Appointments, Promotion and Tenure
Criteria and Procedures for The Ohio State University Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures

Effective Fall 2022, Updated March 2022
Revision Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: October 15, 2025

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: June 30, 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PREAMBLE 4

II. MISSION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EAST ASIAN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES 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 7
- **5.** Minimum Composition 7

B. *Promotion and Tenure Committee 7*

C. *Quorum 8*

D. *Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty 8*

E. *Appointment 8*

F.*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 12
- **4.** Emeritus Faculty 13
- **5.** Joint Appointments 13
- **6.** Courtesy Appointments 13

B. *Procedures 13*
- **1.** Tenure-Track Faculty 14
- **2.** Teaching Faculty 15
- **3.** Transfer from the Tenure-Track 15
- **4.** TIU Transfer 15
- **5.** Associated Faculty 16
- **6.** Joint Appointments 16
- **7.** Courtesy Appointments for Faculty 17

V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW PROCEDURES 17

A. *Documentation 18*

B. *Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty 19*
- **1.** Fourth Year Review 20
- **2.** Extension of the Tenure Clock 20

C. *Tenured Faculty 21*

D. *Teaching Faculty 21*

E. *Associated Faculty 22*

F. *Salary Recommendations 22*

VI. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS 23

A. *Criteria and Evidence That Support Promotion 23*
1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure 24
2. Promotion to Professor 27

B. *Teaching Faculty 31*
1. Promotion to Assistant Teaching Professor 31
2. Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor 31
3. Promotion to Teaching Professor 34

C. *Associated Faculty 35*
1. Promotion to Adjunct Associate Professor and Adjunct Professor 35
2. Promotion to Associate Professor and Professor with FTE below 50% 35
3. Promotion to Senior Lecturer 35
4. Promotion of Visiting Faculty 35

D. *Procedures 35*
1. Tenure-Track and Teaching Faculty 35
2. Procedures for Associated Faculty 40
3. External Evaluations 40

VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS 42

VIII. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS 42

IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING 43

A. *Student Evaluations of Teaching 43*

B. *Peer Evaluation of Teaching 43*

X. APPENDIX A: MENTORING PLAN 46

I. PREAMBLE

Matters of appointment, reappointment, review, promotion, and tenure in the Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures (DEALL) will be administered in accordance with this document. This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty; the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Chapter 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook; and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the department and its faculty are subject.

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

Revisions to this document must be consistent with the purpose of the document and with appropriate university rules and policies. Within the first year of his or her appointment or reappointment, the Chair shall review the Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure document and, in consultation with the faculty, draft revisions, as appropriate. At other times, any tenure-track faculty member of the department may propose amendments. Revisions and amendments shall be adopted after consultation with the tenure-track faculty. The chair will then forward the revised Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure document to the College, and then to the Office of Academic Affairs.

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

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

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

II. MISSION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EAST ASIAN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

The mission of the Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures is to create, advance and disseminate knowledge of East Asian languages, literatures, and cultures among scholars, students, professional institutions, public entities, and the general public in the State of Ohio, the U.S., and internationally. The department is committed to maintaining and enhancing its national and international reputation in research, education, and professional as well as public service.

The scope of the department's research expertise is designed to do justice to the fact that East Asia has been and continues to be one of the world's major drivers of innovation and commands a large corpus of written sources and oral traditions relevant to regional and global culture. Accordingly, the department comprises faculty members, whose work ranges across multiple disciplines anchored in a deep engagement with East Asian language sources; three major geographical and cultural regions of East Asia, namely, the Chinese-speaking world, Japan, and Korea; and key periods of history ranging over the last three millennia through the contemporary period.

The department's educational objective is to prepare students for careers inside and outside academia through the acquisition of an in-depth understanding of East Asia. The analytical study of our subdisciplines helps develop logical thought, awareness of the complexity of texts and of value judgements, apprehension of others' point of view, and the cultivation of imagination and innovation. The study of East Asian languages and cultures can expand creative, communicative, and cognitive capacities; can sharpen the ability to make difficult judgements and decisions; and can help develop leadership capacity.

III. DEFINITIONS

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

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

1. Tenure-Track Faculty

Appointment Reviews

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

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

2. Teaching Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

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

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

3. Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- The initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type of associated faculty members is decided by the department chair based on recommendation from the search committee.
- 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 of associated faculty are decided by the department chair in consultation with the tenure-track and teaching faculty.

Promotion Reviews

- Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have adjunct titles, tenure-track titles with service at 49% FTE or below, and lecturer titles.
- For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Sections III.A.1 or III.A.2 above.
- For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with tenure-track titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section III.A.1.
- For the promotion review of a lecturer to senior lecturer, the eligible faculty shall be all tenure-track and nonprobationary teaching faculty at the rank of associate professor and professor.

4. Conflict of Interest

Search Committee Conflict of Interest

- A member of a search committee must disclose to the committee and refrain from participation in any of the interviews, meetings, or votes that comprise the search process if the member:
  - decides to apply for the position;
  - is related to or has a close interpersonal relationship with a candidate;
  - has substantive financial ties with the candidate;
  - is dependent in some way on the candidate's services;
  - has a close professional relationship with the candidate (e.g., dissertation advisor); or
  - has collaborated extensively with the candidate or is currently collaborating with the candidate.

Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest

- A member of the eligible faculty has a conflict of interest when 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 divisional dean, will appoint one or more faculty members from another department within the college of Arts and Sciences for the review so that the minimum number of three can be obtained.

B. *Promotion and Tenure Committee*

The chair, in consultation with the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, appoints members of the eligible faculty to serve on a Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee for each tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion case and each teaching faculty promotion case that arises in the department in a given year. Each P&T Committee consists of three eligible faculty members appointed to one-year terms. In addition to tenure-track faculty at the appropriate rank, one non-probationary teaching faculty member of appropriate rank can serve on a P&T Committee when a candidate for promotion is a teaching faculty member. A P&T Committee promotion and tenure to associate professor should consist of associate professors and professors. A P&T Committee for a promotion to professor should consist only of

professors. One of the committee members, as decided by the committee, serves as the committee chair and another, also decided by the committee, serves as a Procedures Oversight Designee.

C. Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty on approved leave 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 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 only “yes” and “no” votes are permitted. Absentee ballots, proxy votes and abstentions are not permitted, but participating fully in discussions and voting via remote two-way electronic connection are allowed.

E. Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast by eligible faculty members is positive. If the top candidate receives more than half but less than two-thirds of the votes, the chair in consultation with the dean will decide whether to make an offer to the top-ranked candidate on the basis of a simple majority or to end the search and begin again.

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

F. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal is secured when two thirds of the votes cast by eligible faculty members are positive.

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

IV. APPOINTMENTS

The types of faculty appointments in the Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures include tenure-track faculty, teaching faculty, and associated faculty, the latter of which can include visiting faculty, lecturers, tenure-track faculty appointed at 49% FTE or less and adjunct faculty.

A. Criteria

The Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures is committed to making faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the department. Important considerations include the individual's record to date in teaching, research and service; the potential for professional growth in each of these areas; and the potential for collaborating with colleagues and students both within

the department and across the university in a way that will enhance the department's mission as a comprehensive East Asian languages and literatures department and attract other outstanding faculty and students to the department. No offer will be extended in the event that the search process does not yield one or more candidates who would enhance the quality of the department. The search is either cancelled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, 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

a. Instructor

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

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

b. Assistant Professor

An earned doctorate in the relevant field is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor without tenure. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the department and the profession is highly desirable. At the time of appointment to the rank of assistant professor, the individual must have a strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the ranks in a timely fashion.

An appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, and may not exceed six years, 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 or not promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the seventh year.

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

A probationary appointment may be terminated at any time subject to the notice provisions of Faculty Rule 3335-6- 08 and the provisions of paragraphs (F), (G), and (H) of Faculty Rule 3335-6-03.

c. Associate Professor

Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor and offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

It is expected that an individual appointed to the Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures faculty as an associate professor is a nationally recognized researcher with a high-quality body of scholarship, has demonstrated excellence in teaching undergraduate and graduate students, and demonstrated excellence in service/outreach to their profession and field as well as to the university. It is expected at the time of appointment to the rank of associate professor that the individual has strong potential to advance to the rank of professor in a timely fashion.

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.

d. Professor

Appointment offers at the rank of Professor and offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Appointments at the rank of professor without tenure are not possible. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

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

2. Teaching Faculty

The Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures is committed to making teaching faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of teaching in the department. These appointments exist for faculty members who focus principally on the education needs of students in the department or college. Teaching faculty members are expected to contribute to the department's research and education mission as reflected in undergraduate and graduate program development and teaching. Teaching faculty appointments are made in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-7.

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 (5) years. The initial contract 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 (3) years and for no more than five (5) years. Second and subsequent contracts for teaching professors must be for a period of at least three (3) years and no more than eight (8) years. Tenure is not granted to teaching faculty. 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. For faculty in their second and subsequent appointment terms, the teaching faculty member may be reappointed by the affirmative vote of the eligible faculty as defined in Section III.A.2. 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).

a. Teaching Instructor

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

b. Assistant Teaching Professor

A Master's degree and appropriate professional credentials demonstrating relevant experience and expertise in the field are minimum requirements for the rank of assistant teaching professor. Evidence of high-quality teaching is required, and high-quality service to the department and profession is desirable. Expectations include contribution to programmatic development, ability for collaborative work, and openness to innovation. Initial appointment to the rank of assistant teaching professor is for five years. At the end of the penultimate year, a review will take place and a decision made on another reappointment term.

c. Associate Teaching Professor

The awarding of the rank of associate teaching professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a demonstrable record of excellence as a teacher, has provided effective service, and can be expected to continue a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of the department and the mission of the university. Qualifications include knowledge of current research impacting teaching; contribution to programmatic development; ability for collaborative work; openness to innovation; and high-quality service to the department and profession.

d. Teaching Professor

The awarding of the rank of teaching professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member maintains a record of excellence in creating, developing and sustaining programs of high-quality instruction and meets, at a minimum, the department's criteria—in teaching, service, and scholarship—for promotion to this rank. The faculty member has a strong record of service relevant to the mission of the department and the mission of the university. Leadership in service at the local, state and national levels is expected.

3. Associated Faculty

Associated appointments are made for up to three years at a time. In accordance with University Rule 3335-6-08 (D), decisions regarding the appointment and renewal of associated faculty on year-to-year contracts must be made in accordance with the department criteria and procedures. Appointments of all associated faculty, with the exception of lecturer appointments, must be reviewed and approved by the College of Arts and Sciences. Lecturer appointments are handled at the department level as prescribed by the SHIFT Framework.

a. Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor

Adjunct appointments are sometimes compensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give considerable uncompensated academic service to the department, such as teaching a course, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Adjunct titles are used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to tenure-track or teaching faculty of equivalent rank. Adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Reappointment of faculty in this category requires annual review.

b. Lecturer and Senior Lecturer

Appointment as lecturers requires that the individuals have, at a minimum, a master's degree (or equivalent experience and/or expertise) in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught. In the appointment of Lecturers, the crucial criteria are teaching experience and evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction. Appointment as Senior Lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a terminal degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught or a doctorate, along with evidence of ability to provide high quality instruction; or a master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience with documentation of high quality. Lecturers and senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure, though lecturers may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer or a senior lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts cannot exceed three years per contract.

c. Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%

An earned doctorate is the minimum requirement for appointment of tenure-track titles at 49% FTE or below, either compensated or uncompensated. 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.

d. Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor

Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Visiting faculty on leave from a regular 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 are not eligible for tenure or promotion. They may not be reappointed for more than three consecutive years at 100% FTE.

4. 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 to be conferred upon retirement or resignation at the age of sixty or older with ten or more years of service or at any age with twenty-five or more years of service.

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

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

5. 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.

6. Courtesy Appointments

Occasionally the active academic involvement in this department by a tenure-track faculty member from another department at Ohio State warrants a 0% FTE (no-salary courtesy) appointment in the department. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course, or a combination of these. The appointment continues only as long as the faculty member contributes directly to the academic activities of the department. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized. Courtesy appointments are handled at the departmental level and do not require review or approval by the College of Arts and Sciences.

