

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure

**Criteria and Procedures for
The Ohio State University
Department of English**

Approved by the English Department Council: 9/8/2025

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 9/16/2025

Table of Contents

I.	Preamble	4
I.	English Department Mission	4
II.	Definitions	4
A.	Committee of the Eligible Faculty	4
1.	Tenure-track Faculty.....	5
2.	Teaching Faculty	5
3.	Associated Faculty	6
4.	Conflict of Interest.....	6
5.	Minimum Composition.....	7
B.	Promotion and Tenure Committee	7
C.	Quorum	7
D.	Recommendations from the Eligible Faculty	7
1.	Appointment	8
2.	Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion.....	8
III.	Appointments	8
A.	Criteria	8
1.	Tenure-track Faculty.....	8
2.	Teaching Faculty	10
3.	Associated Faculty	10
4.	Regional Campus Faculty.....	11
5.	Emeritus Faculty	11
6.	Joint Appointments	12
7.	Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	12
B.	Procedures.....	12
1.	Tenure-track Faculty, Columbus Campus.....	12
2.	Teaching Faculty, Columbus Campus	14
3.	Transfer from the Tenure Track	15
4.	TIU Transfer	15
5.	Associated Faculty, Columbus Campus	15

6.	Regional Campus Faculty.....	16
7.	Joint Appointments	17
8.	Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	17
IV.	Annual Performance and Merit Review	17
A.	Documentation.....	18
B.	Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus	19
1.	Fourth-Year Review	19
2.	Extension of the Tenure Clock.....	21
C.	Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus	21
D.	Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus	22
E.	Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	23
F.	Regional Campus Faculty.....	23
G.	Salary Recommendations.....	24
V.	Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	25
A.	Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion	25
1.	Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure on the Columbus Campus.....	26
2.	Promotion to Professor on the Columbus Campus.....	30
3.	Teaching Faculty	32
4.	Promotion to Professor of Teaching	34
5.	Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	35
6.	Regional Campus Faculty.....	35
B.	Procedures.....	36
1.	Tenure-Track Faculty and Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	36
2.	Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	44
3.	Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty.....	44
4.	External Evaluations	44
VII.	Promotion and Tenure Appeals	47
VIII.	Seventh-Year Reviews.....	47
IX.	Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	47
A.	Student Evaluation of Teaching.....	47

	B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching	48
IX.	Appendix 1: Mentorship Plan	52

I. Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the [Rules of the University Faculty](#); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in chapter 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) [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 of English 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 of Arts and Sciences and the OAA 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 OAA 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 the department's 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 eligible 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 the Department of English and the College of Arts and Sciences; 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. English Department Mission

The Department of English creates and teaches knowledge about literature, poetics, writing, media, language, and cultures in the English-speaking world. The department serves constituents both inside and outside the university (including interdisciplinary programs, service-learning projects, and the discipline at large) and prepares students for careers inside and outside of academia. We believe that the analytical study of our sub-disciplines helps develop logical thought, awareness of the complexity of texts and of value judgments, apprehension of others' points of view, and imagination. English studies can expand creative, communicative and cognitive capacities; can sharpen the ability to make difficult judgments; and can help us understand societies, times, and cultures different from our own.

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 (TIU) or primary appointment in the Department of English.

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

For all faculty appointment reviews, the search committee is responsible for making a recommendation to the department chair. In this department, the search committee's recommendation follows a vote of the eligible faculty, as described below.

1. Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring) review of an assistant professor, associate professor, or professor on the Columbus campus, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the department on all campuses.
- **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 fourth-year reappointment and promotion and tenure reviews of assistant professors on all campuses, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors.
- For the promotion reviews of associate professors on all campuses, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors.

2. Teaching Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- The eligible faculty 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 consists of all tenure-track faculty and all teaching faculty in the department.
- **Rank Review.** For an initial appointment or reclassification review of teaching faculty at senior rank (associate teaching professor or teaching professor), a vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all non-probationary teaching faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

3. Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- Initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type), of associated faculty members is decided by the department chair in consultation with the hiring committee.
- Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by the eligible faculty (all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college dean.
- Reappointment of associated faculty members is decided by the department chair in consultation with the relevant member(s) of the Directors Committee.

Promotion Reviews

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

4. Conflict of Interest

- Search Committee Conflict of Interest

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

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

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

- a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor;

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

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

5. Minimum Composition

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

B. Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Department of English has a Promotion and Tenure (P&T) committee that consists of faculty chosen from the ranks of associate professors and professors. Details about the committee's membership and duties are found in SECTION VII.C in the department's Pattern of Administration.

C. Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is three-fifths of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence, including a Faculty Professional Leave or external fellowship. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the chair has approved an off-campus assignment that precludes virtual participation.

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

D. Recommendations from the Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters, voting is by secret ballot, and votes must be cast prior to the meeting adjournment. Only "yes" and "no" votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. They will be entered in the record but not counted in the vote total. 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 more than half of the votes cast are positive.
- In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment unit 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 at least two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.
- In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment unit prior to his/her/their reappointment or 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 its quality. 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, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment.

All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university's system of record for faculty and staff. A formal review and selection process, including interviews using pre-designed evaluation rubrics, is required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in [Workday](#) to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

1. Tenure-track Faculty

Instructor. Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but requirements for the terminal degree (Ph.D., M.F.A, or equivalent) 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 eligible faculty, the chair, the dean, and the OAA. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor. Minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of assistant professor include an earned terminal degree in an appropriate field of study (Ph.D., M.F.A., or equivalent terminal degree), evidence of potential for scholarly productivity and potential to develop into an internationally recognized scholar, demonstrated potential for effective teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, a willingness to provide high-quality service to the department, the institution, and the profession, and a strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the ranks in a timely fashion.

An appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service, except in cases of approved extensions of the tenure clock. 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 upon the candidate's request, if the candidate passes a screening by the eligible faculty (see VI.B). The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the OAA, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period.

Associate Professor and Professor. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor, with or without tenure, or Professor with tenure and offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the College of Arts and Sciences and the OAA.

A person appointed as associate professor or professor is expected to hold the Ph.D., M.F.A., or equivalent terminal degree, to have successful teaching experience, and to be capable of distinguished scholarship on the evidence of work already accomplished, in line with the criteria for promotion to associate professor below. A person appointed as professor should have demonstrated a distinguished record of teaching, scholarship and professional service, in line with the criteria for promotion below.

The College of Arts and Sciences has the following additional criteria for appointment offers at the rank of associate professor or professor with tenure: demonstrated excellence in teaching undergraduate and graduate students and demonstrated excellence in service/outreach to the profession and field as well as locally to their university. Additionally, appointment offers at the rank of associate professor with tenure require national recognition for a high-quality body of scholarship and strong potential to advance to the rank of professor in a timely fashion. Appointment offers at the rank of professor with tenure must have an established national or international reputation as a leading scholar in their field with an outstanding body of scholarship.

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 relevant teaching experience. A probationary period of up to four years is

possible, on approval of the OAA, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

Appointments at the rank of professor without tenure are not possible.

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

2. Teaching Faculty

Teaching faculty appointments exist for faculty members who focus principally on the educational needs of students in the department. Teaching faculty members are expected to contribute to the department's educational mission as reflected in undergraduate and graduate program development and teaching; they may also be asked to contribute in scholarship of teaching and learning and in service to the university or to the profession. The expected duties must be spelled out in the letter of hire. Teaching faculty appointments are made in accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-7](#).

Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all other teaching faculty must be for a period of five years. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for teaching assistant professors and associate professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for teaching professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. These extended appointments are not probationary, and the individual may only be terminated for cause (see rule [3335-5-04](#) of the Administrative Code) or financial exigency (see rule [3335-5-02.1](#) of the Administrative Code). Tenure is not granted to teaching faculty.

Assistant Teaching Professor. Any individual who is appointed as an assistant teaching professor is expected to hold a PhD, MFA, or equivalent appropriate terminal degree in the relevant field; alternately, they may possess a bachelor's degree and significant experience or accomplishment in an area of expertise relevant to the position for which they are hired. (For example, a professional business writer who has taught at another institution may be deemed qualified to hold a teaching position in business writing or an instructor without a terminal degree who has had extensive teaching at the college level could also be deemed qualified.) They will have experience teaching in an institution of higher education and have a record of pedagogical effectiveness. Depending on the composition of their workload agreement, they will demonstrate willingness to provide high-quality service to their field and institution.

Associate Teaching Professor; Teaching Professor. Appointment at the rank of associate teaching professor or teaching professor requires that the individual have earned a PhD, MFA, or equivalent appropriate terminal degree in the relevant field. They must meet, at a minimum, the department's teaching criteria as described in section VI.A.3 of this document for promotion to this rank.

3. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a few weeks to assist with a focused assignment (as when another faculty member's illness or resignation requires hiring a substitute), a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. Associated faculty may be reappointed. Appointments of all associated faculty must be reviewed and approved by the College of Arts and Sciences.

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, though in most cases the Department prefers the Ph.D., M.F.A., or an equivalent terminal degree. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is required. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for lecturers cannot exceed three years.

Senior Lecturer. Appointment as a senior lecturer requires a terminal degree (e.g., the Ph.D., M.F.A., or equivalent terminal degree along with evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction; or an M.A. and five or more years of teaching experience with documentation of high-quality performance. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The initial appointment for a senior lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for senior lecturers cannot exceed three years. The department, however, may limit terms of some senior lecturers for programmatic or budgetary reasons.

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated (0% FTE). 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.

4. Regional Campus Faculty

As the mission of the regional campuses emphasizes undergraduate instruction, regional campus criteria for appointment at the tenure-track ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor are 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 and associated faculty are the same as those for Columbus campus associated faculty.

5. Emeritus Faculty

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

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

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

6. Joint Appointments

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

7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

The department may extend courtesy (0% FTE) appointments to tenure-track Ohio State faculty from other tenure initiating units (TIUs) whose teaching and scholarship have ties to the work of the department and who are actively involved in the department.

Expected contributions include advising of graduate students, participation in the scholarly life of the department, and, in some cases and with the approval of the home TIU, occasional teaching in the department. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

B. Procedures

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, teaching, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment. All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university's system of record for faculty and staff. A formal review and selection process, including interviews using pre-designed evaluation rubrics, is required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in Workday to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

See the [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#) and the [Policy on Faculty Appointments](#) for information on the following topics:

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

1. Tenure-track Faculty, Columbus Campus

A national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. This includes all external candidates for all faculty positions. The only exception is for dual career partners, as described in Chapter 5, section 4.1 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the OAA in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

The dean of the college 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 chair will appoint a search committee for each position the department seeks to fill. Each search committee will consist of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search, 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 chair will designate one person on each search committee to serve as committee chair. Faculty not on the search committee are invited to read letters of recommendation, CVs, and writing samples and to make comments, but the search committee will select the list of interviewees.

