, and methodological and theoretical approaches challenges the undergraduate and graduate students to prepare some for a professional future in the field and all for a life of learning and critical thinking. The department's goal is to make this knowledge available to a wide constituency of colleagues and friends of Greek and Roman studies, inside and outside the university, and to foster a collegial environment that promotes excellence in research, teaching, and discussion. Further, we recognize service to the needs of the department, the college, the university, and the community as an essential element of good academic citizenship.

III. DEFINITIONS

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

The department chair, the dean, divisional deans, and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president may not participate as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure.

1. *Tenure-Track Faculty*

Appointment Reviews

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

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

- The eligible faculty for reappointment and promotion reviews of assistant teaching professors consists of all tenured associate professors and professors and all non-probationary associate teaching professors and teaching professors.
- The eligible faculty for the reappointment and promotion reviews of associate teaching professors, and the reappointment reviews of teaching professors consists of all tenured professors and all non-probationary teaching professors.

3. *Associated Faculty*

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

Initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type), reappointment of compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair based on search committee recommendations. When appropriate, the chair will consult with the faculty.

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

Reappointments are decided by the chair.

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, or lecturer titles.

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

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

For the promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer, the eligible faculty shall be all tenure-track and nonprobationary teaching faculty at the ranks 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 25% of projects since appointment or last promotion, including current and planned collaborations;
- in a consulting/financial arrangement with the candidate since appointment or last promotion, including receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services) or is dependent in some way on the candidate's services; or
- in a family relationship such as a spouse, child, sibling, or parent, or other relationship, such as a close personal friendship, that might affect one's judgment or be seen as doing so by a reasonable person familiar with the relationship.

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

5. *Minimum Composition*

In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the department chair, after consulting with the dean, will appoint one or more faculty members from another tenure-initiating unit within the college so that the minimum of three faculty members is reached. That individual should not serve as the procedures oversight designee for the committee of the eligible faculty.

B. *Promotion and Tenure Committee*

The department normally does not have a promotion and tenure committee, as all review, promotion, and tenure cases are handled directly by the committee of the eligible faculty.

C. *Quorum*

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty from all campuses not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. A member of the eligible faculty on special assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-campus assignment. Faculty members who recuse themselves because of a conflict of interest are not counted when determining quorum.

D. Recommendation From the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

1. *Appointment*

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

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

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

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

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

IV. APPOINTMENTS

A. Criteria

The Department of Classics will make only faculty appointments that enhance the quality of the department and its effectiveness in pursuing its mission. Important considerations include the individual’s record to date in teaching, scholarship, and service; the potential for professional growth in each of these areas; and the potential for interacting with colleagues and students in a way that will enhance their academic work and attract other outstanding faculty and students to the department. The department expects that its senior members will be distinguished scholars within their areas of research and that junior members will have reasonable promise of achieving that status. Excellence in scholarship is therefore a necessary condition for appointment or promotion to any tenure-track faculty position and to appointment or promotion of teaching faculty to the rank of associate teaching professor or teaching professor. The department expects excellence in teaching from all of its members as part of its mission. The department further expects excellence in service to the department, the college and the university, with the understanding that assistant professors are generally spared heavier and more time-consuming service assignments. No offer will be extended in the event that a search process does not yield one or more candidates who would enhance the quality of the department. The search is either cancelled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, 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

Instructor

An appointment to the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but the appointee has not completed the required terminal degree at the onset of the appointment. Procedures for appointments are identical to those for an assistant professor. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. The appointment is always probationary and may not exceed three years. Promotion to assistant professor occurs without reviewing the semester following completion of the required credentialing. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment or the appointment will not be renewed, and the third year is the terminal year of appointment. Promotion occurs without reviewing the semester following completion of the required credentialing.

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

Assistant Professor

Minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of assistant professor include an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study, evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, for a strong research profile, and for developing into an internationally recognized scholar, demonstrated potential to be an effective teacher at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, a willingness to provide high-quality service to the department, the institution, and the profession, and a strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the ranks in a timely fashion. An appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service, including prior service credit. An assistant professor is reviewed for promotion and tenure no later than the sixth year of appointment as an assistant professor and informed by the end of the sixth year as to whether promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the seventh year. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the 7th year will be the final year of employment.

Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Committee of Eligible Faculty 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.

Professor or Associate Professor

Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor, with or without tenure, Professor with tenure, and offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

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.

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

- National recognition for a high-quality body of scholarship
- Demonstrated excellence in teaching undergraduate and graduate students
- 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.

Criteria for appointment offers at the rank of professor with tenure include:

- An established national or 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 record of high-quality service to their field and institution.

2. *Teaching Faculty*

Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all other teaching faculty 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 teaching professors and associate teaching professors must be for a period of at least three years and 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. There is no presumption that subsequent appointments will be offered, regardless of performance. The terms of a contract may be re-negotiated at the time of reappointment. These extended appointments are not probationary, and the individual may only be terminated 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 no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance.

Teaching appointments exist for faculty members who focus principally on the educational mission of the department. Teaching Faculty members are expected to contribute the

department's research and education mission as reflected in undergraduate and graduate program development and teaching. Teaching Faculty appointments are made in accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-7](#). Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the department.

