

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures for The Ohio State University Department of Economics

Approved by the Faculty: April 22, 2024

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: May 28, 2024

Revision Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: December 1, 2025

Table of Contents

I.	Preamble	4
II.	Department Mission	4
III.	Definitions	4
	A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty	4
	1. Tenure-track Faculty	5
	2. Associated Faculty	5
	3. Conflict of Interest	5
	4. Minimum Composition	6
	B. Reading Committee	6
	C. Quorum	6
	D. Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty	7
	1. Appointment	7
	2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion	7
IV.	Appointments	7
	A. Criteria	7
	1. Tenure-track Faculty	8
	2. Associated Faculty	9
	3. Regional Campus Faculty	9
	4. Emeritus Faculty	10
	5. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	10
	B. Procedures	10
	1. Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus	11
	2. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	12
	3. Regional Campus Faculty	13
	4. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	13
V.	Annual Performance and Merit Review	13
	A. Documentation	14
	B. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus	14
	1. Fourth-Year Review	15

2.	Extension of the Tenure Clock.....	15
C.	Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus	15
D.	Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	16
E.	Regional Campus Faculty	16
F.	Salary Recommendations.....	17
VI.	Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	17
A.	Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion	17
1.	Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	17
2.	Promotion to Professor	21
3.	Associated Faculty	22
4.	Regional Campus Faculty	22
B.	Procedures	22
1.	Tenure-Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus	23
a.	Candidate Responsibilities	23
b.	Reading Committee Responsibilities	25
c.	Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities	26
d.	Department Chair Responsibilities	27
2.	Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	28
3.	Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty	28
4.	External Evaluations	29
a.	Peer and Near Peer Institutions	29
VII.	Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals	30
VIII.	Seventh-Year Reviews.....	31
IX.	Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching	31
A.	Student Evaluation of Teaching	31
B.	Peer Evaluation of Teaching	31

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 TIU 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 department mission and criteria.

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

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

II. Department Mission

The mission of the Department of Economics is to achieve excellence in research, teaching, and service. Excellence in research means attaining national and international recognition, as evidenced by, for example, comparative national rankings, the amount of high quality published scholarly research, citation counts, external funding, and awards and honors. Excellence in teaching means offering to all students the opportunity to realize their full potential for learning Economics and offering to the most capable and motivated students an enhanced learning experience. Excellence in service means providing a high level of professional expertise and experience not only to professional organizations but also to the College, the University, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, and the nation.

III. Definitions

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

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

1. Tenure-track Faculty

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 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. Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- For the initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the department. For reappointments, the eligible faculty are 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 faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Sections III.A.1, 2 or 3 above.
- For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with tenure-track titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section III.A.1.
- The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the department chair in consultation with the Advisory Committee.

3. 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.

4. 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. Reading Committee

The department has a Reading Committee for each promotion and tenure case that normally consists of three faculty members. The Reading Committee assists the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in managing individual P&T cases. If feasible, two are in a field related to the candidate's research area, while the chair of the Committee is from another area. The committee's chair and members are appointed by the department chair.

C. Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless

they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

D. Recommendation from the 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.

1. Appointment

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

IV. Appointments

A. Criteria

The department is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the department. Important considerations include the individual's record to date in teaching, 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, clinical/teaching/professional practice, research, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment.

All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university’s system of record for faculty and staff. 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 Committee of Eligible Faculty determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to exclude the probationary period.

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

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

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

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

2. 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 faculty. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

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 a terminal degree 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.

3. 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 associated faculty are the same as those for Columbus campus faculty in each of these categories.

4. Emeritus Faculty

Emeritus faculty status is an honor given in recognition of sustained academic contributions to the university as described in Faculty Rule [3335-5-36](#). Full-time tenure track 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.1-2) 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.

5. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Occasionally the active academic involvement in this department by a tenure-track, clinical/teaching/professional practice, 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 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.

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 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](#).

The dean 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, fairness, and equity 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.

If an offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If an 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.

In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the department chair decides which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the department chair.

The department 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. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

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 the department and are decided by the department chair in consultation with the 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.

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

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

4. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track, clinical/teaching/professional practice, or research faculty member from another Ohio State tenure-initiating unit. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this department 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.

The annual performance and merit review of a faculty member is the responsibility of that faculty member's department chair.

- Depending on a faculty member's appointment type, the review is based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.
- The review of faculty with budgeted joint appointments must include input from the joint appointment department chair 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.
- Annual performance and merit reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting as well as a written assessment.
- Per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35, department chair are required to include a reminder in annual review letters 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, compensated 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 annually by the department chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their performance, future plans, and goals; and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

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

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

1. Fourth-Year Review

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

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

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

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

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 department 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 his/her/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 the department, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the college, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, 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. 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 his/her/their performance, future plans, and goals.

The department chair's decision on renewal of the appointment is final. If the decision is to renew, the 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 his/her/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.