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

- “Phase 1 | Search Preparation & Proactive Recruitment” is the earliest stage in the search process. Key steps during this phase include determining faculty needs for the unit, creating a search strategy (including timeline), establishing a budget, and identifying additional partners to include in the process. The steps in this phase provide guidance on forming committees, detail training requirements for search committee members, and innovative approaches to advertising and outreach. This section also includes ideas and resources for developing qualified talent pools to ensure alignment with the university’s commitment to EO principles and advance the eminence of the institution.
- “Phase 2 | Preliminary Review of Applicants” focuses on best practices for the application review and candidate screening processes. The guidelines and resources in this section support consistency and fairness in the review, assessment, and selection of candidates moving forward in the recruitment process. This section also outlines how to select a list of candidates for on-campus interviews.
- “Phase 3 | Finalists Interviews & Evaluations” provides guidance and tools for conducting interviews and campus visits, requesting reference letters (if not requested earlier in the application stage), and collecting feedback from everyone who interacted with the candidates. Adherence to the guidelines outlined in this section has a direct impact on enhancing the candidate experience and ensuring a consistent evaluation process. This phase concludes with the submission of a letter from the search committee to the department chair.

- “Phase 4 | Extend Offer” provides guidance and resources related to effectively selecting the most qualified candidate(s) for the position(s) and successfully negotiating to result in an accepted offer.
- “Phase 5 | Preboard and Onboard” offers resources to help prepare and support new faculty as they transition to Ohio State. The suggestions in this phase focus on creating a seamless transition for incoming faculty and their partners/families, if applicable.
- “Phase 6 | Reflect and Assess the Search” is a process supported by OAA to reflect on the hiring cycle each year and evaluate areas that may need improvement and additional support.

After the campus visits, the eligible faculty meet to discuss perceptions and preferences and to vote on each candidate. The vote is advisory to the search committee which makes a recommendation to the department chair on which candidate should receive an offer. The department chair decides, in consultation with the divisional dean, which candidate will receive an offer. At that time, the department chair must discuss the details of the offer, including compensation with the divisional dean and receive approval before extending an offer.

If the 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.

Following a positive vote from the eligible faculty on appointment at senior rank, the P&T Committee will arrange an expedited tenure process, soliciting evaluations of the candidate’s scholarship by at least two scholars whose names are not given to the department by the candidate. The chair will give the eligible faculty access to the new external review letters and ask whether they would change anyone’s vote from “yes” to “no.” If one person says their vote would change, the eligible faculty will meet again to discuss and take a new vote on the tenure case; a two-thirds majority of “yes” votes is required for the tenure decision to move forward. Once the expedited tenure process is completed, the chair will secure the approval of the dean, and the chair and dean will work together to determine salary, start-up package, and other details of the appointment following the SHIFT Framework. The chair will then extend the formal offer.

All offers at the rank of associate professor, with or without tenure, all offers at the rank of professor, and all offers of prior service credit require the prior approval of the College of Arts and Sciences and OAA.

The department chair discusses 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, Columbus Campus

Searches for teaching faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the following exceptions:

- Candidates should submit a teaching statement describing their pedagogical techniques, philosophies, and/or achievements; this statement may also describe the evolution of the

applicant's teaching practices over their career.

- Candidates are not required to submit a research writing sample as part of their application.
- At least one letter of recommendation focused on teaching.
- The candidate's presentation during the virtual or on-campus interview is on teaching practice and/or philosophy rather than scholarship
- The candidate will have the opportunity to meet with the faculty and chair but will not be expected to meet with graduate students.

3. Transfer from the Tenure Track

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a teaching appointment if appropriate to the individual's circumstances and departmental and college needs, and if funding for the salary has been identified. Tenure or tenure eligibility is lost upon transfer, though rank is retained. Such transfers must be approved by the department chair, the college dean, and the executive vice president and provost.

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

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

4. TIU Transfer

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

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

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

5. Associated Faculty, Columbus Campus

The appointment of compensated associated faculty 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 chair based on recommendations by a hiring committee.

Reappointment of all compensated associated faculty is decided by the department chair in consultation with the relevant member(s) of the directors committee.

Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one to three years. Visiting appointments may be made for one non-renewable 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 of up to three years 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.

Tenure Track Faculty: The regional campus has primary responsibility for determining the need for and the position description for a tenure-track faculty search, but the regional campus dean or designee consults with the chair to reach agreement on the description before the search begins. The regional campus dean/director appoints the search committee and must include at least one tenure track faculty member from the Columbus campus.

Candidates should, at the minimum, be interviewed by the regional campus dean/director, the divisional dean in the College of Arts and Sciences or their designee, the department chair, the search committee, and representatives of both faculties. Candidates will be evaluated on both campuses, with the faculty on the Columbus campus (particularly those in the field) serving in an advisory role to the hiring campus. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. A decision to hire requires agreement on the part of the department chair and of the regional campus dean/director. Negotiations with a candidate should not begin without such agreement, and a letter of offer must be signed by the department chair and the dean/director of the regional campus.

Teaching Faculty: The regional campus has primary responsibility for determining the need for and the position description for a teaching faculty search, but the regional campus dean or designee consults with the chair to reach agreement on the description before the search begins. The department chair and the regional campus dean/director will agree on a single search committee for the position consisting of members of both units, with at least one tenure track faculty member from the Columbus campus.

The teaching presentation will take place on the regional campus.

Associated faculty: The appointment of associated faculty on the regional campus is described in the regional campus APT document. In cases where a particular associated faculty member is appointed on both a regional campus and the Columbus campus, the dean/director and the chair will work together to transfer funds between units or to create coordinated separate appointments in such a way that best supports the needs of the units and of the faculty member.