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

Assistant Teaching Professor. An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field or equivalent experience is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant teaching professor. Evidence of ability to teach effectively 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 or other terminal degree in the relevant field or equivalent experience. The individual must meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria—in teaching, professional practice, and other services—for promotion to the rank. Appointment at the rank of associate teaching professor or teaching professor requires production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy. These materials can include a combination of publications in academic journals or edited collections, conference presentations, authorship or co-authorship of pedagogical materials such as textbooks/websites (print or open access), and development of pedagogical materials for classroom use.

3. *Associated Faculty*

The department may extend associated appointments to faculty who provide significant teaching and service. These are not tenured or tenure-track appointments and may or may not have a salary. The appointment of all compensated faculty must be the result of a search process. Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a few weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. Associated faculty may be reappointed. Appointments of all associated faculty must be reviewed and approved by the College of Arts and Sciences.

Associated appointments in the Department of Classics include the following:

Senior Lecturer

Appointment at the rank of senior lecturer requires the Ph.D. degree or its equivalent, demonstrated potential for significant scholarship, and ability as an effective teacher in Greek and/or Latin. Senior lecturers may teach at any level for which they are qualified. Their teaching must be evaluated in writing by their students and by the chair or his/her designee and by others among the tenure-track faculty. Such appointments may be renewed, provided that their record in teaching, scholarship, and service has served the department's mission and that

there is a continuing need for their services. 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.

Lecturer

The minimum requirement for appointment to the rank of lecturer will be a master's degree and completion of all work for the Ph.D. except the dissertation be completed at the time of the appointment. Normally, lecturers will teach introductory-level courses only. Their appointments will be made on a course-by-course and semester-by-semester basis. Their teaching must be evaluated by their students and by the chair or his/her designee. Lecturers may be reappointed if there is a continuing need for their services and if their teaching has been effective. 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.

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor

Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated. Visiting faculty must have credentials as scholars and teachers like those of a tenure-track appointment at the same level (as defined elsewhere in this document). Visiting faculty are eligible to teach at any level for which they are qualified as scholars and teachers. Visiting faculty, whose appointments may not exceed three continuous years, include individuals on leave from other academic institutions. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion.

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor

Adjunct titles are used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to tenure-track or teaching faculty of equivalent rank. The term of appointment is for one year with renewal contingent on continued significant contributions. The adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty are eligible to teach at any level for which they are qualified. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTW below 50%

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

4. *Regional Campus Faculty*

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

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

5. *Emeritus Faculty*

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

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the department chair (regional campus dean for associated faculty on regional campuses) outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-3) will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair. The department chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean or designee. 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 unit at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment. A courtesy appointment in the Department of Classics requires a Ph.D. in Classics or in an equivalent or related field and a tenure-track or teaching faculty

appointment in another unit at The Ohio State University. It is based on the expectation that the appointee will contribute substantially to the department's mission. An individual with a courtesy appointment (0% FTE) may not participate in department meetings or be appointed to department committees. He or she may hold graduate faculty status in the department, upon the recommendation of the graduate studies committee, but may not be the main adviser of Ph.D. students. Appropriate active involvement includes collaboration with tenure-track faculty in graduate and undergraduate courses and/or participation in program development. Continuation of the appointment will reflect ongoing contributions to the department's mission and will be terminated when those contributions cease to exist or cease to serve the department's needs. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

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.

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; and letters of offer.

Upon appointment, all compensated probationary tenure-track and teaching faculty and all associated faculty are assigned a faculty mentor. See Section X, Appendix A for details of the department's mentoring program.

1. Tenure-Track Faculty—Columbus Campus

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

The dean of the college, in consultation with the divisional dean, provides approval for the department to commence a search process. This approval may be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise. The department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty members for tenure-track and teaching faculty searches and consisting of at least one tenure-track or teaching faculty member for associated faculty searches.

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

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

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

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible 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. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the

appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor, with or without tenure, Professor with tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

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

If the chair decides to make an offer, s/he will write a letter of explanation of the circumstances to the faculty with a copy to be sent to the dean. After the offer is made, the chair will discuss the search with the graduate students.

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

2. *Teaching Faculty—Columbus Campus*

Searches for teaching faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the on-campus or virtual interview will address issues in teaching or professional teaching practice rather than scholarship.

3. *Transfer From the Tenure Track*

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a teaching appointment if appropriate to the individual's circumstances and department 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 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*

Tenure-track faculty requests to move from another TIU must be approved by a simple majority of the eligible faculty in the receiving TIU, by both department chairs, 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 upon the establishment of mutually agreed-upon arrangements among the

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

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

5. *Associated Faculty—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 a recommendation from the search committee.

The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair. Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one to three years.

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

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer

Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are made by the chair, preferably on an annual basis but, if need be, on a semester-by-semester basis following a formal search using the SHIFT framework. After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple-year appointment may be offered.

Visiting Faculty

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department and are decided by the department chair in consultation with the full faculty and in accordance with the majority opinion as determined by a vote of the tenure-track faculty. Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three years.

Adjunct Faculty

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department and are decided by the chair upon consultation with the full faculty and in accordance with the majority opinion as determined by a vote of the tenure-track faculty.

