

**Appointments, Promotion, and
Tenure
Criteria and Procedures for
The Ohio State University
Department of Evolution, Ecology,
and Organismal Biology**

Approved by the Faculty May 11th, 2023

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: May 16, 2024

Revision Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: November 11, 2025

Table of Contents

I. Preamble	4
II. Department Mission	4
III. Definitions	5
A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty	5
1. Tenure-track Faculty	5
2. Teaching Faculty	5
3. Research Faculty	6
4. Associated Faculty	6
5. Conflict of Interest	7
6. Minimum Composition	8
B. Quorum	8
C. Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty	8
1. Appointment	8
2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion	8
IV. Appointments	8
A. Criteria	8
1. Tenure-track Faculty	9
2. Teaching Faculty	10
3. Research Faculty	10
4. Associated Faculty	11
5. Regional Campus Faculty	11
6. Emeritus Faculty	12
7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	12
B. Procedures	12
1. Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus	13
2. Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus	14
3. Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus	15
4. Transfer from the Tenure Track	15
5. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	15
6. Regional Campus Faculty	15
7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	16
V. Annual Performance and Merit Review	16
A. Documentation	17
B. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus	17
1. Fourth-Year Review	17
2. Extension of the Tenure Clock	18
C. Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus	18
D. Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus	18
E. Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus	19
F. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	19
G. Regional Campus Faculty	19
H. Salary Recommendations	20

VI. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	20
A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion	20
1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.....	20
2. Promotion to Professor	23
3. Teaching Faculty	24
4. Research Faculty	25
5. Associated Faculty.....	25
6. Regional Campus Faculty.....	25
B. Procedures	26
<u>1.</u> Tenure-Track, Teaching, and Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus	26
<u>2.</u> Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	31
<u>3.</u> Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty	31
<u>4.</u> External Evaluations.....	32
VII. Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals	33
VIII. Seventh-Year Reviews	34
IX. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching	34
A. Student Evaluation of Teaching	34
B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching (see the Appendix for more on the peer evaluation process).....	34
X. Appendix: Good Teaching Defined and Peer Review Processes	36

I. Preamble

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

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

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

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

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

II. Department Mission

The mission of the Department of Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology (henceforth, EEOB or the department) is to discover, derive, and disseminate an understanding of biodiversity. This includes understanding how evolutionary and ecological processes create variation and pattern in organisms, populations, species, communities, and ecosystems as well as the effects of interactions among that biological diversity. We fulfill this mission through research and teaching; through collaborations across disciplines; in the context of laboratory, museum, field, and modeling studies; and from molecular to global scales. We are dedicated to the application of our basic research to solving applied local and global problems and to promoting understanding of the natural world; we have a rich tradition of blending basic and applied research. Our faculty and staff strive to produce the highest quality research and to prepare excellent scientists, leaders, and well-informed citizens through undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral education and public outreach. We strive for leadership in our scholarly disciplines combined with excellence in the classroom. To those ends, our service to the university and the community is built on the strength of a collegial workplace and the free flow of ideas.

As necessary components of this mission, the department is committed to continuous improvement through regular scrutiny of the undergraduate and graduate curricula; the hiring of tenure-track faculty and other personnel who enhance or have the strong potential to enhance the department's quality in the areas of teaching, research, and service; the recruitment and retention of an intellectually diverse workforce and student body; the creation of a welcoming community; and the development and maintenance of a physical and intellectual environment that fosters those activities.

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 EEOB.

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

The committee's chair is appointed by the department chair and has a term of service is three years, with reappointment possible.

1. Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring) review of an assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track and 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.

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

2. Teaching Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **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. Research Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

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

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

4. Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- The initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type), of compensated associated faculty is decided by the department chair in consultation with Vice Chair of Undergraduate Studies (VCUS) based on recommendations 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 college dean.
- For reappointments of associated faculty members, the eligible faculty are all those with nonprobationary teaching titles and tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank than the candidate.

Promotion Reviews

- Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have adjunct titles, tenure track titles with service at 49% FTE or below, and lecturer titles.
- For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track, teaching, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Sections III.A.1, 2 or 3 above.

- For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with tenure-track titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section III.A.1.
- The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the department chair in consultation with VCUS.

5. Conflict of Interest

Search Committee Conflict of Interest

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

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

Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest

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

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

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

6. Minimum Composition

In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the department chair, after consulting with the dean, will appoint a faculty member from another tenure-initiating unit within the college.

B. Quorum

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

Faculty members who recuse themselves because of a conflict of interest are not counted when determining quorum.

C. Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty

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

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

1. Appointment

- A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when a majority of the votes cast are positive.
- In the case of a joint appointment, EEOB must seek input from a candidate’s joint appointment TIU prior to his/her/their appointment.

2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion

- A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion is secured when a majority of the votes cast are positive.
- In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate’s joint appointment TIU prior to his/her/their reappointment, promotion and/or tenure, or contract renewal.

IV. Appointments

A. Criteria

The department is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of EEOB. Important considerations include the individual's record to

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

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

All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university's system of record for faculty and staff. Formal interviews are required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in [Workday](#) to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

1. Tenure-track Faculty

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

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

Assistant Professor. An earned terminal degree is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high quality teaching, and high-quality service to the department and the profession is highly desirable. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the 7th year will be the final year of employment.

Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the CEF determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to exclude time from the probationary period.

Associate Professor and Professor. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor and offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

Appointment at the rank of associate professor normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at the rank of associate professor is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate

has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

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

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

2. Teaching Faculty

Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all other teaching faculty members must be for a period of five years. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for assistant and associate teaching professors must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for teaching professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. Tenure is not granted to teaching faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance.

EEOB supports Teaching Faculty. 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](#). Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the department.

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

Assistant Teaching Professor. An earned doctorate is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant teaching professor. Evidence of ability to teach is highly desirable.

Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor. Appointment at the rank of associate teaching professor and teaching professor requires that the individual have an earned doctorate and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria—in teaching, professional practice and other service, and scholarship—for promotion to these ranks.

3. Research Faculty

Appointment of research faculty entails one- to five-year appointments. The initial appointment is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to research faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent appointments will be offered, regardless of performance.

External appointees at the research associate professor or research professor level will demonstrate the same accomplishments in research and service as persons promoted within the department.

Research Assistant Professor. Appointment at the rank of research assistant professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and a record of high-quality publications that strongly indicate the ability to sustain an independent, externally funded research program.

Research Associate Professor and Research Professor. Appointment at the rank of research associate professor or research professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria for promotion to these ranks.

4. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a few weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. Associated faculty may be reappointed.

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give academic service to the department, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees, for which a faculty title is appropriate. The adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track, teaching, or research 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, teaching, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

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

Lecturer. Appointment as lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a Master's degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is desirable. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer should generally not exceed one year.

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

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

Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for only three consecutive years.

5. Regional Campus Faculty

As the mission of the regional campuses emphasizes undergraduate instruction, regional campus criteria for appointment at the tenure-track ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor are

similar to those for Columbus campus faculty but give relatively greater emphasis at each rank to teaching experience and quality.

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

6. 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, research, or associated faculty may request emeritus status upon retirement or resignation at the age of sixty or older with ten or more years of service or at any age with twenty-five or more years of service.

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the department chair (regional campus dean for associated faculty on regional campuses) outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-4) will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair. The department chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered.

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

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

7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

B. Procedures

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, teaching, research, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process. All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university's system of record for faculty and staff. Formal interviews are required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in Workday to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

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

- recruitment of tenure-track, teaching, research, and associated faculty
- appointments at senior rank or with prior service credit

- hiring faculty from other institutions after April 30
- appointment of foreign nationals
- letters of offer

1. Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

A national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure track positions. This includes all external candidates for all faculty positions. The only exception is for dual career partners, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, section 5.1 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

The dean of the college provides approval for the department to commence a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise.

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

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

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

- “Phase 1 | Search Preparation & Proactive Recruitment” is the earliest stage in the search process. Key steps during this phase include determining faculty needs for the unit, creating a search strategy (including timeline), establishing a budget, and identifying additional partners to include in the process. The steps in this phase provide guidance on forming committees, detail training requirements for search committee members, and innovative approaches to advertising and outreach. This section also includes ideas and resources for developing qualified talent pools to ensure alignment with university and unit EEO goals and advance the eminence of the institution.
- “Phase 2 | Preliminary Review of Applicants” focuses on best practices for the application review and candidate screening processes. The guidelines and resources in this section support consistency, and fairness in the review, assessment, and selection of candidates moving forward in the recruitment process. This section also outlines how to select a list of candidates for on-campus interviews.