7. Joint Appointments

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

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

8. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

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

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

The department chair may designate the responsibility for annual performance and merit reviews to appropriate unit administrators. The designee or a subcommittee of the eligible faculty may provide a written assessment to the department chair. However, unless the Office of Academic Affairs has granted an exception to a large unit, the department chair must schedule a face-to-face meeting with all probationary faculty as part of the review. An opportunity for a face-to-face meeting with the department chair or the chair's designee must be provided to all tenured and non-probationary faculty.

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

Depending on a faculty member's appointment type, the annual 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 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 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.

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

A. Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, compensated faculty members must submit the following documents:

- OAA [dossier outline](#) (*required for probationary faculty*) or annual activity report, identifying performance and accomplishments (*non-probationary faculty*)
- Updated CV (*all faculty*)

Assistant professors are also required to submit a sample of their work in progress, and associate professors have the option to do so if they would like feedback from their professor review partners or the chair.

Other documentation for the annual performance and merit review will be the same as that for consideration for promotion and/or tenure. That documentation is described in Section VI of this document. The equitable review process thus provides a structured and scaffolded opportunity for candidates to begin the process of collecting materials that will be needed for promotion reviews.

At the request of the faculty member, the chair may solicit letters from internal or external collaborators or others familiar with annual teaching, research, or service. Faculty should not directly solicit such letters or other evaluations. 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

All probationary faculty are reviewed annually by the department chair and an ad-hoc review team for the first three years, and the department chair prepares a written evaluation with sufficient detail for meaningful feedback that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

Annual reviews of probationary faculty are conducted during the spring semester and are coordinated by the chair of the P&T Committee. The assistant professor submits to the department chair an annual activity report and CV, and to the P&T chair a report of activities in the format of the OAA dossier outline; discursive student evaluations of teaching and syllabi for the past year; a selection of scholarship in progress or completed; and any relevant evidence concerning service. The department chair may also solicit such other information and consult with colleagues as necessary to ensure a fair and thorough review. The P&T chair, in consultation with the department chair, appoints a tenured faculty member in the assistant professor's field or a related field to serve with the department chair, the P&T chair, and the junior POD on the assistant professor's annual review team. The four members of the team review the material and meet with the assistant professor to discuss strengths and weaknesses of the performance, to offer advice about preparing for the fourth-year and sixth-year reviews, and to respond to any concerns the assistant professor might wish to raise. The P&T chair produces a summary of the discussion of the meeting to be included in the assistant professor's annual review letter; copies of the annual review letter also go to each member of the team and to the college. The assistant professor may respond in writing.

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

If an annual review during the first three years suggests that the assistant professor might be terminated prior to the fourth-year review or as a result of the fifth-year annual review, the department chair will convene the eligible faculty to conduct a formal review following the procedures for fourth-year review (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#)). Following completion of the comments process the complete dossier will be forwarded to the College of Arts and Sciences for college-level review. As in the case of fourth-year reviews, the dean makes the final decision on renewal or non-renewal 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 chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. External evaluations are solicited only when either the 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 purpose of the fourth-year review is to determine whether, in the view of the eligible faculty, an assistant professor is making satisfactory progress toward establishing a record of teaching, scholarship, and service that is likely to meet the department's expectations in time for the sixth-year promotion and tenure review.

In assessing whether or not a colleague at fourth year is making satisfactory progress in teaching, the eligible faculty will consider all of the information in the dossier, including peer observations, summaries of discursive evaluations, SEI reports, and annual review letters. In assessing satisfactory progress in scholarship, the senior faculty will use measures appropriate to the candidate's field as defined in section VI.A below.

The department's expectations with regard to scholarship should be established early and reiterated both verbally in the annual review meetings and in writing in the department chair's annual review letters that result from those meetings. In assessing the satisfactoriness of a candidate's service by fourth year, senior faculty will consider the record of annual review letters and other relevant evidence, such as feedback from the chairs of committees on which the candidate has served.

Before or at the mid-point of spring semester of the fourth year of service as a member of the tenure-track faculty, the candidate submits to the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee all relevant evidence concerning teaching, scholarship, and service. For each candidate the committee assembles and distributes to the eligible faculty materials that include: (a) the OAA-designed dossier for reporting teaching, scholarship, and service activities; (b) the candidate's cumulative SEI report and summaries of student evaluations of teaching, made by the committee and approved (or else rebutted in writing) by the candidate; (c) peer evaluations of instruction by senior colleagues; and (d) the candidate's annual review letters. The department chair may also solicit such other information and consult with colleagues as necessary to ensure a fair and thorough review. Such information will be included in the dossier that goes forward to the college for review.

The department chair, members of the P&T Committee, and the candidate should pay careful attention to the guidelines and materials—and the format of their presentation—specified by the College of Arts and Sciences and the OAA. The P&T chair and the Procedures Oversight Designee will be responsible for verifying the accuracy of the candidates' citations and other aspects of the candidates' dossiers. The Procedures Oversight Designee will also check the dossiers to ensure the appropriateness of their contents.

At its spring semester meeting, the eligible faculty discusses each candidate separately in alphabetical order. Voting will occur after the discussion of each individual candidate. After discussion of each candidate, a motion is made to conduct a straw vote taken by secret ballot. The results are announced to the meeting. Discussion will continue until there is a motion to conduct a final vote by secret ballot. In cases of unanimous affirmative votes, a motion may be made to accept the straw vote as the final vote.