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 need for a tenure-track position and the position description, but the regional campus dean or designee should consult with and seek the agreement of the department chair and faculty of the Columbus department on the position description before the search begins. The regional campus search committee must include at least one representative from the Columbus campus department.

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, the chair of the department, and either the 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. Candidates will be evaluated on both campuses, with the Columbus faculty taking primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's record and potential as a scholar. At the end of the evaluation process, the search committee will make a recommendation to the department chair and the regional campus dean. The search committee's recommendation is informed by a vote of the eligible faculty. A hiring decision requires an agreement between the department chair and the regional campus dean and director. Negotiations with a candidate should not begin without such agreement and a letter of offer must be signed by the chair of the department and the dean and director of the regional campus.

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

The appointment of associated faculty on the regional campuses is described in the regional campuses' APT documents.

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. A [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 tenure-initiating unit. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this department justifying the appointment will be considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by an affirmative vote of more than 50% of the eligible faculty, the department chair extends an offer of appointment. The department chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEWS

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 all probationary faculty, an opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all other compensated faculty members, as well as a written assessment. According to the policy, the purposes of the review are to:

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

The department chair may designate the responsibility for annual performance and merit reviews to appropriate department faculty administrators. The designee or a subcommittee of the eligible faculty may provide a written assessment to the department chair. However, the department chair must schedule a face-to-face meeting with all probationary faculty as part of the review. An opportunity for a face-to-face meeting with the department chair or 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, scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.

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.

At the end of each academic year, the chair will invite each faculty member to discuss specific goals for the upcoming year. Committee appointments, teaching assignments, and other discretionary actions of the chair will be informed by this meeting, and the faculty member may request to have the understanding reached put in writing. During the Spring semester, the chair will notify all faculty in a timely manner of the forthcoming annual review. If there has been an understanding as described above, during the review the year's accomplishments will be assessed in terms of that understanding.

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 in carrying out their teaching, scholarship, and service activities, 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 the due date established by the chair:

- Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#) (required for probationary faculty) 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.

The chair may also seek additional information as necessary and consult colleagues as necessary for a fair and thorough review. In this regard, the chair may invite reviews of public presentations, curricular development, service, or general impact of scholarship from anyone in a position to evaluate the faculty member's performance. Copies of these supplementary materials and of the teaching evaluation committee evaluations or summaries of the faculty member's teaching evaluations will be provided to the faculty member at least one week before the annual review so that he or she may provide explanation or other comment.

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—Columbus Campus

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the department chair, who prepares a written evaluation with sufficient detail for meaningful feedback that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The department chair offers each probationary faculty member a scheduled opportunity to discuss their performance, future plans, and goals.

1. Procedures

At the time of appointment, probationary tenure-track faculty members will be provided with all pertinent documents detailing department, college, and university promotion and tenure policies and criteria. If these documents are revised during the probationary period, probationary faculty members will be provided with copies of the revised documents.

The chair of the department and the committee of the eligible faculty will review all probationary tenure-track faculty in each year of their probationary service. The annual performance and merit review will encompass the probationary tenure-track faculty member's performance in the areas of research, teaching, and service, and will require evidence of continuing development in each area. (It is, however, understood that early career faculty contribute less in the area of service than their mid- and later-career colleagues.) The chair will inform probationary faculty members at the time of the initial appointment and in a timely fashion each year thereafter when the annual review will take place and remind them of the required documentation stipulated above. This documentation must be submitted at least one week prior to the date of the review. The annual review enables the department to communicate its performance expectations to probationary faculty and to evaluate progress towards those expectations. The department is committed to not renewing a probationary appointment following any annual review in which it is apparent that the candidate's likelihood of meeting expectations for promotion and tenure is poor. All annual review letters will become a part of a faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure.

The committee of the eligible faculty must meet and discuss each probationary faculty member's annual performance at the annual review. It is the responsibility of every committee member to review all available documentation and to participate in the review meeting. If it is absolutely impossible for a faculty member to attend the meeting, s/he may participate in the meeting by two-way electronic communication. In each annual review other than the fourth-year review (described in V.B.2 below), the vote of the committee is only advisory to the chair. The chair may participate but not vote at this review. The committee will appoint a senior member and participant in the discussion to summarize the deliberations and explain the vote in a letter to the chair.

If the department chair recommends renewal of the probationary 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. The department chair's letter, along with any written comments, is forwarded to the dean. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure, along with any written comments. If the chair's recommendation to the dean is to *not* reappoint the faculty member, 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.

Both the committee's written assessment of the faculty member and the chair's letter must be circulated to all faculty who participated in the review meeting before being officially communicated to the probationary tenure-track faculty member. The chair must provide the faculty member under review with a copy of his or her letter of recommendation and the letter of the committee of the eligible faculty. The faculty member will be given ten (10) days to respond in writing to the letters from the committee of the eligible faculty to the chair and/or from the chair to the dean. The chair of the committee and/or the department chair may respond to this letter. There will be only one iteration of this process. All letters and responses will, then, become part of the faculty member's dossier. A copy will also be sent to the college office.