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.

The SHIFT (Strategic Hiring Initiative for Faculty Talent) Framework was designed to identify and recruit broad, qualified applicant pools of extraordinary scholars who are leaders in their respective fields. Deans, TIU heads, and search committee members work in partnership with the Office of Faculty Affairs

and other key stakeholders in adherence to this framework to ensure a thorough, fair, and consistent faculty search process. The framework consists of four distinct phases—each of which includes a series of core requirements (must-do action steps) and optimal practices (aspirational action steps)—followed by a fifth phase focused on preboarding and onboarding.

This department adheres in every respect to the Framework requirements as detailed at SHIFT.

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
- Letters of offer

1. Tenure-Track Faculty

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

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

The dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, in consultation with the divisional deans, authorizes the department to commence a search process. This approval may be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise.

After authorization has been received from the dean to initiate a search, the department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty members who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the department. A faculty member from another department of the university whose expertise is relevant to the search may be asked to serve on the committee.

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

If more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the department chair decides which candidate to approach first. At that time, terms of the hire, including compensation and other features of the recruitment, are discussed. The divisional dean must be consulted during this time.

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

The department is advised to discuss potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status with the Office of International Affairs. An 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

A national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates for all teaching 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 in advance by the Office of Academic Affairs. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection.

Searches for teaching faculty proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the on-campus/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 circumstances exist. Tenure or tenure eligibility is lost upon transfer, and transfers must be approved by the department chair, the college dean, and the executive vice president and provost.

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

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

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

The transfer must be approved by the Office of Academic Affairs and is dependent on the establishment of mutually agreed-upon arrangements among the affected TIU heads, college dean(s), and the faculty member. A 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

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

The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair in consultation with the tenure-track and teaching faculty.

The associated faculty position used most frequently in the department is that of lecturer. Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are made on an annual basis or semester by semester. After the initial appointment, a multiple year appointment may be offered. Renewals of appointment depend both on a satisfactory performance and on the department's need for lecturers in subsequent semesters. There is never a presumption that a lecturer who teaches one semester will be offered an appointment in subsequent semesters.

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department. Once the tenure-track faculty approves the proposed appointment or reappointment, the chair extends an offer.

Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Adjunct appointments may be renewed only when the uncompensated academic service for which the appointment was made continues. There is never a presumption that an associated appointment is continued without formal renewal.

Visiting appointments are limited to three consecutive years at 100% FTE.

6. Joint Appointments

The department may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another Ohio State TIU as described in Section IV.A.5. 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.

7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Any member of the department faculty may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for an Ohio State faculty member from another tenure unit if that faculty member meets the criteria for such an appointment as stated in Section IV.A.6. After discussion and approval by the eligible faculty, a courtesy appointment is made by the chair. The chair reviews courtesy appointments every three years to determine if they continue to be justified and takes recommendations for non-renewal before the eligible faculty for a vote. Similarly, any member of the faculty may request that the faculty consider the desirability of continuing courtesy appointments, and the faculty will take appropriate action.

V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW PROCEDURES

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

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

The department chair may designate the responsibility for annual performance and merit reviews to appropriate unit administrators. The designee or a subcommittee of the eligible faculty may provide a written assessment to the chair. The written assessment of the subcommittee for the purposes of the annual review will not be shared with the faculty under review. The chair's letter is the sole document governing the annual review process. The chair's letter will be written in accordance with Office of Academic Affairs Guidance and will contain two sections:

- An explicit judgement in accordance with the three mandated rubrics of "meets expectations," "exceeds expectations," and "does not meet expectations" for the purposes of assessing the faculty member's performance in their capacity of state employee.
- A narrative section commenting on (1) on the faculty member's trajectory within the framework of the three mandated rubrics and (2) the faculty member's progress in terms of their next major career milestone (e.g., promotion and tenure, promotion to professor or to teaching associate professor or teaching professor, senior lecturer, reappointment).

The department chair must schedule a face-to-face meeting with all probationary faculty as part of the annual review. For all other types of faculty, a face-to-face meeting can be called either by the faculty member or by the department chair or the chair's designee.

In all cases, at the departmental level, accountability for the annual review process resides with the department chair. However, because reviews are based on the materials provided, failure to submit the required documentation by the college deadline may lead to a negative evaluation. Once the department chair submits their letter to the divisional dean, the dean and the executive vice president and provost will separately evaluate whether they concur with the chair's judgements pertaining to the three mandated rubrics ("does not meet expectations," "meets expectations," "exceeds expectations"). If the faculty member disagrees with the chair's rating, they can appeal the rating to the dean after the chair submits their letter to the dean.

Depending on their appointment type, the annual reviews of faculty members are based on expected performance in teaching, research, and/or service as set forth in the department's policy on faculty duties and responsibilities, and workload (in the department Pattern of Administration); on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. The review of faculty with budgeted joint appointments must include input from the joint appointment TIU head for every annual evaluation cycle. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on goals specific to the individual in the joint unit. Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.

The department chair is required (per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35), to include a reminder in the annual 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 are not merely descriptive summaries of activities but instead 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 will also describe, when appropriate, actions that the unit or its head will undertake to support the faculty member in achieving goals. When relevant, annual review letters will recognize engagement with partners beyond the university, which may take the form of research/creative work, teaching, service, and/or commercialization. Department chairs may also comment upon and/or recognize ways in which individual faculty members exemplify and reinforce the university's shared values, including units cultures that are inclusive, 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.

A. Documentation

The annual performance review of every compensated faculty member requires that the documentation described below be submitted to the department chair. Annual review and all other personnel procedures (e.g., promotion and tenure, promotion, reappointment) are separate from one another. In other words, all compensated faculty need to submit documentation for the annual review process no later than the first Monday in February.

- Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline (*all faculty*)
- Updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)
- Detailed SEI/SSLE for the calendar year and for available career record at Ohio State (*all faculty*)

- Supplementary document reflecting individual workload assignments for the calendar year under review (retrospective) and the next calendar year (prospective) (*all tenure-track and teaching faculty*)

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

The chair reserves the right to request copies of published or forthcoming work for the purposes of the annual review. Any published materials presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or some other final form that documents actual publication. An author's manuscript does not constitute documentation of publication.