E. 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 in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

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

F. 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 department Advisory Committee. The department chair should proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in 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 acknowledgement of excellence and future potential for preeminence. It is therefore essential to evaluate and judge the probability that faculty, once tenured, will continue to develop professionally and contribute to the department's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university.

Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. 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](#).

The accomplishments listed below in the areas of teaching, research and service are expected of faculty for promotion to associate professor with tenure. In the evaluation of untenured associate professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Developed new and effective instructional techniques and materials appropriate for the objectives and level of the course	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to or development of syllabi, examinations, problem sets demonstrate up-to-date thought on subject content • Summary of class comments demonstrate instructional content up-to-date • Experts in field evaluate and determine syllabi, class evaluation items and class materials up-to-date and appropriate for topic and audience • Keep adopting new materials in class • Completed Teaching at Ohio State through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning
Demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge	
Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cumulative eSEI reports or peer review of teaching reports • eSEI items 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9 scores equal or greater than 4.0 • eSEI items 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9 scores demonstrate positive trajectory during review period • eSEI item 10 scores equal or greater than 4.0 • Positive peer evaluation documenting these areas demonstrate positive trajectory during review period

Demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom or online technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of multimodal techniques or approaches to stimulate class participation and learning • Peer evaluation descriptions positive on mode of instruction • eSEI items 2, 8, 9 scores equal or greater than 4.0 • eSEI items 2, 8, 9 scores demonstrate positive trajectory during review period
Engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, critical thinking, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • eSEI items 2, 4, 8 scores equal or greater than 4.0 • eSEI items 2, 4, 8 scores demonstrate positive trajectory during review period
Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students/residents throughout the instructional process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive qualitative student comments
Treated students/residents with respect and courtesy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive qualitative student comments • Positive peer evaluations
Improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement and specific outcomes in curriculum development • Leadership in development of the curriculum and courses which goes beyond normal teaching and service expectations
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	<p>Teaching activities as listed in the core dossier including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • involvement in graduate exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research
Engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching. Any candidate whose annual reviews have suggested teaching deficiencies should provide documentation of efforts to improve teaching.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed Teaching at Ohio State through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning. • Teaching portfolio demonstrating teaching outcomes after efforts to improve • Annual evaluations – setting goals, document activities in which faculty member participated, changes made to teaching, and outcomes of the change (improvement in student success as demonstrated by higher board scores or other documentation, eSEI improvements, etc.) • Awarding of “Endorsement” by the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning

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

Published a body of high-quality work in high-quality peer-reviewed journals; this work should contribute substantively to knowledge in the area of focus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Journal ranking, citation index, impact on field • Primary journal of faculty member's discipline • Publications in the discipline's flagship journals are highly valued • Sufficient productivity over time according to norms in the field • List of prizes and awards for research or scholarly work • External reviewer positive comments • The candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described to permit accurate assessment
Demonstrated influence on the work of others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome indicators of activity to the profession/discipline that indicate impact and importance in the candidate's field • External reviewer positive comments • Citations
Demonstrated promising research productivity in the future	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing a pipeline of working papers ranging from revise and resubmitted papers to working papers in preparation for submission
Applying for and receiving external grants (field specific, not necessary but highly valued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competitive peer-reviewed research funding – national or international grants from funding agencies including government agencies and private foundations, and associations that require outcomes
Developing national/international reputation in the candidate's field	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition by external reviewers that the faculty member has made a substantial contribution to the discipline or profession and the extent to which that person has been recognized by other scholars, public policy makers and/or practitioners • 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
Engagement with business entrepreneurship (not necessary but also valued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patents and licenses of invention disclosures • Technology commercialization • Formation of startup companies • Licensing and options agreements • Consulting work with industry and other external partners
Demonstrated a high degree of professional ethics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High degree of ethical conduct of research including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of undergraduate, graduate and professional students, residents, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators • Contributes to a positive and compelling working environment

Evaluation of scholarship must consider the fact that the average lag time between initial submission to a peer reviewed journal and publication is over two years, the most highly regarded journals have single digit acceptance rates, and top field journals often have acceptance rates well below 15%. Therefore, accepted papers are considered to be the equivalent to published articles, and papers in revise-and-resubmit status are given weight in evaluating research.

SERVICE	
Expectations	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Contributed to the governance of the department and demonstrated the promise of future contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service on department, college, or university committees • Participation in faculty meetings and in department seminars and workshops • Annual evaluations documenting good service to the department
Made useful contributions to the profession and demonstrated the potential for significant contributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement with professional journals (journal editorships, reviewer) and professional societies (offices or committees) • Professional conference organization • Consultation activity with industry, professional discipline education development, other universities, or government • Awards and prizes for service to profession • Evidence of professional expertise to public and private entities as a reviewer for funding proposals, member of panels and commissions, professional consultant to industry, government, and education organization

2. Promotion to Professor

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

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

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

The Department also expects senior faculty to be responsible for the majority of doctoral-level advising and service on university committees. Senior faculty are expected to take responsibility for the development and growth of their fields of expertise within the department.