In the case of a recommendation for reappointment, the chair will also compose a letter to the faculty member offering constructive and candid advice and counsel. The letter should include strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate. In cases of differing assessments, the chair will attempt to resolve conflicting evaluations in a way that both advises the faculty member of those areas where his or her record is open to question and provides candid and clear advice about aspects of performance that need improvement.

If during an annual review the committee of the eligible faculty determines by a two-thirds vote in a confidential written ballot that an assistant professor should be put up for promotion and tenure before his or her probationary term is completed, the chair will invite that assistant professor to submit his or her dossier to the committee for review and evaluation in accordance with section VI.B., below.

2. *Fourth-Year Review*

During the fourth year of the probationary period, the annual review has the same purposes as any other annual review but the procedures are the same as those of the sixth-year (mandatory) review for tenure, with the following exceptions: (a) the dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment; (b) external evaluations are solicited only when 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. Unlike other annual reviews, the vote of the eligible faculty in the fourth-year review is not only advisory to the chair but has independent standing.

Following the vote on the fourth-year review, the chair of the committee of the eligible faculty will submit to the chair of the department a letter in which the full committee's assessment of the probationary faculty member's performance is stated and discussed. The letter will also record the vote and the committee's recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The chair of the department will prepare a separate evaluation of the probationary faculty member's performance and an independent recommendation on renewal. On completion of the departmental review, the probationary faculty member will be informed in writing that he or she may review the department's evaluations, and the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)) is followed. The probationary faculty member has ten days from receipt of this notice to provide written comments on the department's evaluations for inclusion in the dossier. Should the probationary faculty member provide comments, the committee and/or the department chair will have the opportunity to respond in writing to those

comments. There will be only one iteration of this process. The two evaluations produced in the department (those of the committee of the eligible faculty and of the chair of the department), along with any comments from the probationary faculty member and responses by the chair of the committee (or a designee) and the department chair, will be forwarded to the dean of the college.

Renewal of the appointment of a probationary faculty member for the fifth year requires the approval of the divisional dean. In cases in which 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 department reappointment recommendations. If either the department chair or the dean recommends nonrenewal of a faculty member's probationary contract, the case will be referred to the college's Promotion and Tenure Committee, which will review the case, vote, and make a recommendation to the dean, who makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

3. *Extension of the Tenure Clock*

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

C. *Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus*

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the professors in the department who comment on the faculty member's performance in the areas of research, teaching, and service, continuing development in each area, and progress toward promotion.

The department chair will inform all associate professors in a timely fashion each year when the annual performance and merit review will take place and request the documentation stipulated in section A above. This material will be made available to the committee of the eligible faculty; they may also seek additional information and consult colleagues as necessary for a fair and thorough review. This annual review enables the professors to communicate their expectations to associate professors and to evaluate their progress towards those expectations.

The professors will elect one who has participated in the discussion to summarize their deliberations in a letter to the chair. After the meeting the chair will provide the faculty member with an independent written assessment of his or her performance and professional development, based upon and reflecting the discussion of the professors. If the chair's assessment disagrees in essential details with the assessment written by the professors, the chair will explain her/his disagreement in a letter to them.

Associate professors will meet annually with the chair or the chair's designee to discuss their annual reviews and future plans. The Chair of the Eligible Faculty also participates in the annual

individual review meetings between associate professors and the department chair. Faculty under review may respond in writing to any part of the review. The chair of the committee of the eligible faculty may respond to this response. There will only be one iteration of this process.

Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair who may seek input from the professors in the unit and may meet with the faculty member to discuss performance and future plans and goals. Professors will submit the documentation stipulated in section V.A, above. The chair will review this documentation and other documents, as necessary, will consult members of the faculty as appropriate, and will use this information as the basis for an annual performance review.

The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the 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 will prepare a written evaluation of performance against these expectations, including discussion of future plans. Faculty members will meet annually with the chair to discuss their annual reviews and future plans. If they choose, they may respond in writing to any part of the review and the department chair may reply in writing.

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—Columbus Campus

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

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

If the position continues, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review generally proceeds in the same manner as the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure track faculty.

All reappointment decisions are at the discretion of the college dean. There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

E. Associated Faculty—Columbus Campus

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

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

F. Regional Campus Faculty

Regional campus tenure-track faculty are reviewed according to the process established on that campus, with the review focusing on teaching and service. Following the review by the regional campus, the regional campus dean meets with the department chair for evaluation of the faculty member's research and creative activity during the review period. The regional campus dean provides an annual performance and merit review letter. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice. For probationary tenure-track faculty, if 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 annual performance and merit review of regional campus teaching faculty is conducted on the regional campus according to the process established on that campus. The dean/director will provide the department chair with a copy of a teaching faculty member's annual performance and merit review letter.

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

G. Salary Recommendations

The College of Arts and Sciences requires that units:

- adopt procedures for the distribution of merit salary and other rewards that recognize the importance of qualitative rather than merely quantitative contributions in each area of faculty activity.
- guard against rigid formulas or weightings of research/creative work, teaching, and service that might limit recognition of extraordinary one-time commitments in one or more areas of

variations in workload, or of shifts in responsibilities at different stages of professional development.