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

Procedures for the annual reviews of probationary tenure-track faculty are governed by Faculty Rule 3335-6-04, as well as by policies determined by the Office of Academic Affairs and contained in the Policies and Procedures Handbook.

Every probationary 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 meets with each probationary faculty to discuss their performance, and future plans, and goals.

The department chair's review is informed by input from each faculty member's Annual Review Committee following review and discussion among the full eligible faculty. The Annual Review Committee is charged with providing a set of written recommendations to the Chair for probationary faculty members. It shall:

- Select among its members the chair of the committee.
- Review the annual review dossier prepared by the probationary faculty in adherence to College of Arts and Sciences and Office of Academic Affairs guidelines.
- Invite the probationary faculty to discuss their annual review materials in an interview; the faculty member may submit to the committee a written statement detailing their accomplishments in teaching, research, and service.
- Produce and submit to the chair a written report of the evaluation and recommendation on the renewal or the appointment following review and discussion of the full eligible faculty.

If the department chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The department chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The department chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the divisional dean. In addition, the annual

review becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the written comments, if provided).

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

1. Fourth Year Review

During the fourth year of probationary period, this mandatory review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exceptions that external evaluations are optional, and the dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. In addition, the P&T Committee responsible for assisting in managing the fourth-year review will consist of at least three (not two) tenured faculty. A separate annual review must also be completed following the procedures outlined in the Faculty Annual Review, Post-Tenure-Review, and Reappointment Policy.

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

The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

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

Renewal of the appointment of a probationary faculty member for the fifth year requires the approval of the divisional dean. In cases where the divisional dean concurs with a 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 divisional dean recommends nonrenewal of a faculty member's probationary contract, the case will be referred to the college's Promotion and Tenure Committee, which will review the case, vote and make a recommendation to the dean. The dean, in consultation with the divisional dean, makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

2. Extension of the Tenure Clock

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure-track faculty member may extend the probationary period. Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (E) does likewise for reducing the probationary period. A faculty member remains on duty regardless of extensions or reductions to the probationary period, and annual reviews are conducted in every probationary year regardless of time

extended or reduced. Approved extensions or reductions do not limit the department's right to recommend nonrenewal of an appointment during an annual review.

C. Tenured Faculty

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the professors in the unit who comment on the faculty member's performance in relation to department and individual goals and on progress toward promotion. The department chair conducts an independent assessment; provides an opportunity for a face-to-face meeting with the faculty member to discuss their performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review, and the department chair may respond in writing if warranted. The annual review includes the opportunity to have a face-to-face meeting. Such an optional face-to-face meeting can either be called by the associate professor or by the chair.

Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the tenure initiating unit, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring on the part of professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty. The department chair prepares an annual review letter against these expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review and the department chair may respond in writing.

If an associate professor or professor has an administrative role constituting at least 5% of their annual workload, the impact of that role and other assignments will be evaluated in the annual review.

D. Teaching Faculty

All probationary and non-probationary teaching faculty members must be reviewed annually. The performance and merit review process for probationary and non-probationary teaching 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. Annual reviews are conducted during the spring semester.

In the penultimate contract year of a probationary 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 a probationary faculty member's position will continue, and for all nonprobationary faculty, 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

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 their performance, future plans, and goals.

The department chair's decision on renewal of the appointment is final. If the decision is to renew, the 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, who prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance, future plans, and goals. No later than October 15 of the final year of the appointment, the department chair will decide whether or not to reappoint. The department chair's decision on reappointment is final.

F. 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 department chair makes annual salary recommendations to the divisional dean who may modify them. Meritorious performance in teaching, research, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. The time frame for assessing performance will be the past 24-36 months, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity, especially those noticed in the immediate past 12 months. In order to support the success of carrying out the department's mission across all domains, the department favors a balanced approach to all workload areas.

Specifically, "meets expectations" across all relevant categories, in combination with documented progress toward the next major career milestone, will be the primary grounds for favorable consideration in the Annual Merit Compensation Process. "Exceeds expectations" in any category will also be given consideration in the Annual Merit Compensation Process, but primarily to the extent that such performance advances progress toward major career milestones. For tenure-track, tenured, and teaching faculty, a "does not meet expectations" rating in any category that is upheld by the divisional dean and/or by the executive vice president and provost will make the faculty member ineligible for a merit increase that year.

In making the recommendations, the chair also considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate. In addition, 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.

Except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increase, all funds for annual salary increases are directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and assuring, to the extent possible given financial constraints, that salaries reflect the market and are internally equitable.

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

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

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

VI. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

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

A. Criteria and Evidence That Support Promotion

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

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

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

1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C) provides the following general criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

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

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 all criteria for promotion in all aspects of performance.

Excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service includes professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics.

In the College of Arts and Sciences, promotion to associate professor with tenure requires excellence in both scholarship and teaching, where scholarship is defined as research, scholarly and/or creative work. The service contribution during the probationary period of assistant professors is limited by design. The most important judgment is that the candidate will achieve excellence in service in the future. The substantial probability that a high rate of quality research/creative work and excellence in teaching and service will continue needs to be established. The claim that awarding tenure to the candidate will improve the overall quality and standing of the unit needs to be supported.