- “Phase 3 | Finalists Interviews & Evaluations” provides guidance and tools for conducting interviews and campus visits, requesting reference letters (if not requested earlier in the application stage), and collecting feedback from everyone who interacted with the candidates. Adherence to the guidelines outlined in this section has a direct impact on enhancing the candidate experience and ensuring a consistent evaluation process. This phase concludes with the submission of a letter from the search committee to the TIU chair/director.
- “Phase 4 | Extend Offer” provides guidance and resources related to effectively selecting the most qualified candidate(s) for the position(s) and successfully negotiating to result in an accepted offer.
- “Phase 5 | Preboard and Onboard” offers resources to help prepare and support new faculty as they transition to Ohio State. The suggestions in this phase focus on creating a seamless transition for incoming faculty and their partners/families, if applicable.
- “Phase 6 | Reflect and Assess the Search” is a process supported by OAA to reflect on the hiring cycle each year and evaluate areas that may need improvement and additional support.

Following completion of virtual/on-campus interviews, the eligible faculty meet to discuss perceptions and preferences, and to vote on each candidate. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on each candidate to the department chair.

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

External hires at the Associate Professor or Professor rank with tenure will demonstrate the same accomplishments in scholarship and/or creative activity, teaching and service as persons promoted within the university. For all, the substantial probability that a high rate of quality scholarship and/or creative activity and excellence in teaching and service will continue needs to be established. The claim that retention of the candidate will improve the overall quality and standing of the unit needs to be supported.

In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the search committee proposed a ranking in a faculty meeting which is subject to approval by the majority of faculty. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the department chair.

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

Searches for teaching faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty. It is understood that the candidate's presentation during the virtual or on-campus interview is on teaching practice, as relevant, rather than scholarship.

3. Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that during the virtual or on-campus interview the candidate is not asked to teach a class.

4. Transfer from the Tenure Track

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

5. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

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

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

Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three years. Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are made on an annual basis and rarely semester by semester. After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment may be offered. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued.

6. Regional Campus Faculty

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

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

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

decision to make an offer requires agreement by the department chair and regional campus dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the department chair and the regional campus dean.

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

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

7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Any EEOB faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track, teaching, or research faculty member from another Ohio State tenure-initiating unit. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to EEOB justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the eligible faculty, the department chair extends an offer of appointment. The department chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

V. Annual Performance and Merit Review

The department follows the requirements for the annual performance and merit review as set forth in the [Policy on Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment](#), which stipulates that such reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting as well as a written assessment. According to the policy, the purposes of the review are to:

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

Depending on their appointment type, the annual performance and merit review of faculty members is based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. 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 performance and merit review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#)) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

A. Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to the department chair no later than the final day of autumn semester classes:

- Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, [*Policies and Procedures Handbook*](#), Volume 3 (*required for probationary faculty*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (*non-probationary faculty*)
- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)

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

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

B. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed each Spring Semester by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty (CEF). Copies of the probationary faculty members' Faculty Activity Reports, CVs and SEIs are made available to the CEF. The CEF is convened, and the individual cases are presented and discussed, after which a vote is taken by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

The CEF forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department chair. The chair conducts an independent assessment of performance; meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and, as appropriate, future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

If the department chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the dean of the college. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments, if provided).

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

1. Fourth-Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exceptions that external evaluations are optional, and the dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

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

The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by 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 departmental review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)) is followed, and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

2. Extension of the Tenure Clock

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

C. Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the department chair. The chair conducts an independent assessment; meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her/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.

Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance and future plans and goals. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of EEOB, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the college, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest-ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty.

If a professor has an administrative role, the impact of that role and other assignments will be considered in the annual review. The department chair prepares a written evaluation of performance against these expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

D. Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

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

There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

E. Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

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

There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

F. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss 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.

G. Regional Campus Faculty

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

The annual performance and merit review of regional campus teaching faculty is conducted on the regional campus. The dean/director will provide the department chair a copy of a teaching faculty member's annual performance and merit review letter.

The annual performance and merit review of regional campus research faculty is conducted by the department chair on the Columbus campus and proceeds as described above for Columbus campus research faculty. Following the review, the department chair will consult with the regional campus dean/director. The department chair will provide the regional campus dean/director a copy of the faculty member's annual performance and merit review letter.

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

H. Salary Recommendations

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

In formulating recommendations, the department chair consults with the VCUS and VCGS. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the department chair divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) and considers market and internal equity issues. The department chair should proactively engage in equity audits of faculty salary to ensure faculty salaries are commensurate both within EEOB and across the field or fields represented in the department. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

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

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

VI. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

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

1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

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

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

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

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

Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Above all, candidates are held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. For example, if a candidate's primary teaching role is and will continue to be undergraduate teaching, then excellence in undergraduate teaching is required. A mediocre performance in this area would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another aspect of teaching that is a significantly smaller part of the individual's responsibilities.