- Make recommendations for merit salary increases and other rewards that are consistent with that department's APT document and other relevant policies, procedures, practices, and standards established by: (1) the college, (2) the Faculty Rules, (3) the Office of Academic Affairs, and (4) the Office of Human Resources.

The dean determines the amount of incremental money available to the department, and the chair makes salary recommendations to the dean, who may modify them. The recommendations are based on the current annual performance and merit review as well as on the performance and merit reviews of the preceding 24 months.

Except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increase, all funds for annual salary increases will be directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and the active promotion of an enriching working and learning environment through collegiality, civility, and openness to diverse ideas and opinions.

The regional campuses have their own resources for salary increases for their faculty.

In formulating recommendations, the chair consults with the Salary Advisory Committee. The chair should proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in it. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

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

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

VI. PROMOTION AND TENURE, AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

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

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

for promotion to tenured positions. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

A. CRITERIA AND EVIDENCE THAT SUPPORT PROMOTION

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

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

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

1. *Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure*

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

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

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

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

Every candidate is expected to meet the criteria for promotion in all aspects of performance (teaching, scholarship, and service).

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

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. 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.

Criteria and evidence for promotion to associate professor with tenure are outlined in the tables below.

TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
<i>Candidates must demonstrate:</i>	<i>Candidates may be asked to submit</i>
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"> • Peer evaluations of instruction • Student evaluations of instruction • Graduate and undergraduate student mentoring • Graduate and undergraduate student accomplishments • Teaching narratives in dossier • Commentary on teaching in annual review letters • Contributions to curricular development • Scholarship on pedagogy • Syllabi, exams, and course assignments for all courses in the review period
Excellence as a teacher of undergraduate and graduate students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer evaluations of instruction • Student evaluations of instruction • Graduate and undergraduate student mentoring • Graduate and undergraduate student accomplishments • Teaching narratives in dossier • Commentary on teaching in annual review letters • Contributions to curricular development • Scholarship on pedagogy • Syllabi, exams, and course assignments for all courses in the review period •
Clear evidence of an effective interest in students, stimulation of student interest in the subject matter, high standards of intellectual performance and, where appropriate, the use of up-to-date scholarship and resources in teaching.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer evaluations of instruction • Student evaluations of instruction • Graduate and undergraduate student mentoring • Graduate and undergraduate student accomplishments • Teaching narratives in dossier • Commentary on teaching in annual review letters • Contributions to curricular development • Scholarship on pedagogy • Syllabi, exams, and course assignments for all courses in the review period

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in Drake Institute Programming
--	--

SCHOLARSHIP/RESEARCH	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
<i>Candidates must demonstrate:</i>	<i>Candidates may be asked to submit:</i>
Emerging national reputation as a scholar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete publication and presentation record including research monographs, published articles, invited book chapters, conference papers, • External evaluations • Complete record of grants and research awards • Invited talks at symposia, conferences, or other field specific venues that demonstrate the recognition of the thought leadership of the candidate. • Elected service in national professional associations
Research record that demonstrates a high standard of excellence and clear distinction in scholarship, as is appropriate to faculty at a major research institution*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete publication and presentation record including research monographs, published articles, invited book chapters, conference papers, • Complete record of grants and research awards • Invited talks or participation at symposia, conferences, or other field-specific venues • External evaluations
A significant body of scholarship demonstrating significant achievements that will have an impact on scholarly discussion and the ability to undertake sustained and continuing original work.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete publication and presentation record including research monographs, published articles, invited book chapters, conference papers, • Invited talks or participation at symposia, conferences, or other field-specific venues • Complete record of grants and research awards • External evaluations
A consistent record of productivity and a well-articulated research agenda indicates that the candidate will continue to develop professionally.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete publication and presentation record including research monographs, published articles, invited book chapters, conference papers, • Invited talks or participation at symposia, conferences, or other field-specific venues • Complete record of grants and research awards • External evaluations • Research narrative in dossier
*This will typically take the form of a finished book, published or under final board-approved contract and in production with a quality press	

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
<i>Candidates must demonstrate:</i>	<i>Candidates may be asked to submit:</i>
An established record of good departmental citizenship through a willingness to serve when asked and conscientious performance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual review letters • Complete list of departmental and other service • Service narratives in dossier

2. *Promotion to Professor*

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

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

The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, 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 distinction as a scholar and an emerging international reputation in the field, and excellence in service to one or more publics, including the university, the Columbus community, the state of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations.

The Department of Classics expects an individual ready for promotion to professor to be a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession.

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 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 leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the department, college, and university.

To be eligible for promotion to professor, a faculty member must have made outstanding scholarly contributions to his or her area of expertise, contributions that have secured him or her national or international reputation for intellectual eminence in his or her field. It is expected that the faculty member will have a second body of scholarship that represents a continuing and strong record of publications since promotion to the associate professor rank. It is further required that there be strong evidence that the scholar's work has had a major impact on his or her field. Typically, evidence will include a second book, published or in production with a quality press, and a series of refereed journal articles, book chapters, edited works, conference papers, and book reviews beyond those presented for tenure, as well as national and international grants and fellowships, and invitations to speak at prestigious conferences and universities, to contribute to international publications, and/or to be a visiting professor on other campuses. There must be evidence not only of continuous past accomplishment, but of a strong ongoing scholarly agenda that predicts continued eminence in the field. In addition, he or she must have demonstrated continued excellence as a teacher of graduate and undergraduate students and must have an excellent record of leadership in service to the department, college, and scholarly community.