The accomplishments listed below in the areas of research, teaching, and service are expected of faculty for promotion to associate professor with Tenure in the department. Tenure is not awarded below the rank of associate professor at The Ohio State University. In the evaluation of untenured associate professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
High standard of quality in direct teaching activities	• Student-experience survey (SEI/SSLE and departmental instruments) noting command of subject matter, enthusiasm, effective material selection and organization, creative use of various instructional modes, appropriate content and level

	of delivery to create an optimal learning environment, timely feedback and respectful treatment of students • Summary of class comments demonstrate up-to-date instructional content • Required peer evaluation of teaching • High enrollments in elective classes • Nomination or selection for teaching awards as documented in core dossier
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.	• Student progress and noteworthy student accomplishments • Evaluation of teaching by students and peers.
Continued growth as a teacher	• Demonstrated improvement via student-opinion surveys and peer evaluations • Self-assessment by the candidate through narrative on teaching included in core dossier

RESEARCH	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
A body of focused research that contributes to knowledge in area of candidate's expertise and relationship to their scholarly agenda and unit mission	• A monograph (either published or in press, peer reviewed) in a high-quality outlet (standard expectation for P&T in literature, folklore, media, and performance studies) • Textbooks and instructional software or other technology-based instructional materials (either published or in press, peer reviewed) in a high quality outlet (standard expectation for P&T in language pedagogy); judged as scholarly works to the extent that they utilize or present new methodologies or incorporate ideas from original research, explicate their design, innovative features, efficacy and theoretical significance, and are pertinent to the academic mission of the department • Creation and dissemination of significant linguistic corpora • The above pieces of scholarship recognized by external peer reviewers as part of the external submission and the P&T solicitation of external letters as having made a substantial contribution to the discipline or a field of study
Regular high-quality scholarly production (major)	• Journal articles (peer-reviewed) (a series of substantive articles in high quality outlet is a standard expectation for P&T in linguistics)

	• Journal articles (editor-reviewed) • Book chapters (peer reviewed, invited, editor-reviewed) • An edited or co-edited volume of scholarship with a substantial introduction (peer-reviewed) • Guest-editing a special issue of an important journal in the candidate's field • A book-length translation project, preferably with a substantial introduction that explains the historical, aesthetic, cultural and social significance and/or with a critical scholarly apparatus • The above pieces of scholarship recognized by external peer reviewers as part of the external submission and the P&T solicitation of external letters as having made a substantial contribution to the discipline or a field of study
Gain an emerging national reputation as a scholar	• Participation in significant international and national scholarly meetings (e.g., organizing panels, presenting papers, serving as discussant) • Invitations to collaborate in panels at national conference • Invitation to submit work to special issues and edited volumes • Invitation to specialized scholarly symposia • Published reviews of candidate's published work • Publications in the fields of study in reputable journals and/or with reputable publishers • Citations (especially important in Linguistics) • Major national or international research funding awards • Scholarly prizes and awards

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Demonstrated capability to achieve excellence in service to one or more publics (department, university, Columbus community, state of Ohio, the nation, and/or professional organizations) in the future	• Diligent service as peer reviewer of teaching for teaching and associated faculty • Diligent service on appointed and elected departmental and college ad hoc and standing committees (e.g., search committees, award committees, Honors and Scholars liaison) • Reviewer for departmental and other fellowship competitions • Quality contributions to initiatives spearheaded by other ASC units (e.g., CLLC, T&I Program, Humanities Institute, Center for Ethnic Studies, etc.)

	• Organizing quality programming (talks, events, workshops) for department and college • Capably serving as a faculty advisor for a recognized Ohio State student organization Serving • Regular contributions to departmental and college publicity initiatives for the department (e.g., news items, brochures, social media, website and more) • Serving as Graduate School representative on examination committees • Completion of peer review for book manuscripts • Completion of peer review for journal articles • Leadership role or substantial service in professional conference organization • Leadership role or substantial service in public-facing scholarly projects • Evaluative statements concerning work ethic, dependability, integrity, collegiality, and related qualities noted as part of annual review letters. • Annual review evaluations documenting excellence in service to department or college • Recognition, awards, and prizes for service to department or college or university or professional body

2. Promotion to Professor

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C) establishes the following general criteria for promotion to the rank of professor.

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

The specific criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to Professor in the department are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and increasing quality of contributions and a record of continuing professional growth. Specific criteria required for promotion to the rank of professor in this department are shown in the tables below.

TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
High standard of quality in direct teaching activities	• Student-experience survey (SEI/SSLE and departmental instruments) noting command of subject matter, enthusiasm, effective material

	selection and organization, creative use of various instructional modes, appropriate content and level of delivery to create an optimal learning environment, timely feedback and respectful treatment of students • Summary of class comments demonstrate up-to-date instructional content • Required peer evaluation of teaching • High enrollments in elective classes • Teaching awards as documented in core dossier
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.	• Student progress and noteworthy student accomplishments • Evaluation of teaching by students and peers.
High standard of quality in advising and mentoring in a number that is appropriate relative to the department's graduate student/faculty ratio, the undergraduate major numbers, and the faculty member's area of expertise	• List of undergraduate theses, MA theses, doctoral dissertations on which candidate served as an advisor or committee member • Provided appropriate mentoring to Graduate Teaching Associates under their supervision • Prestigious academic awards and honors awarded to current students • Professional success of current and former students as outlined in the core dossier
Continued growth as a teacher	• Demonstrated improvement via student-opinion surveys and peer evaluations • Self-assessment by the candidate through narrative on teaching included in core dossier • Record of participation in workshops, webinars and other professionalization opportunities focused on advising/mentoring • Completed courses at the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning and at other OSU-based units • Awarded endorsements by the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning

RESEARCH	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
A new body of focused research published since the last promotion that contributes to knowledge in area of candidate's expertise and relationship to their scholarly agenda and unit mission	• A monograph (either published or in press, peer reviewed) in a high-quality outlet • An edited or co-edited volume of scholarship, preferably with a substantial introduction • A book-length translation project, preferably with a substantial introduction that explains the historical, aesthetic, cultural and social significance and/or with a critical scholarly apparatus

	• Textbooks and instructional software or other technology-based instructional materials (either published or in press, peer reviewed) in a high quality outlet (standard expectation for P&T in language pedagogy); judged as scholarly works to the extent that they utilize or present new methodologies or incorporate ideas from original research, explicate their design, innovative features, efficacy and theoretical significance, and are pertinent to the academic mission of the department • Creation and dissemination of major linguistic corpora • The above pieces of scholarship recognized by external peer reviewers as part of the external submission and the P&T solicitation of external letters as having made a substantial contribution to the discipline or a field of study
Regular high-quality scholarly production (major)	• Journal articles (peer-reviewed) (a series of substantive articles in high quality outlet is a standard expectation in linguistics) • Journal articles (editor-reviewed) • Book chapters (peer reviewed, invited, editor-reviewed) • Guest-editing a special issue of an important journal in the candidate's field • Conference proceedings • Co-publishing with advisees and alumni • The above pieces of scholarship recognized by external peer reviewers as part of the external submission and the P&T solicitation of external letters as having made a substantial contribution to the discipline or a field of study
Established national distinction as a scholar and and emerging international reputation	• Invitations to collaborate in international research teams • Invitation to present keynote, plenary or colloquium speaker at reputable international venues • Invitations to guest teach at other universities • Third-party translation of candidate's scholarly work into East Asian languages and/or self-translation with major press • Citations (especially important in Linguistics) • Scholarly prizes and awards