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

TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidates must have demonstrated the quality, impact, and quantity of their teaching by:	Candidates are encouraged to submit any of the following items as evidence that they have met these criteria:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge;• demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm;• demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment;• engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process;• provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process and treated students with respect and courtesy;	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• changes to or development of syllabi, examinations, laboratory exercises, case studies, field trip agenda, problem sets, computer software demonstrate up-to-date thought on subject content;• summary of class comments demonstrate instructional content up-to-date;• reviews of teaching by peer experts in field which function to evaluate whether syllabi, class evaluation items and class materials are up-to-date and appropriate for topic and audience;• summaries of SEI scores;• documentation that they have attended workshops or other continuing education events on topics related to teaching pedagogy or the subject matter covered by the course;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs; served as advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the department's graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise, as well as undergraduate researchers and (possibly) postdocs; and engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> completed formal programs offered through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning; and/or awarded "Endorsement" from Drake Institute of Teaching and Learning.
--	---

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidates must have demonstrated the quality, impact, and quantity of their scholarship by:	Candidates are encouraged to submit any of the following items as evidence that they have met these criteria:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publishing a body of work in high quality peer-reviewed venues that is thematically focused, contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and is beginning to be favorably cited or otherwise show evidence of influence on the work of others; demonstrating leadership of a developing research program who make unique contributions to their chosen line of inquiry; demonstrating the ability to obtain and the potential to sustain research program funding (i.e., probationary faculty on the Columbus campus are normally expected to secure at least one competitive, peer reviewed grant prior to their sixth-year review); developing a national or international reputation in the candidate's field; and demonstrating a high degree of ethics in the conduct of research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Probationary faculty on the Columbus campus should show evidence of a sustained publication record that averages 2-3 publications per year over the course of the probationary period in journals that are appropriate to the field as determined by the CEF; high-quality is measured both by the rigor of the peer-review process and degree of dissemination of publication venues (e.g., archival journal publications and monographs are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published research more than unpublished research, and original works more than edited works); while collaborative work is encouraged, and indeed is essential to some types of inquiry, the candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described to permit accurate assessment; competitive peer-reviewed funding is weighted more favorably than other types, since it serves as a quality indicator of research programs, and grants requiring the exercise of intellectual creativity are weighted more heavily than those that largely dictate the work to be done; external evaluations, invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals, and a beginning trend of positive citations in other researchers' publications; and full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators.

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidates must have demonstrated the quality, impact, and quantity of their service by:	Candidates are encouraged to submit any of the following items as evidence that they have met these criteria:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making contributions to the business of the department, college, or the university in a manner that facilitates positive contributions by others; • demonstrating the potential for useful contributions to the profession; and • providing (<i>where appropriate</i>) letters of evaluation of teaching for tenure and promotion dossiers of faculty as described in IV-Appointments; 3-Teaching Faculty and VAnnual Reviews—Procedures; Section C of the APT. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • list of letters of recommendation that they have provided for faculty, staff, or students; • list of <i>ad hoc</i> reviews provided to professional journals or granting agencies; • service as symposium organizer or society committee member; and • signed letters of peer teaching evaluation made available to curriculum committee and department leadership.

2. Promotion to Professor

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

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

The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure [*see charts in Section VI.A.1*], with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national or international reputation in the field.

Assessment takes place in relation to specific assigned responsibilities, with exceptional performance expected in these required responsibilities. The criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to associate professor with tenure serve as benchmarks for promotion from associate professor to professor. Outstanding performance in the sum and balance of these three criteria will serve as the basis for a positive assessment.

In terms of scholarship, evidence of established national or international reputation in the field is expected. Evidence of such a reputation can be in the form of speaking invitations at prestigious institutions or meetings, research collaborations, or outside evaluation by eminent scholars. A continuing record of publication in the peer-reviewed literature as well as recurring funding at a level sufficient to maintain an active research program are expected.

Excellence in service means the provision of a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more publics – including the university, the local community, the State of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations. Leadership in professional service can be demonstrated through significant involvement in professional societies or agencies, including activities such as editorial board member, agency panel member, or elected officer of professional societies.

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

In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#), assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another. Promotion should reflect the reality that (a) not all faculty members have the same distribution of assignments (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence equally in all evaluation dimensions; and (c) there is a multi-faceted institutional responsibility that must be achieved by the skills of the faculty collectively. Promotion to professor should be awarded not only to those faculty who have demonstrated impact in their scholarship of research and creative inquiry, teaching and learning, and service, but also to those who have exhibited excellence in the scholarship of leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the department, college, and university.