3. *Teaching Faculty*

a) Promotion to assistant teaching professor requires that a faculty member has completed their doctoral or other terminal degree in the relevant field or hold a master's degree with experience equivalent to a terminal degree 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.

b) Promotion to associate teaching professor requires that a faculty member hold a doctoral or other terminal degree in the relevant field or a master's degree and experience equivalent to a terminal degree, show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service; have a documented high level of competence in professional practice; display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of the department; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy. 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.

c) Promotion to teaching professor requires that a faculty member hold a doctoral or other terminal degree in the relevant field or a master's degree and experience equivalent to a terminal degree; have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching; leadership in service to the department and to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy. 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*

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

B. *Procedures*

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

1. *Tenure-Track and Teaching Faculty—Columbus Campus*

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 Eligible Faculty makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by him or her.

Teaching Documentation

It is not enough that a teacher conscientiously meets his or her obligations and successfully conveys knowledge. The Department of Classics expects clear evidence of an effective interest in students, stimulation of student interest in the subject matter, high standards of intellectual performance and, where appropriate, the use of up-to-date scholarship and resources in teaching. Evaluation of a candidate's performance as a teacher will be based on the widest possible range of evidence. It will include (1) evidence solicited by the department chair or by the chair of the committee of the Eligible Faculty, and (2) evidence offered by the candidate.

Evidence presented to the committee of the Eligible Faculty regarding teaching will normally include the following:

- a) Student evaluations for all courses for all the probationary years or, in the case of promotion from associate professor to professor, student evaluations for courses taught since the last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, to present.
- b) Syllabi, exams, and course assignments for all courses (1000-8000 levels) for all the probationary years or, in the case of promotion from associate professor to professor, for all courses taught since the last promotion or in the last five years, whichever is less, to present.
- c) A brief written statement by the candidate of his or her teaching objectives, methods, and accomplishments. This document may include a statement of the candidate's approach to and goals for teaching, a self-assessment, and a description of specific strategies for improvement of teaching. The candidate may want to call attention to innovations, improvements, and adjustments made in courses over time.
- d) Peer evaluations of a range of courses as stipulated in section IX, below.
- e) Other data in the core dossier pertinent to an evaluation of the candidate's performance in the area of teaching might include:
 - Explanations or demonstrations of especially successful or innovative teaching techniques;
 - Explanations of special teaching accomplishments, awards, and the like;

- Information regarding publication of teaching materials and articles on teaching techniques;
- Descriptions of technical innovations and use of new technology in preparing course material, delivering information, setting learning tasks and evaluating performance;
- Team teaching and interdisciplinary work that brings research in Classics into meaningful interaction with other areas of research and instruction in the college and college.

The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is 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.

Scholarship Documentation

Scholarly excellence entails significant and original contributions to published scholarship in the candidate's field of specialization.

The usual media for scholarly contributions are books, articles in recognized, refereed journals or prestigious invitations to contribute to publications that advance rather than summarize knowledge and understanding, and presentations at scholarly meetings.

Comparable electronic media are also acceptable, so long as these have standard refereed processes.

The candidate's achievements and the likelihood of further long-term scholarly accomplishments will be evaluated on the basis of the widest possible range of evidence in the dossier, including both evidence offered by the candidate in the core dossier and that is solicited by the department chair and the chair of the committee of the Eligible Faculty (e.g., external evaluations).

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

Evidence will normally include:

(1) Publications. In evaluating publications and manuscripts, the committee will consider the nature of each publication, the type of refereeing, the reputation of a publisher or journal, and any other external measure, but will not allow extrinsic concerns to modify their scholarly judgment regarding the intrinsic merit of the publication. Ordinarily, the committee will consider monographic or interpretive publications based upon original research as providing primary evidence of scholarly development rather than textbooks or source books conceived

primarily for elementary undergraduate instruction, though the development of materials for use with new technologies may serve as evidence insofar as it entails original research. The department chair or chair of the committee may solicit -- and the candidate may present -- published reviews from scholars in the field. The candidate may be asked to offer or may present the reports of anonymous referees.

(2) Scholarly activity at professional meetings. The quality of the contributions will be the primary consideration in evaluating this activity. Papers, formal commentaries on the papers of others, and participation in colloquia will be evaluated. It is part of the responsibility of senior colleagues to try to attend the presentations and colloquia of junior colleagues; their evaluations may be placed in writing in the candidate's file. Again, the committee may seek and the candidate may present evaluations from scholars in the field.

(3) Reviews of scholarly works for journals. The scholarship of the reviews and the nature of the journals in which they appear will be appraised.

(4) Scholarly recognition in the form of requests to serve on editorial boards of scholarly journals, to chair sessions at professional meetings and conventions or to serve on program committees for such meetings, to speak at other institutions or to assume the post of visiting professor.

(5) Recognition in the form of prizes, awards, grants, or fellowships based on scholarly esteem and reputation.