The eligible faculty forwards to the department chair a record of the vote and a written performance review summarizing the case and the eligible faculty's discussion, to the department chair. The department chair conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The department forwards the complete dossier to the college, including its recommendations to the dean via the letter from the P&T chair, and the letter from the department chair expressing the chair's view of the case.

Renewal of the appointment of a probationary faculty member for the fifth year requires the approval of the divisional dean. In cases where the divisional dean concurs with a TIU's recommendations to approve the renewal of the appointment, review by the College of Arts and Sciences Divisional Promotion and Tenure Review Panel is optional and at the divisional dean's discretion. The divisional review panel, however, must review negative TIU reappointment recommendations. If either the TIU head or the divisional dean recommends nonrenewal of a faculty member's probationary contract, the case will be referred to the college's Promotion and Tenure Committee, which will review the case, vote and make a recommendation to the dean. The dean, in consultation with the divisional dean, makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

The department chair will inform candidates promptly when recommendations have been reached at each level of review. They will be given copies of the letters from the department chair and from the P&T chair stating the recommendations and the reasons for them. Candidates will be informed that they have ten calendar days after receipt of these letters to submit comments in writing. If a candidate does submit comments, the department chair and the P&T chair may, in turn, provide written responses to the candidate's comments. Similarly, candidates will be invited to examine letters from the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and from the dean and to comment in writing on these letters. The dean and the college P&T Committee may, in turn, provide written responses to a candidate's comments.

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

All tenured faculty receive an annual evaluation of their performances. For the associate professors, the department chair consults with the professors, who help with the process. During early spring semester, the chair, in consultation with the chair of P&T or senior POD, arranges review partners, ensuring that the workload is distributed as fairly as possible and that, ideally, the same person is not reviewing the same colleague repeatedly. If an associate professor has an administrative role, the impact of that role and other assignments will be considered during the annual review.

The department chair is responsible for conducting annual review of professors, in conjunction with the P&T chair. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence

in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the 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 an associate professor or professor has an administrative role, the impact of that role and other assignments will be considered in the annual review.

All associate professors and professors receive an annual review letter based on their annual activity report. The annual review letter is separate from the salary letter. The letters aids individual faculty in their on-going self-assessments and future planning of their teaching, scholarship, and service and provides fuller information to the department chair and the salary committees for their deliberations about merit raises. For Associate Professors, the letter becomes part of their official Promotion and Tenure file. Faculty members may provide written comments on their review and the department chair may respond in writing.

All associate professors are encouraged to take advantage of the annual review process as an opportunity to discuss with the annual review partner and, if requested, the department chair, the department's expectations regarding appropriate measures of quality, quantity, and impact in particular fields.

D. Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus

The annual performance and merit review process for teaching probationary and non-probationary faculty is identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty respectively, except for the following:

- Non-probationary teaching faculty may participate in the review of teaching faculty of lower rank.
- The focus of the review will be on teaching but may also include service and scholarship, depending upon the faculty member's workload assignment.
- In the penultimate contract year of a teaching faculty member's appointment, the department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed. If the position will continue, a mandatory formal performance review for reappointment occurs in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review generally proceeds in the same manner as the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty.

These criteria will usually be focused on teaching and service but may include other contributions

to the department, university, and field, as outlined in the criteria laid out in the terms of initial appointment. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

E. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The department chair, or designee, meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and prepares a written evaluation. The department chair's recommendation on renewal of the appointment is final. If the recommendation is to renew, the department chair may extend a multiple-year appointment of up to three years, when resources allow.

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

Expected contributions to the department include undergraduate teaching and, only when specifically assigned as part of the position, administrative work related to undergraduate teaching. Participation in committee work or in the scholarly life of the department is evaluated only when it is a component of the faculty member's assigned workload responsibilities.

In establishing priority among Senior Lecturers wishing to be reappointed, the Department follows this order:

- Dual-career-accommodation appointments, where the partner has a record of excellent teaching and meets demonstrated teaching needs within the Department
- Senior Lecturers qualified to meet specific instructional needs
- Senior Lecturers who, all other things being equal, have seniority

The department chair's recommendation on reappointment is final.

F. Regional Campus Faculty

Regional campus tenure-track faculty are reviewed according to the process established on that campus, with the review focused on teaching and service. Following the review by the regional campus, the regional campus dean meets with the department chair for evaluation of the faculty member's research and creative activity during the review period. The regional campus dean provides an annual performance and merit review letter. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the 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.

For probationary tenure-track faculty reviews, in the event that the regional campus dean/director recommends renewal and the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the case shall be reviewed by the college dean. The disagreement shall be considered during that review, with the college dean's

judgment prevailing. All recommended non-renewals must proceed with a review using the Fourth-Year review process described in section V.B.1. The college dean's decision is final.

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

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

G. Salary Recommendations

The College of Arts and Sciences requires that units:

- adopt procedures for the distribution of merit salary and other rewards that recognize the importance of qualitative rather than merely quantitative contributions in each area of faculty activity.
- guard against rigid formulas or weightings of research/creative work, teaching, and service that might limit recognition of extraordinary one-time commitments in one or more areas of variations in workload, or of shifts in responsibilities at different stages of professional development.
- make recommendations for merit salary increases and other rewards that are consistent with the department's APT document and other relevant policies, procedures, practices, and standards established by: (1) the college, (2) the Faculty Rules, (3) the Office of Academic Affairs, and (4) the Office of Human Resources.

The department chair annually presents to the dean recommendations about merit salary increases. The dean makes the final decision about whether to approve or amend these recommendations. In preparing those recommendations, the department chair seeks the advice of the associate professors and professors through the establishment of a committee on merit salary increases. This salary committee consists of the department chair and the elected professors and associate professors on the Executive 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 it. Any faculty member is entitled to confer on an individual basis with the department chair on merit and equity issues.