3. Teaching Faculty

Promotion to Assistant Teaching Professor. For promotion to assistant teaching professor, a faculty member must complete their doctoral degree and meet the required licensure/certification in their specialty and be performing satisfactorily in teaching and service. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor. For promotion to associate teaching professor, a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service; and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of EEOB. In some cases, scholarship activity (e.g., research leading to peer-reviewed publications, books or book chapters, research grant proposals, advising student or postdoc research) may qualify as service; if so, this will be stated in the College approved letter of offer. As a guideline, the expectation is that Teaching Faculty will allocate 80% of their effort to teaching (sixteen courses per academic year) and no more than 20% of effort to service activities (broadly defined), with the specific allocation of effort to be spelled out in the appointment letter for each individual. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to associate teaching professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure:

Teaching Faculty Service Activities	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidates must have demonstrated the quality and effectiveness of their teaching by meeting the requirements described in section VI.A.1 and via the following service activities:	Candidates are encouraged to submit any of the following items as evidence that they have met these criteria:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Managing graduate and undergraduate TAs including formal training for lab classes; advising departmental, OSU or local school clubs or organizations; serving on undergraduate thesis or graduate student committees; serving as a judge for research forums; performing outreach for EEOB (e.g., participating in recruiting/welcoming events); developing, revising, editing and/or assessing content for journals or textbooks; conducting and/or participating in workshops related to teaching/curriculum; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Narratives describing course organization and effectiveness in managing TAs; list of advising activities for clubs and organizations; lists detailing service on committees or as a judge in research forum such as the Denman Forum or high school science fairs; summaries of editing, revising, or assessment work for educational materials; evidence of completion of workshops related to teaching and curriculum development; published research involving teaching pedagogy; and

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pedagogical research that includes research design, data collection and analysis and publication or presentation; and • updating teaching laboratory activities or developing curriculum for future courses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a record of changes to classroom materials such as syllabi, assignments, and assessments.
---	---

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

Promotion to Teaching Professor. For promotion to teaching professor, a faculty member must have a record of professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching and professional practice; leadership in service to EEOB and to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

4. Research Faculty

Promotion to Research Associate Professor. For promotion to research associate professor, a faculty member must have a substantial record of high-quality focused research consistent with an appointment devoted solely to research. Publications must appear in high-quality peer reviewed venues and be judged by external evaluators as having substantial positive impact on the field. A record of continuous peer reviewed extramural and/or commercial funding is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Research Professor. For promotion to research professor, a faculty member must have a national or international reputation built on an extensive body of high-quality publications and with demonstrated impact on the field. A record of continuous peer-reviewed extramural and/or commercial funding is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

5. Associated Faculty

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

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

Promotion to Senior Lecturer. Lecturers may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank as described in Section IV.A.4.

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

6. Regional Campus Faculty

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

quantity of scholarship by regional campus faculty may differ from that of Columbus campus faculty, due to the weight of other responsibilities and lack of access to comparable resources, the department nevertheless expects regional campus tenure-track faculty to establish a program of high-quality scholarly activity. Probationary tenure-track faculty on regional campuses should show evidence of a publication record that averages at least one publication per year over the course of the probationary period in journals that are appropriate to the field as determined by the CEF. Tenured associate professors on the regional campuses should demonstrate a record of sustained scholarly activity that is recognized nationally or internationally. Evidence of such a reputation can be in the form of speaking invitations at prestigious institutions or meetings, research collaborations, or outside evaluation by eminent scholars. In addition, continuing to publish scholarly articles in peerreviewed literature and obtaining the extramural funding needed to maintain an active research program will be interpreted as evidence of sustained scholarly activity. The judgment whether a particular body of work meets departmental standards for tenure and/or promotion will take into consideration the regional campuses' different mission, higher teaching expectation, and more limited access to research resources.

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

B. Procedures

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

1. Tenure-Track, Teaching, and Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus

a) Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier and providing a copy of the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed, if 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 EEOB guidelines. Each of these elements is described in detail below.

In addition, because a packet must be sent to outside reviewers, the candidate should supply the chair with a CV, selected reprints or preprints, and a 3-5 page narrative describing past, current, and planned research.

- **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 Committee of Eligible Faculty makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by them.