(6) Any other written evidence which the candidate believes pertinent to the candidate's development as a scholar that is included in the dossier. The candidate may include in his or her dossier any manuscripts of articles or papers, whether they have been published or not.

Service Documentation

A member of the Department of Classics at The Ohio State University has an obligation to use his or her talents to collaborate effectively with colleagues for the betterment of the department, the college, the university, and the larger community. A faculty member's profile of service may vary over time, and it is understood that junior faculty are generally spared many service commitments. Promotion to professor, unlike promotion to associate professor, *does* entail a record of committed service to the department. This service may include, but is not limited to, graduate advising, working with graduate students on preparing candidacy exams, committed involvement on dissertation committees, chairing a dissertation committee. Additionally, associate professors are expected to chair department committees, and to demonstrate involvement in organizations, outreach projects, or other community and/or disciplinary initiatives that contribute to the well-being and enhancement of the Department of Classics at OSU and across the discipline. The committee of the Eligible Faculty may consider any information that the candidate considers pertinent to a full evaluation of the candidate's ability to render effective service to these communities, including evidence relating to the quality and the quantity of such service that is provided in the dossier. Candidates with significant service activities outside the department may request that the department chair solicit letters from colleagues familiar with the candidate's contributions to these activities. Such letters are not counted towards the five required external letters of evaluation.

Other information may include:

- a) Service on department, college, and university committees;
- b) Presentations made in the classes of others, contributions to university publications, lectures to the departmental faculty, and similar activities;
- c) Activities in the university community and in the community outside the university based on and related to one's professional training and professional concerns;
- d) Activity in the national or international scholarly community and its institutions.

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.

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

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document

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

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

External Evaluations

If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair and the committee of the Eligible Faculty. The candidate may add no more than three additional names but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names. The department chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

Responsibilities of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

- The responsibilities of the Eligible Faculty are as follows:
- To review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a nonmandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds affirmative vote is required for the review to proceed.
 - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
 - A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04A\(3\)](#) only once. Faculty Rule [3335-7-08](#) makes the same provision for 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 committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the Eligible Faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, the committee of the Eligible Faculty provides administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
 - **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described [here](#).
 - **Late Spring:** Suggest the names of external evaluators to the department chair. This responsibility falls mainly to the chair of the Eligible Faculty, who may solicit suggestions from the rest of the committee. 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:** The chair of the committee, the POD, and any other committee members so designated by the chair review the candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs

requirements; and they work with the candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins. They 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.

- Review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed. Members must attend all Eligible Faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; participate in discussion of every case; and vote.
- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship, and service, provide the fully eligible faculty with the dossier, and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.
- Consider the interdisciplinary work of a candidate across multiple units as part of the whole work, especially if the candidate has a joint appointment in another unit.
- Revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of the eligible faculty to reflect the committee's discussion and vote and summarize 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 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 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.

Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. (The department must ensure that such questions are asked of all applicants in a non-discriminatory manner.) 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 committee of the Eligible Faculty, the department chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this department. The department chair will seek a letter of evaluation from the TIU head of the joint appointment unit. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.
- To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the Eligible Faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty 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 Eligible Faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the Eligible Faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the Eligible Faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process: of the recommendations by the Eligible Faculty and department chair; of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the Eligible Faculty and department chair; and of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten calendar days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she will submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline.

- To receive the committee of the Eligible Faculty's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure- initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the department chair of the other tenure initiating unit by the date requested.

2. *Procedures for Associated Faculty—Columbus Campus*

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

3. *Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty*

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

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

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

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

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

4. *External Evaluations*

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews and all teaching faculty reviews to the rank of teaching professor. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for promotion of associated faculty or for promotion of teaching faculty to the rank of associate teaching professor.

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/or the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA). Justification will be provided in each case when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.
- Is written by a person highly qualified to provide an arms' length judgment of the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post- doctoral mentor of the candidate, or someone who has collaborated extensively with the candidate or is currently collaborating with the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will solicit evaluations 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, the department seeks more letters than are required and solicits these letters 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, the committee of the Eligible Faculty, the department chair, and the candidate assemble a list of potential evaluators. All potential evaluators must be approved by the College of Arts and Sciences through the Associate Dean for Faculty 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. These should be a minority of the final set of letters. The research credentials of the evaluators should generally mirror those of a professor at the professor rank at Ohio State. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors. The department should provide justification if more than a minority of the evaluations are from associate professors (e.g., candidate's work is in a small or new field for which more senior people are not available, evaluators have gained prominence as national or international experts in the field). For reviews of associate professors, all evaluators must be professors (or equivalent). Emeritus professors are acceptable as long as they are active researchers.

If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those people. Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) requires that no more than half of the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

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

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

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

VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS

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 teaching faculty, for securing a reappointment.

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) sets forth the general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions.

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.

Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule [3335-5-05](#).

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, considering the 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

All faculty are expected to offer students in all regularly scheduled courses an opportunity to evaluate the course and the instruction in the course. The use of the university Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) is required. The evaluations will be entered into the faculty member's Annual Review Dossier for use by the committee of the Eligible Faculty and the chair.