The salary committee's recommendations are based on the current annual performance and merit review as well as on the performance and merit reviews of the preceding 12 months). Upon review of the annual activity reports and (when available) the chair's annual review letters, the salary committee will assign a rating for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service, as well as an overall rating for each faculty member, according to the following scale: Outstanding (5), Excellent (4), Very Good (3), Good (2), Satisfactory (1), Unsatisfactory (0). A faculty member who receives an Unsatisfactory overall rating will not be recommended for a merit increase.

Except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increases, all funds for annual salary increases are directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and the active promotion of an

enriching working and learning environment through collegiality, civility, and openness to diverse ideas and opinions.

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

See also the “Faculty Salary Appeals” section of the College of Arts and Sciences [Pattern of Administration](#) (POA) for the procedures governing a formal salary appeal.

Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation (see Sections V-A and V-B 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.

The following guidelines are supplementary to the University and College documents and set forth procedures applicable particularly to the Department of English. In formulating its judgments on promotion and tenure, the Department takes into account the candidate's accomplishment in (1) teaching; (2) scholarship; and (3) service to the Department, the University, the community, and the profession. The Department is aware that no one of these criteria can or should be applied mechanically.

A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

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

A commitment to these values and principles is demonstrated, for example, by participation in faculty governance and community outreach; activities related to the University's [Shared Values](#); adherence to

principles of the responsible conduct of research; constructive conduct and ethical behavior during the discharge of responsibilities and authority; and the exercise of rights and privileges consistent with the [American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

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

1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure on the Columbus Campus

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.

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](#).

Consistent with these guidelines, promotion to associate professor with tenure in the College of Arts and Sciences requires excellence in both research/creative work and teaching. Evidence of service to the unit and the promise of excellence in service beyond the unit are desirable. The substantial probability that a high rate of quality research/creative work and excellence in teaching and service will continue needs to be established. The claim that awarding tenure to the candidate will improve the overall quality and standing of the unit needs to be supported.

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

Teaching

The department considers excellence in teaching to be as important as excellence in scholarship, and it takes into consideration the candidate's effectiveness, in exciting interest, cultivating independent thought, and imparting demonstrable knowledge and skill to the variety of students enrolled in our

classes. Candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to serve on advising-meeting, candidacy-exam, and dissertation committees. Assistant professors are not expected to direct dissertations. Faculty in Creative Writing are expected to direct MFA theses and serve on thesis committees.

Documentation of these criteria are outlined below:

TEACHING	
Criteria Candidates must have:	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met Candidates may be asked to submit:
Developed effective instructional techniques and materials appropriate for the objectives and level of the course Effective service on student committees. For Creative Writing Faculty this includes service on thesis committees and direction of MFA theses. For other faculty, this includes service on advising-meeting, candidacy-exam, and dissertation committees. Cultivated students' independent thought through assignments and class activities and advising/mentoring activities Imparted demonstrable knowledge and skill to the variety of students enrolled in our classes. Provision to all students of the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning and, to the most capable and motivated students, an enhanced learning experience.	• Syllabi that demonstrate content, assignments, and activities in line with learning outcomes • Independent summaries of discursive student comments from a variety of classes • Peer evaluations of instruction • Evidence of student advising at the undergraduate and graduate level • Information about curriculum development • Information about endorsements or other activities with the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning • Information about other relevant professional development activities for teaching (e.g., attending workshop at a professional conference) • Receipt of teaching awards

Scholarship

The department expects all candidates for promotion and tenure to have demonstrated excellence in scholarship by producing original work and disseminating its results in peer-reviewed venues; and by presenting one's scholarship at meetings of professional scholarly organizations nationally or internationally. The most important measure of scholarly excellence, however, will be a candidate's record of publications, creative projects, or other products by which his or her expertise makes a demonstrable national or international impact. The department recognizes that scholarly and creative activities occur in diverse media (e.g., print and digital format), and the same standard—clear excellence—applies regardless of the medium. Scholarship should normally be reviewed in the medium in which it was published (e.g., web publications should be read online).

In assessing a candidate's scholarship, the department considers both quality and quantity. The department values especially the quality of a candidate's scholarship: its originality, its lucidity, its intellectual depth, and its importance in terms of contributing meaningfully to the relevant field(s) of

inquiry. We weigh as additional evidence of quality such indicators as the reputation of publishers, the receipt of awards and prizes, published reviews, and the assessments that we solicit from external evaluators of a case. But members of the eligible faculty of the department will also judge quality on the basis of their own reading and discussion of the evidence of scholarship submitted.

No single quantitative standard for scholarship will suffice for a department as large and diverse as English. We therefore accept that different subfields should establish clear expectations and specify (through the annual review process and, when appropriate, through a memorandum of understanding) what form(s) and quantity of evidence are appropriate for a candidate in a given area. For many subfields in English, the principal evidence of scholarly achievement remains a book, singly or collaboratively authored, published by a press with a strong reputation or an emerging series in the candidate's field. If the book is not yet published by the time of the department's formal vote in the Fall, the manuscript should be under final contract. (Here and afterwards, having a "final contract," as opposed to an advance contract, means that the work has received final board approval from the press and that the author has completed revisions in response to all levels of review at the press.)