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met

Demonstrated excellence in service to the department or college	• Capable service in major departmental roles (e.g., Chair, Vice-Chair, Graduate Studies Director, Undergraduate Studies Director, Language Director) • Leadership roles or participation in interdisciplinary, university-based centers, institutes and academies • Appointed and elected university ad hoc or standing committees, councils, task forces, and boards • Administrative responsibilities including the direction/coordination of programs or offices, preparation of grants received in support of the institution • Contributions to initiatives spearheaded by university units • Quality indicators of the outcomes of contributions (e.g., roles in major reports issued, policy changes recommended and implemented, and administrative units restructured) • Reviewer for Graduate School and other fellowship competitions • Organizing quality programming (talks, events, workshops, conferences) of significance for department, college, or the university • Supporting the land-grant mission of the university through public outreach (K-16 schools, media, government, business) • Annual evaluations documenting excellence in service to department or college or university • Recognition, awards, and prizes for service to department or college or university
Demonstrated significant service to a profession or field	• Leadership role at a professional journal (editor, co-editor, associate editor) • Service on editorial board of professional journal • Leadership role in a professional organization • Solicitation for peer review for book manuscripts • Solicitation for peer review for journal articles • Leadership or substantial service in professional conference organization • Consultation activity with industry, other universities, government, or field-specific organizations • Evidence of professional expertise to public and private entities as a reviewer for funding proposals, study sections, external examiner,

	tenure review, and member of panels and commissions • Evidence of building strong relationships with international partners in East Asia (e.g., research collaborations, study abroad, visiting scholars and students) • Available evidence (e.g., letters from committee chairs, etc.) of the quality of service • Evaluative statements concerning work ethic, dependability, integrity, collegiality, and related qualities as noted in annual review letters. • Awards and prizes for service to 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.

B. Teaching Faculty

1. Promotion to Assistant Teaching Professor

For promotion to assistant teaching professor, a faculty member must either have completed their doctoral degree (literature, linguistics, media studies, performance studies, language pedagogy) or hold an MA or other terminal degree (language teaching) along with experience equivalent to a doctoral degree in the relevant field 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.

2. Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor

For promotion to associate teaching professor the department requires convincing evidence that the faculty member has a demonstrable record of excellence as a teacher, has provided effective service, and can be expected to continue a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of the department and to the mission of the University. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to

associate teaching professor are shown in the table below. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
High standard of quality in direct teaching activities	• Student-experience survey (SEI/SSLE and departmental instruments) noting command of subject matter, enthusiasm, effective material selection and organization, creative use of various instructional modes, appropriate content and delivery to create an optimal learning environment, timely feedback and respectful treatment of students • Summary of class comments demonstrate up-to-date instructional content • Required peer evaluation of teaching • High enrollments in elective classes • Developing and piloting innovative instructional resources • Nomination or selection for university-based or external teaching awards as documented in core dossier
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.	• Student progress and noteworthy student accomplishments • Coaching of students for regional target language speech contests • Individualized student advising for targeted learning and career opportunities • Participation in intensive summer teaching programs • Evaluation of teaching by students and peers. • Continued growth as a teacher through demonstrated improvement via student surveys and peer evaluations • Self-assessment by the candidate through narrative on teaching included in core dossier

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Demonstrated capability to enhance and enrich the student experience within the department	• Provided appropriate mentoring to GTAs under their supervision through classroom

	observations and pedagogical guidance in accordance with departmental formative teaching evaluation criteria • Successful co-coordination of language instruction across all levels and delivery modalities as reflected in SLEE and other student-experience surveys • Successful coordination of large enrollment content courses as reflected in SLEE and other student-experience surveys • Provided formal and informal mentoring for associated faculty through peer evaluation of teaching and pedagogical guidance in accordance with departmental formative teaching evaluation criteria • Development of revised and new Individual Instruction (I.I.) lesson plans that receive satisfactory ratings in course evaluations across instructors • Development of textbooks and digital resources for use within the department, and/or nationally • Development of AI instruction and other technology templates for broad-based use within the department, the university, and/or nationally
Demonstrated capability to achieve excellence in program building	• Participation in Center for Languages, Literatures, and Cultures and other university events to support undergraduate student involvement in language learning and area studies • Organization of well-attended undergraduate student enrichment and innovative recruitment, retention, and alumni events for the department • Soliciting and securing grants related to the improvement of instructional delivery or/or materials • Development and management of experiential learning and education abroad opportunities for students as well as other program-related services • Organization of pedagogically focused enrichment events for graduate students

Demonstrated record of continuous professional development	• Continued professional development through course completion and endorsements via the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning, the Center for Languages, Literatures, and Cultures, and other university bodies • Continuing education through in person and/or virtual workshops on pedagogy-related content • Continuing education through participation in regional professional conferences with a pedagogical focus
Demonstrated capability to achieve excellence in service to one or more publics (department, university, Columbus community, state of Ohio, the nation, and/or professional organizations) in the future	• Service on departmental search committees for associated faculty and student-centered scholarship committees • Potential to serve as Language Director and/or Undergraduate Studies Director for the department as documented through coordination of curricular activities and/or relevant leadership training. • Serving as departmental representative in university bodies • Advising student organizations • Development of online component of courses for delivery across the state of Ohio • Enlarging the footprint of the department's instructional impact through participation in cross-regional course share arrangements • Representing the department in regional and national professional bodies and/or supporting regional conferences and workshops focused on pedagogy

3. Promotion to Teaching Professor

For promotion to teaching professor, the department requires convincing evidence that the faculty member maintains a record of excellence in creating, developing, and sustaining programs of high-quality instruction. Evidence of scholarly publication is expected, typically, a book, a textbook, translation, works of synthesis, edited volumes, scholarly papers, peer-reviewed research articles, in leading professional journals. Scholarly publication and other scholarly activities occur in diverse media, including a bound, printed form, current formats of stand-alone electronic media, or on the Internet. Regardless of the medium, the same standard of clearly demonstrated excellence applies. The faculty member has a strong record of service relevant to the mission of the department and the mission of the University. Some service at the local, state and national levels is also expected. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

C. Associated Faculty

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.b.