The use of other forms of evaluation is left to the discretion of the instructor, though faculty members are strongly encouraged to use other evaluation instruments to supplement the SEI. If such are used, they are to be proctored by a student, who will return them to a designated member of the office staff. These evaluations will be retained in the office and given to the faculty member only after the final grades have been submitted. Any comments collected through these instruments should be included in the regularly scheduled peer review or Annual

Performance Report. Summaries of these comments, prepared by someone other than the candidate, should also be included in promotion and tenure dossiers.

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 and may delegate this responsibility to a Peer Review of Teaching Committee.

Peer evaluations of teaching for probationary faculty and for faculty seeking promotion or reappointment are comprehensive and include, in addition to classroom visitation (or the equivalent for an online course), review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and exams. Faculty under review should provide peer reviewers with the course syllabus and other materials well in advance of the classroom visit or visits. They should also provide reviewers with a list of preferred visitation dates. In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should focus on such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. The college encourages the reviewer to first meet with the faculty member under review to discuss the instructor's teaching philosophy, goals and expected outcomes for the course, and any challenges related to instruction (including previous feedback from previous evaluations of teaching). In addition to preparing a written report for the faculty member's dossier, the reviewer should meet with the faculty member following the classroom visitation for a more informal consultation about their teaching effectiveness.

Written reports of peer evaluation of teaching 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. A formal review will include at least two visits to the classroom. A faculty member must be assigned by the Teaching Evaluation Coordinator to perform the review. Wherever possible a peer reviewer will be of higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed. The reviewer will make a written report by the end of the semester of review, give it to the Teaching Evaluation Coordinator, who will give a copy to the probationary faculty member. The report will become part of the probationary faculty member's file. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if he or she wishes. All such comments are appended to the report for inclusion in the faculty member's promotion and tenure dossier, unless the faculty member requests the comments be excluded.

The department chair is responsible for coordinating peer review of teaching of probationary tenure-track and teaching faculty at least once per year during the probationary period with the goal of adequately assessing teaching at all levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the probationary period. When probationary tenure-track faculty are reviewed for tenure and promotion, they are required to have a minimum of five peer evaluations of teaching from the probationary period, including (ideally) at least one large lecture course, one small lecture or discussion course, one 2000-6000 level language course,

and one 7000-8000 level graduate course. When probationary teaching faculty are reviewed for reappointment or promotion, they are required to have a minimum of four peer evaluations of instruction from the probationary period.

The teaching of tenured associate professors, nonprobationary assistant teaching professors, and nonprobationary associate teaching professors will be formally peer reviewed at least once every two years, so that a minimum of two peer evaluations are available before the commencement of a promotion or reappointment review. However, the department will strive to evaluate at least four courses, (ideally) one large lecture course, one small lecture/discussion course, one 2000-6000 level language course, and one 7000-8000 level graduate course. The faculty member assigned by the Teaching Evaluation Coordinator to perform the review will make a written report, a copy of which will be made available to the faculty member. The report will become part of the faculty member's file.

The teaching of tenured professors and nonprobationary teaching professors will be formally peer reviewed at least once every four years, with the goal of assessing teaching at all levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. When nonprobationary teaching professors are reviewed for reappointment, they are required to have a minimum of two peer evaluations of instruction since the last promotion or reappointment.

The department chair shall arrange for at least one annual peer evaluation of associated faculty on multiple year appointments. When associated faculty on multiple year appointments are reviewed for promotion or reappointment, they are required to have a minimum of two peer evaluations of instruction since the last promotion or reappointment, whichever is most recent.

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

Any faculty member may request additional peer review of teaching. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews 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 department chair or faculty member and may or may not include class visitations.

X. APPENDIX A: MENTORING

General goals of the mentoring process:

- To enhance the ability of tenure-track faculty to work effectively during the probationary period as they lay the foundation for continued success after tenure review.*
- To provide guidelines for a uniform structure of team mentoring for all new tenure-track faculty yet to be individualized based on the needs of a particular faculty member.*

Assistant Professors. Newly hired tenure-track faculty are assigned a formal mentor by the department chair. The mentor must be a tenured professor within the department. If possible, the search committee for a position should be organized so that a member of the committee could serve as the mentor of the successful candidate (to provide some continuity from the search process). The mentor will initiate meetings with the mentee at least twice each semester to review progress in scholarship, teaching, and service. Assistant professors should meet with the department chair as soon as possible following the annual review meeting in the spring semester. The mentor is expected to respond to additional requests from their mentee as needed. If a mentor is on leave, the department chair will assign another faculty member to serve as mentor until they return. Finally, Assistant professors should establish a mentoring relationship with a tenured faculty member outside the department, ideally by the end of the second year: the department chair and/or departmental mentor will assist.

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. 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.

Lecturers and Teaching Faculty are to be assigned a formal mentor by the departmental teaching evaluation coordinator. The mentor must be a tenure-track faculty member within the department. For lecturers who were graduate students in the department, the mentor should not be the dissertation director. The mentor and mentee meet (at least) once each semester to discuss teaching and service within the department and guidance and support for job searches. The mentor should observe at least one of the mentee's courses per semester.