Teaching

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

- Examples of teaching documentation include:
 - cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class -- required
 - peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details, including number, provided in Section IX below) -- required
 - copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.
- Teaching activities as listed in the core dossier include:
 - involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and
 - undergraduate research
 - mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers
 - extension and continuing education instruction
 - involvement in curriculum development
 - awards and formal recognition of teaching
 - presentations on pedagogic and teaching at national and international conferences
 - adoption of teaching materials at other colleges or universities
 - 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.

- Examples of scholarship documentation include:
 - copies of all books, articles, and scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed.
 - documentation of grants and contracts received
 - other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted)
- Scholarship activities as listed in the core dossier include:
 - documentation of creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus including
 - artwork, choreography, collections, compositions, curated exhibits, moving images, multimedia, performances, radio, recitals, recordings, television, and websites
 - documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options and commercial licenses

- list of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work

Service

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As noted above, if external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed according to departmental 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, providing the reasons for the request. The department chair decides whether removal is justified.

b) Committee of Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF) are as follows:

- To review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a nonmandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the CEF may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
 - The CEF bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
 - A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04A(3) only once. Faculty Rules 3335-7-08 and 3335-7-36 make the same provision for nonprobationary teaching and research faculty, respectively. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
 - A decision by the CEF to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
 - **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.
 - **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section VI.B.4 below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.
 - **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
 - Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his/her/their dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.

- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.
 - Revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of the full eligible faculty, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
 - Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
 - 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 EEOB's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.
- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
 - To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.

c) **Department Chair Responsibilities**

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. For tenure-track assistant professors, department chairs are to confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an MOU at the time of promotion with tenure.
- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the CEF, the department chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments. The TIU head from the joint appointment unit must provide a letter of evaluation to the primary TIU head. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.
- To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To charge each member of the CEF to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.

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

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

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

3. **Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty**

Regional campus tenure-track faculty are first reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. The regional campus review focuses on teaching and service. The regional campus dean/director forwards the written evaluation and recommendation of the regional campus review to the department chair, from which point the review follows the procedures described for the Columbus campus faculty. A request to promote requires agreement by the dean/director and the department chair.

Regional campus teaching faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. Following the review, the dean/director consults with the faculty member's department chair. A request to promote follows the same

procedures as tenure-track faculty except that external letters are not needed unless scholarship is a component of the assigned role.

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

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

4. External Evaluations

This department will seek external evaluations predominately from evaluators in the following programs: Peer Programs include: University of Texas at Austin, Department of Integrative Biology; University of Washington, Department of Biology, Evolution, Ecology, and Conservation; University of California, Davis, Department of Evolution and Ecology; University of Colorado Boulder, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology; University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Department of Biology, Evolutionary Biology and Ecology; University of Minnesota, Department of Ecology, Evolution and Behavior; University of Maryland, Department of Biology, Ecology and Evolution; University of Massachusetts Amherst, Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology; University of California, Santa Barbara, Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Marine Biology; Michigan State University, Department of Integrative Biology. Aspirational Peer Programs include: Harvard University, Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology; University of California, Berkeley, Department of Integrative Biology; University of Chicago, Department of Ecology and Evolution; Stanford University, Department of Biology, Evolution and Ecology; University of Michigan, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology; Cornell University, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology; Yale University, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology; University of Wisconsin-Madison, Department of Integrative Biology; University of Arizona, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology; University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology.

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track faculty promotion and tenure or promotion reviews and all research faculty appointment contract renewals and promotion reviews. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for teaching/ professional practice or associated faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations for a teaching/professional practice or associated faculty member will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the CEF.

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

employment in the same institution within the past 12 months, or those who are being considered for employment at that institution.

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

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

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

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

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

Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit external evaluations or initiate contact in any way with external evaluators for any purpose related to the promotion review. If an external evaluator should initiate contact with the candidate regarding the review, the candidate must inform the evaluator that such communication is inappropriate and report the occurrence to the department chair, who will decide what, if any, action is warranted (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

Only the candidate may appeal a negative tenure, promotion, or reappointment decision.

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 or research faculty, for securing a reappointment.

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule [3335-5-05](#).

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

VIII. Seventh-Year Reviews

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

IX. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) 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.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching (see the Appendix for more on the peer evaluation process)

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

Annually the department chair appoints a Peer Review of Teaching Committee of a size judged sufficient to meet the volume of peer review activity expected that year, without overburdening any of the members. The term of service is one year, with reappointment possible. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the tenured faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the department. Although there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible.