4. Promotion of Visiting Faculty

Visiting faculty members are not eligible for promotion.

D. Procedures

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rules 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

a. Candidate Responsibilities

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

Dossier

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

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

Teaching

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

- Cumulative SEI/SSLE reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class.
- Narrative summary, prepared by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, of departmental Course Evaluation Forms, or any course evaluation forms developed by the faculty member.
- Peer Evaluation of Teaching reports, as detailed in Section IX of this document.
- Copies (or URL) of original, and substantial pedagogical materials that are not published but are used regularly in the department's courses. These must be accompanied by documents, such as course syllabi, that prove the use of the materials in department courses.
- Teaching activities as listed in the core dossier.
- Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.

Scholarship

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

- Copies of all scholarly publication. Materials accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final stage of preparation.
- Candidate may wish to submit, or the committee may ask to see the review letters that were sent to a publisher who had requested a critical appraisal of a manuscript or, in the case of a software, a beta testing edition.
- Documentation of grants and contracts received.
- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate, e.g. published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, or grants and contract proposals that have been submitted.

Service

The time period for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion, 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 if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

- Service activities as listed in the core dossier.
- Any available documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier. Candidates cannot solicit such documentation, but can ask the TIU head to solicit written input from those who can speak to this for inclusion in the dossier.

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

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document

Candidates must indicate the APT under which they wish to be reviewed. Candidates 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 last reappointment in the case of teaching faculty), whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, for tenure-track faculty, the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year. If a candidate wishes to be reviewed under an APT other than the current approved version available here, a copy of the APT document under which the candidate has elected to be reviewed must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the department.

External Evaluations

If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed according to department guidelines.

The candidate may add no more than three additional names but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names. The department chair decides whether removal is justified (see Section VI.D.3 below.)

b. Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review of each candidate as described below.

- Early spring: Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) who will serve in this role for the following year. The POD cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The POD's responsibilities are described here.
- Mid spring: Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair and assist the chair in formulating the final list of external reviewers to be contacted by the chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from faculty at institutions that are members of the Association of American Universities (AAU) and/or the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA) (see Section VI.C below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program that is not a member of these organizations.

- Early autumn: Summarize the departmental discursive student evaluations of teaching for the candidate.
- Early autumn: Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made to the dossier before the formal review process begins.
- Mid autumn: Meet with the candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- Mid autumn: Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty along with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The Promotion and Tenure committee does not vote as a body on cases. The committee clearly presents its analysis of the candidate's record to the eligible faculty.
- 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 include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting. The revised document must specify each of the unit's criteria in teaching, scholarship and service, summarize the faculty perspectives on whether the candidate has met each criterion, and include the sources of evidence in the dossier on which these perspectives are based. The completed written evaluation and recommendation is forwarded to the department chair.
- Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

c. Committee of the Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

The committee of the eligible faculty shall:

- Review this APT document each year and recommend proposed revisions to the faculty
- To consider annually, in early spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A simple majority of votes cast on a request must be affirmative 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 3335-6-04 only once. Faculty Rule 3335-7-08 makes the same provision for non-probationary teaching faculty. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists

that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.

- A decision by the 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.

- Assist the department chair in forming the Promotion and Tenure Committees for all cases of promotion and tenure.
- Review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed and voted on.
- Attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance. Participate in discussion of every case; and vote.

d. Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- Determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. (The department must ensure that such questions are asked of all candidates in a non-discriminatory manner). For tenure-track assistant professors, the 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.
- Early spring: Form a Promotion and Tenure committee for each candidate for promotion and/or tenure or reappointment and appoint its chair, in consultation with the committee members.
- Mid spring: solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the chair, and the candidate for P&T and promotion cases (see Section VI.D.3 below.)
- Review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this department. The 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.
- 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.
- Charge each member of the Eligible Faculty to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- 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.
- Attend the meetings of the Eligible Faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions that are raised during the meeting. The chair may not vote. In addition, at the request of the Eligible Faculty, the chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the Eligible Faculty members.
- Mid-autumn: Provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the Eligible Faculty’s completed evaluation and recommendation.

- Explain to the Eligible Faculty any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the eligible faculty.
- Inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department's 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 days of 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 they expect to submit comments.
- Provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- Forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline.
- Receive the Promotion and Tenure Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the head of the other TIU by the date requested.

2. Procedures for Associated Faculty

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

3. External Evaluations

This department will seek external evaluations predominately from evaluators at institutions with membership in the American Association of Universities (AAU) or the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA). Justification will be provided in each case when a suggested evaluator is from a program that is not a member of the AAU or BTAA.

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

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for promotion for teaching faculty or associated faculty unless a significant amount of scholarship is required for promotion. The decision to seek external evaluations for a teaching or associated faculty member will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

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 guidelines of the College of Arts and Sciences, the department will primarily obtain evaluations from faculty at institutions that are members of the Association of American Universities (AAU) and the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA). To the extent that excellent faculty in various subfields in our disciplines are also found at top-rated universities in Europe, Australia, and East Asia, we will also consider reviewers from international institutions where appropriate and approved by the College of Arts and Sciences. Justification will be provided in each case in which a suggested evaluator is from a program that is not part of AAU or BTAA.
- is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's research (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post doctoral mentor of the candidate (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, institutional affiliation, and rank at the affiliated institution. The department will solicit evaluations only from professors with institutional affiliations predominately in the universities 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.