For candidates who have been hired to teach in the Creative Writing MFA Program, the principal evidence of scholarly contribution will typically take the form of two published books (one published before or under contract at the time of hire), or of a published book and a second book under final contract by the time of the tenure vote. For any candidate who works in a subfield of English Studies where a monograph is not necessarily the norm for tenure and first promotion (e.g., Linguistics; Folklore; Digital Media Studies; Rhetoric, Composition and Literacy), the department will establish standards of evidence for scholarship appropriate to his/her field. In such cases, the department chair and the P&T chair will work together with the candidate and his/her senior area-colleagues to determine suitable, field-specific guidelines, which will then be documented in the candidate's annual review letters and, if appropriate, in a memorandum of understanding.

Whatever subfield a candidate works in, the department will expect to see a range of evidence indicating breadth and the promise of future achievement; such additional evidence includes, but is not limited to, singly or collaboratively authored publications in refereed journals and essay collections, external grant funding, edited or co-edited collections, invited lectures, conference papers, book reviews or review essays, and professional reports.

Documentation of these criteria are summarized below:

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH	
Criteria Candidates must have:	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met Candidates may be asked to submit:
Demonstrated excellence in scholarship and/or creative activity by producing original work and disseminating its results in peer-reviewed venues, and by presenting such work at professional scholarly organizations nationally or internationally.	A record of publications, creative projects, or other products by which the candidate's expertise makes a demonstrable national or international impact (as evidenced by receipt of awards or prizes, published reviews, and assessment by external evaluators). For many subfields in English, the principal evidence of scholarly achievement will be a book, singly or collaboratively authored, published by or under final contract with a press with a strong reputation or an
Contributed meaningfully to the relevant field(s) of inquiry	

Demonstrated breadth and the promise of future achievement An emerging national or international reputation as a scholar or creative artist	emerging series in the candidate's field. For candidates hired to teach in the creative writing MFA program, the principal evidence will typically take the form of two published books. For candidates in subfields where a monograph is not necessarily the norm, the department will establish standards of evidence for scholarship appropriate to his/her field. In such cases, the department chair and the P&T chair will work together with the candidate and his/her senior area-colleagues to determine suitable, field-specific guidelines, which will then be documented in the candidate's annual review letters and, if appropriate, in a memorandum of understanding. • Complete publication record including books, peer-reviewed and editor-reviewed articles and chapters, textbooks based on scholarship, graphs, books, book chapters, textbooks based on scholarship, and magazine articles and on-line publications • Evidence of applying to and/or receiving internal grants from the college or university or external grants from state or federal agencies or foundations. • Evidence of invited lectures or readings and conference presentations/papers • 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 • Evaluations of the scholarly record from external scholars
---	--

Service

Service is considered by the college and the department to include service to one or more of several publics: The university, the Columbus community, the state of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations. Although assistant professors' service loads are limited by design, candidates for promotion and tenure are expected to assume committee responsibilities when called upon by the department, the college, the university, or the profession, and to participate where appropriate in activities related to their professional expertise that support the academic mission of the university in the community.

SERVICE	
Criteria Candidates must have:	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met Candidates may be asked to submit:
Demonstrated potential for excellence in service to the department, college, university, professional, or community.	• Record of service activities and outcomes in recognition letters and service awards • Evaluation of service in annual reviews • Participation where appropriate in activities that are associated with one's professional

	expertise and support the academic mission of the university in the community • Quality indicators of community participation and engagement.
--	--

2. Promotion to Professor on the Columbus Campus

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.

In addition, the rule further specifies that 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. While acknowledging that a typical case for promotion to professor will emphasize a candidate's scholarly or creative achievements, especially as measured through publication and/or (inter)national reputation, the College of Arts and Sciences also recognizes that, "[w]here a candidate has made truly extraordinary contributions in the areas of teaching or service, that record may warrant promotion in combination with a less extensive, though excellent record of continued productivity in scholarship." In screening candidates for promotion, the Department of English honors this principle of exception as described in the college's APT document, with an understanding that such contributions—whether within or beyond the university—must be documentable in ways that can be reviewed by external evaluators as well as by the eligible faculty.

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, evidence of established national or international reputation in the field, and evidence of excellence in service to one or more publics, as described below. When assessing a candidate's reputation in the field, a national or international reputation for the scholarship of teaching may be counted as either teaching or scholarship.

Teaching:

Typically, candidates for promotion are expected to have been consistently strong to excellent teachers, judged by their effectiveness in exciting interest, cultivating independent thought, and imparting demonstrable knowledge and skills among the variety of students enrolled in our courses. Distinction in teaching can also be measured by national or international recognition in the form of awards or honors, and/or by documentation of successful student outcomes. Promotion candidates on the Columbus campus will usually demonstrate, in addition to a strong record of undergraduate pedagogy, evidence of extensive graduate teaching and graduate advising in their fields.

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.

Scholarship:

The department places particular emphasis on candidates' demonstration of excellence in scholarship. Typically, a candidate for promotion to Professor will have a post-tenure scholarly record of national and/or international distinction judged by its quality, quantity, and impact on the pertinent field(s). The department acknowledges, however, that flexibility in assessing excellence and impact at this level is appropriate.

In many instances, the centerpiece of a candidate's post-tenure scholarly record will take the form of an additional published book or a set of scholarly or creative projects, comparable in their collective substance and impact to a major, book-length work. Such projects may be singly or collaboratively authored and disseminated in peer-reviewed venues or other media as appropriate to the candidate's specialty. In some subfields of English studies, including Folklore, Linguistics, and Rhetoric, Composition, & Literacy, the centerpiece of the case is commonly a set of projects, typically a collection of strong articles and/or book chapters, individually or collaboratively authored.