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

3. 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 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.2.

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

4. 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.

In evaluating regional campus associated faculty for promotion, the department will use the same criteria as described above for the promotion of associated faculty.

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 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 department guidelines. Each of these elements is described in detail below.

• Dossier

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

While the 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 him/her/them.

Any published materials presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or other final form that documents actual publication. An author's manuscript does not document publication. Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

Teaching

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

- Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program
- 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 editor 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 including
 - 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 pedagogy 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 or reappointment may be provided. Any such material should be clearly indicated. However, it is the scholarship performance since the start date or date of last promotion that is to be the focus of the evaluating parties. Scholarship documentation should 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 editor stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed.
- Copies of all scholarly papers for which a revise and resubmit has been received. There should be an accompanying letter from the editor stating the nature of the requested revision.
- Documentation of grants, patents, and contracts received.
- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate.

Service

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

- Service activities as listed in the core dossier including
 - involvement with professional journals and professional societies
 - other service to the discipline
 - service activity with industry, education, or government

- administrative service to department
- administrative service to college
- 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 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 TIU. The documentation of teaching is forwarded along with the dossier. The documentation of scholarship and service is for use during the TIU 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, whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, for tenure track faculty the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year.

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

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

If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed according to department guidelines. The candidate may add no more than three additional names but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The department decides whether removal is justified. The candidate works with the Reading Committee on selecting publications and working papers to send to the external reviewers. The candidate is responsible for supplying to the department a complete set of all publications and working papers.

- b. **Reading Committee Responsibilities**

The responsibilities of the Reading Committee are as follows:

- Suggest names of external evaluators to the Committee of Eligible Faculty. It also solicits additional names from the candidate and presents its list to the candidate for review. The revised list is presented to the department chair.
- Meet with each candidate, either in person or electronically, for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier.

- Draft an analysis of the candidate's research performance. This analysis is based on the candidate's CV, dossier, body of scholarly work, citation counts, and external letters. This analysis is presented to the Committee of Eligible Faculty. The Reading Committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.

c. Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities

- To review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a nonmandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
 - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (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. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
- A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department, 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.
- **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.
- 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 (either in person or via teleconference) all Committee meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance, to participate in discussion of every case, and to vote.

- Hold a meeting to discuss the promotion and tenure candidates and review the draft analysis of the Reading Committee.
- Immediately following the meeting, a ballot will be distributed to the Committee of Eligible Faculty members who attended the meeting. It will be due to the department chairperson two working days after the meeting.
- The Recorder (see Economics Pattern of Administration Section VII.C.1) drafts a final report that incorporates the discussion of the Committee of Eligible Faculty and includes the results of the faculty vote. This report must be balanced and inform the chairperson of the strengths and weaknesses of the case. The report must include a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting. The Recorder circulates this report to the Committee of Eligible Faculty, receives their comments, and prepares a final report. The Committee of Eligible Faculty votes on the final report, using majority rule.
- The final report must be signed by the Committee of Eligible Faculty chair and the Recorder on behalf of the entire Committee and delivered to the departmental chair by the announced deadline.
- Should the candidate comment on the Committee report, the Committee will meet to discuss the comment. The Recorder will develop a written response, on behalf of the Committee, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- The Committee of Eligible Faculty will provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure initiating unit is another department. The full Committee does not vote on these cases.

d. Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. For tenure-track assistant professors, the department chair is 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 Reading Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments. The department chair 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 Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
- of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair; o of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair; and
- of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten calendar days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he/she/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 Eligible Faculty Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the head of the other 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. The regional campus review focuses on teaching and service. The regional campus dean forwards the written evaluation and

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

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

4. External Evaluations

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

a. Peer and Near Peer Institutions

Peer programs include but not limited to: Penn State, University of Maryland, Arizona State, Michigan State, University of Illinois. Aspirational peer programs that the department emulates or aspires to emulate in performance and reputation include but not limited to: University of Chicago, MIT, Yale, UPenn, University of Michigan, University of Wisconsin, Duke University, Cornell University, Brown University. Justification will be provided in each case when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.

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.

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, former academic advisor or postdoctoral mentor of the candidate, or someone who has collaborated extensively with the candidate or is currently collaborating with the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will solicit evaluations 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 Eligible Faculty Committee, 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](#).

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 clinical/teaching/practice or research faculty, for securing a reappointment.

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

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

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

VIII. Seventh-Year Reviews

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

IX. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

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

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 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. A total of five peer evaluations must be submitted for the mandatory promotion and tenure review. For early (non-mandatory) promotion and tenure review, the total number of peer evaluations submitted could be less than five but should be no less than two and typically should equal the number of years that the faculty member has served within the department.
- to review the teaching of tenured associate 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 three peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion review.
- to review, upon the department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for 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 TIU head, 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.