The responsibilities of the Peer Review of Teaching Committee are as follows:

- to review the teaching of probationary tenure-track, teaching, and associated faculty at least once per year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.
- to review the teaching of tenured associate 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 six-year period and of having at least four peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion review.

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

Reviews conducted upon the request of the department chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the department chair or faculty member and may or may not include class visitations.

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

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

X. Appendix: Good Teaching Defined and Peer Review Processes

What is Good Teaching?

Ramsden (1992) identified 13 characteristics of good teaching from an individual instructor's point of view:

- a desire to share your love of the subject
- an ability to make the material stimulating and interesting
- a facility for engaging with students at their level of understanding
- a capacity to explain the material plainly and helpfully
- a commitment to making it absolutely clear what has to be understood, at what level, and why
- demonstration of concern and respect for students
- a commitment to encouraging student independence and experiment
- an ability to improvise and adapt to new demands
- use of teaching methods and academic tasks that require students to learn actively, responsibly, and through cooperative endeavor
- use of valid and fair assessment methods
- a focus on key concepts and students' current and future understanding of them, rather than just covering the ground
- a commitment to give high quality feedback on students' work
- a desire to learn from students and others about the effects of your teaching and how it can be improved

Types of Peer Evaluation of Teaching

EEOB recognizes that peer evaluation comes in different forms and that these enhance teaching abilities in addition to "traditional" peer evaluations (see Comprehensive Peer Review of Instruction below). Therefore the department provides the following annual options for peer evaluation:

Formative evaluation of instruction is designed to contribute to the development of teaching. This type of evaluation is conducted during both the planning and the implementation of a program or a course. Formative evaluation helps find the strengths and weaknesses in a program while it is still going on. The purpose of formative evaluation is to validate or ensure that the goals of the instruction are being achieved and to improve the instruction, if necessary, by means of identification and subsequent remediation of problematic aspects. Formative evaluations are not included in promotion dossiers or personnel files.

Options for formative evaluation:

1. Attend a workshop on some aspect of teaching (either within the university or at a professional society meeting) and demonstrate changes or new ideas that have been/will be incorporated into teaching based on the ideas presented in the workshop.

Evidence required: Date, topic, and sponsor of the workshop. Summary of aspects of teaching learned at the workshop and how they have been/will be incorporated into teaching.

2. Review of course materials. When materials (e.g., grading rubrics, assignments, projects) have been developed for a course, these can be reviewed by inter-professional or intra-professional faculty peers. This review also can be done with a consultation from the [Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#). Whenever possible, this review should occur face-to-face and provide specific and concrete feedback to the faculty member being evaluated. Note: when an off-campus reviewer is selected, the selection of the reviewer must be done in conjunction with the faculty member's EEOB faculty mentor.

Evidence required: Name, rank, institution, and subject area of reviewer. Summary and analysis of strengths identified, areas for improvement, and changes made as a result and reflections on the process of the review.

3. Development/refinement of philosophy of pedagogy.

Evidence required: Report of activities engaged in (e.g., workshops attended, books or articles read, consultations with experts) to support the process, reflections on how the experience enhanced the philosophy of teaching, and the completed product.

4. Observe an expert teacher. Arrange to watch another faculty member teach a class. The faculty member should be selected either because s/he has received distinction for teaching or because s/he has more experience in instruction. Make arrangements to meet with that faculty member prior to the class period to gain an understanding of the goals, purposes, and proposed teaching methods. Meet again after the completion of the class for debriefing.

Evidence required: Name, rank, institution, and subject area of expert teacher. Summary and analysis of what was learned and what changes were made/will be made as a result, and reflections on the process.

5. Videotape yourself teaching. Arrange to have a class period videotaped. Identify a faculty peer or professional from the Drake Institute with whom to watch the videotape and use both self-reflection and the process of watching with another, to identify strengths and areas for growth. EEOB recognizes that peer evaluation comes in different forms and that these enhance teaching abilities in addition to "traditional" peer evaluations (see Comprehensive Peer Review of Instruction below). Therefore, the Department provides the following annual options for peer evaluation.

6. Classroom observation by professional from the Drake Institute.

Evidence required: Name of Drake Institute professional, course observed, date. Summary of changes made as a result and reflections on the process of the observation.

7. Classroom observation by an EEOB faculty peer. Current EEOB policy regarding process of this review should be utilized. This includes (at a minimum):
 - a. Peer evaluations of teaching should be detailed and should provide an analysis of the candidate's instructional skills.
 - b. Reports of observations should specify which courses were observed and at what point in the term the observations took place.