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the chair, and the candidate. 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, a brief written justification will be provided, 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. The research credentials of the evaluators will 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 will 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. Up to two emeritus professors are acceptable if they are active researchers. The department will structure invitations to external reviewers to ensure that the final group of letters received does not include any scholars from the same institution.

If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Section B(3) of Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event

that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor the department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will ascertain by the fastest means available whether or not potential referees are willing to write letters of evaluation within the stipulated time. After a final list of referees has been arrived at conforming to the aforementioned constraints, the chair of the department writes formal letters of invitation and sends out materials. Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, one or two additional letters beyond the required five may be sought, and they are solicited no later than the end of the spring semester prior to the review year.

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, e.g., requesting permission from the Office of Academic Affairs to exclude that letter from the dossier. It is in the candidate's self-interest to assure that there is no ethical or procedural lapse, or the appearance of such a lapse, in the course of the review process.

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

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

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

VIII. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS

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

IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

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

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

In no case should the evaluation of teaching rely exclusively on quantitative instruments such as the SSLE. Evaluation of teaching should also be contextual, taking into account specific challenges of teaching different kinds of material to diverse audiences, and situating each year's performance in relation to previous years and to goals set by the department.

Student and peer evaluations of teaching provide tools for assessing faculty teaching effectiveness and for providing faculty with regular opportunities for improvement.

A. Student Evaluations of Teaching

Use of the online Student Survey of Learning Experience (SSLE) or Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI, prior to Autumn 2025) is required in every course offered in this department. Faculty members should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if students will be asked to complete the evaluation using a mobile application. The faculty member must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation. The faculty member should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and to provide feedback that can be taken into account in future teaching. When a small proportion of the class completes the evaluation, the resulting information has little value either for improving instruction or for performance evaluation.

In addition to the SSLE/SEI, faculty members are strongly encouraged to gather discursive course evaluation from students, using one of the two departmental course evaluation forms or one developed by the faculty member. All such evaluation forms completed by students are filed in the departmental office and are included as documentation for teaching in reviewing the faculty member for promotion and tenure. Faculty should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high to distribute the form. The instructor(s) or the GTA(s) associated with the course may not be present while students complete the evaluation forms or handle the completed evaluation forms until course grades for all students have been submitted to the Registrar. A designated person other than the instructor or the GTA for the course should return the completed forms to the departmental office in an envelope where they will be held until the faculty member has submitted final course grades.

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.

Faculty peer review of teaching aims for an informed assessment that recognizes and encourages efforts to improve instruction. The review includes comments on the course's goals, syllabus, and teaching materials. Reviewers ascertain what the observed class hour will focus on and how these activities fit into the syllabus as a whole. Effective observation and comments depend on such preparatory and follow-up steps. GTAs who work under the faculty member reviewed are also asked to comment on the supervision and guidance they have received.

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

Each year, the Annual Review Committee for probationary faculty conducts peer evaluation of teaching for that faculty member. During the year when a faculty member is undergoing review for promotion and tenure or for promotion, the Promotion and Tenure Committee for that faculty member either conducts the peer evaluation of teaching or solicits other members of the eligible faculty to conduct the Peer Evaluation of Teaching. For associate professors not being reviewed for promotion and professors, the chair, in consultation with the faculty, solicits individual faculty members to conduct it. Faculty members outside of DEALL may be solicited to conduct a peer evaluation of teaching, if the area of expertise, the rank of the faculty member being reviewed, or the specific nature of the course warrants such an arrangement. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute the responsibility for peer evaluation of teaching among the eligible faculty to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the department. Although there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible.

The responsibilities of the peer reviewers of teaching are as follows:

- To review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and teaching faculty at least once per year during the probationary period, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned in the course of each probationary year. When assistant professors are reviewed for tenure and promotion, they are required to have a minimum of five peer evaluations of teaching from the probationary period. 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.

- To review the teaching of tenured associate professors and nonprobationary assistant teaching professors and nonprobationary associate teaching professors at least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a three-year period and of having at least two peer reviews of teaching since the last promotion or reappointment review, whichever is more recent, before the commencement of a promotion or reappointment review.
- To review the teaching of tenured professors and nonprobationary teaching professors at least once every four years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review. When nonprobationary clinical/teaching professors and nonprobationary professional practice professors are reviewed for reappointment, they are required to have a minimum of two peer evaluations of instruction since the last promotion or reappointment review, whichever is more recent
- To review the teaching of associated faculty with multiple year appointments at least once every other year;

- To review, upon the department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching; and
- To review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning.

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

Regularly scheduled peer evaluation of teaching (i.e. the first four situations listed above) is comprehensive and includes, in addition to classroom visitation, review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and exams. These reviews are both summative and formative, i.e. they provide both an assessment of the faculty member's teaching for use in annual and promotion reviews, and advice to improve the faculty member's teaching. At the beginning of the semester, the reviewee shares a list of preferred dates with the reviewer.

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 and curricular choices given the goals of the course (e.g., survey as opposed to required major course), implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and appropriateness of approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. For reviews of probationary faculty, 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). As part of its evaluation the reviewer may examine copies of the faculty member's SEI/SSLE summaries from recent years, and where student opinion is mixed to negative, the peer reviewer attempts "to identify whether those views reflects aspects of instruction or course design that could be improved." In so doing, peer reviewers are to bear in mind that they have observed only one or a few classes out of the semester and moreover have a very different level of knowledge compared to students. Consequently, their assessment may differ considerably from that of the majority of students.

At the conclusion of the classroom visit(s) for a probationary faculty member’s review, the reviewer meets with the faculty member to provide feedback. For all faculty reviews, the reviewer submits a written report to the department chair, copied to the faculty member before the end of the semester of review. Written reports of peer evaluation of teaching should focus not only on classroom performance but also on curricular choices, implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and engagement with current disciplinary knowledge. The faculty member may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond in writing to those comments if desired. All such comments are appended to the report for inclusion in the faculty member's promotion and tenure dossier, unless the faculty member requests that the comments be excluded.

X. APPENDIX A: MENTORING PLAN

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

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

Mentees who would like additional mentorship support or otherwise believe that their current mentoring relationship is not meeting their needs should discuss the issue with the department chair or designee (e.g., P&T committee chair). The department chair 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.