- c. The peer-observer should provide a copy of the evaluation to the faculty member and should meet with the faculty member to review the evaluation.
- d. The peer-observers should be selected by the Department chair

Evidence required: Name of reviewer, course observed, date. Summary of changes made as a result and reflections on the process of the observation.

Summative evaluation of instruction is evaluation whose goal is to assess the quality of teaching performance/effectiveness. A summative review results in documentation that can be reviewed by others. Summative evaluations are included in promotion dossiers and hence are part of a faculty member's permanent record.

Summative evaluations of instruction include:

Comprehensive peer review of instruction. Comprehensive peer evaluations are included in fourth year, tenure, and promotion to full professor dossiers. These evaluations include, in addition to classroom visitation, review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and exams. To initiate a peer evaluation of instruction, the faculty member must request in writing to the chair that s/he has selected this option as part of the annual peer review and would like the chair to select an EEOB faculty peer reviewer.

Summary of reflective statements. In addition to regular peer evaluations, we require for the sixth year review a summary and analysis of the probationary faculty member's two reflective statements based on their formative review activities. This is to be written as a peer evaluation by a tenured faculty member and included with the three standard evaluations in the sixth year review dossier, bringing the total required number to four.

Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

Probationary faculty on the Columbus campus must have at least two comprehensive peer reviews of instruction before their fourth-year review and at least one more during the remainder of the probationary period. These reviews are summative and thus included in the promotion dossiers. During years when probationary faculty do not have peer reviews of instruction, they can choose from the above list of formative evaluation options. Annually, with the completion of the faculty activity report, EEOB probationary faculty members shall, in consultation with the chair, select an appropriate evaluation option for the following year.

Upon completion of the evaluation activities and with the submission of the following year's annual activity report, the faculty member shall provide a written narrative that provides evidence of changes to teaching practice, course content, or other teaching-related endeavors based on the evaluation, thereby "closing the loop." Unless otherwise specified, evidence provided should be in the form of a brief (one-two paragraph) narrative summary.

Probationary faculty must complete a Capstone Narrative (see above) for both the fourth year and tenure review.

Post-Tenure Faculty

As noted in the OAA [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) (Volume 1, Chapter 1, Section 2.8.2), periodic peer evaluation is required for tenured faculty at all ranks. In accordance with this mandate, and in

recognition of the necessity of on-going personal and professional development in the area of instruction, all EEOB faculty engage in annual evaluation of instruction activities. Each year, every tenured, Columbus campus EEOB faculty member shall select one of the formative evaluation options presented above. EEOB faculty recognize that engagement in instructional enhancement of any type can improve instruction. Thus, in addition to the choices listed above, tenured EEOB faculty also may select from the following options, each of which represents a service role to one of the earlier options (shown in parentheses):

- a. Review the course materials of another faculty member (serves #2).
- b. Be observed by another faculty member (serves #4).
- c. Watch a videotape of another faculty member's teaching and provide input and reflections (serves #5).
- d. Observe another faculty members teaching and engage in the process of peer observation of instruction (serves #7).

Tenured faculty members should provide as evidence, to be included with their annual Faculty Activity Report, a brief description of the activity engaged in, with identifying dates, names, and courses, and a brief narrative of how the activity enhanced their own instruction.

Associate Professors on the Columbus campus must have at least two comprehensive peer reviews of teaching included in the dossier for promotion to Professor, in addition to a Capstone Narrative.

Teaching Faculty

The teaching of probationary teaching faculty will be evaluated by summative evaluation at least once per year during the first two years of service in teaching, and at least once more during the remainder of the probationary period, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. During years when probationary teaching faculty do not have comprehensive peer reviews of instruction, they can choose from the above list of formative evaluation options. Annually, with the completion of the faculty activity report, probationary teaching faculty shall, in consultation with the chair, select an appropriate evaluation option for the following year.

The teaching of nonprobationary Associate Teaching Professors will be evaluated with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a threeyear period. The teaching of Associate Teaching Professors must be evaluated a minimum of 3 times, via a comprehensive peer review of instruction, since the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, before promotion to Teaching Professor.

The teaching of nonprobationary Teaching Professor will be evaluated at least once every four years via a comprehensive peer review of instruction with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.

For teaching faculty with responsibilities in the Center for Life Sciences Education (CLSE) it is recommended that their annual evaluations and reviews include the CLSE director or at least one other individual (selected by the CLSE director) who is familiar with the expectations for faculty teaching CLSE courses.