All candidates are additionally expected to demonstrate some degree of breadth and promise of continuing scholarly achievement. This breadth and promise can be demonstrated in a variety of forms:

- Additional articles in peer-reviewed journals or book chapters (for those using a strong collection as the centerpiece of the case for promotion, these essays should address one or more lines of research not reflected in the collection);
- scholarly editions;
- edited or co-edited collections;
- textbooks that incorporate substantial original research;
- digital/database/website productions;
- translations;
- conference papers and invited presentations;
- readings of original creative work;
- curation of exhibits;
- book reviews and review essays;
- editing of a journal and/or book series (where editorial work has made, in the view of senior colleagues in the field, a significant scholarly contribution);
- professional reports on research or pedagogical activity.

In addition, breadth and promise in scholarship can be demonstrated through the following activities when they are substantially informed by one's research:

- the development of published pedagogical scholarship (print or digital);
- the direction of institutes that have documentable impact on teaching and/or scholarship in a given field;
- the creation of major new scholarly tools (print or digital);

- The development and implementation of public-facing projects (eg. lecture series, digital media projects, curatorial work) that contribute to the advancement of public humanities as an area of inquiry and that interact with current disciplinary conversations;
- The development and implementation of projects with community partners that contribute to the community's agency, well-being, knowledge of itself, experiences, and/or resources;
- the performance of departmental administrative roles that relate directly to a candidate's field of scholarly expertise and produce new knowledge or other kinds of impact that can be assessed by peer review.

The preceding list is not meant to be exhaustive. Furthermore, the department is open to considering cases in which the relationship between "centerpiece" and "breadth and promise" (as defined in the previous two paragraphs) is reversed. Whatever form a scholarship profile may take, the department will be most concerned to verify its quality and impact, as measured by peer reviews, the prestige of its venues, the receipt of awards, evidence of citations, and other measures of quality appropriate to the candidate's specialty.

Service:

In the area of service, candidates are expected to have built a record of significant, effective contributions at the college, university, and national levels (including serving on college and university committees, scholarly societies, academic presses and journals, and other academic institutions) while continuing to provide high-quality service to the department at the appropriate campus. Although not required, evidence of professionally-related public service (e.g. outreach at schools, libraries, festivals, or volunteering in civic or cultural organizations in cases where scholarly expertise is pertinent) is valued.

3. Teaching Faculty

Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor

Promotion to associate teaching professor requires that a faculty member hold a doctoral or other terminal degree in the relevant field or equivalent experience; show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service; have a documented high level of competence in professional practice; and display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of the department. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to associate teaching professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Teaching

The Department considers excellence in teaching to be the most important factor in promotion to associate teaching professor. In assessing excellence, the Department takes into consideration the candidate's effectiveness in exciting interest, cultivating independent thought and imparting demonstrable knowledge and skill to the variety of students enrolled in our classes.

Documentation of these criteria are outlined below:

TEACHING	
Criteria <i>Candidates must have:</i>	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met <i>Candidates may be asked to submit:</i>
- Developed effective instructional techniques and materials appropriate for the objectives and level of the course - Cultivated students' independent thought through assignments and class activities and advising/mentoring activities - Imparted demonstrable knowledge and skill to the variety of students enrolled in our classes.	- Syllabi that demonstrate content, assignments, and activities in line with learning outcomes - Independent summary of discursive student comments from a variety of classes that demonstrates engagement with the material - Peer evaluations of teaching - Evidence of student advising at the undergraduate level - Information about curriculum development - Information about endorsements or other activities with the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning and/or other pedagogy-focused entities at OSU or at other institutions. - Information about other relevant professional development activities for teaching (e.g., attending workshop at a professional conference or engaging with pedagogy-focused research).

Service

Service is considered by the College and the Department to include service to one or more of several publics: the university, the Columbus, Lima, Mansfield, Marion, and Newark communities, the State of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations. Although teaching faculty's service loads are limited by design, candidates for promotion are expected to assume committee responsibilities when called upon by the department, the college, the regional campus, the university, or the profession, and to participate where appropriate in activities that support the academic mission of the university in the community.

SERVICE	
Criteria <i>Candidates must have:</i>	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met <i>Candidates may be asked to submit:</i>

Effective participation in committees or other department/campus jobs as assigned	● Record of service activities ● Contributions and quality indicators of the outcomes of the contributions ● Evaluation of service in annual reviews
Effective participation in college, university, or professional committees as appropriate	Contributions and quality indicators of the outcomes of the contributions including positive change
Participation where appropriate in activities that support the academic mission of the university in the community.	Activities and quality indicators within the community setting

4. Promotion to Professor of Teaching

For promotion to teaching professor, a faculty member must hold a doctoral or other terminal degree in the relevant field or equivalent experience, have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching, leadership in service to the department, college, university, community and/or profession, and in the 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. The specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate teaching professor (see charts in Section VI.A.3), with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions and the production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy.

Teaching

Candidates for promotion to Professor of Teaching are expected to have been consistently strong to excellent teachers, judged by their effectiveness in exciting interest, cultivating independent thought, and imparting demonstrable knowledge and skills among the variety of students enrolled in our courses. Distinction in teaching can be measured by the kinds of evidence in the chart in Section VI.A.3 as well as by recognition in the form of awards or honors, and/or by documentation of successful student outcomes.

Service

Candidates for promotion to Professor of Teaching are expected to have built a record of high-quality service to the department and/or regional campus. Evidence of contributions at the college and university levels and of professionally related public service at the local, national, or international levels are valued.

Scholarship

Candidates for promotion to Professor of Teaching are expected to have produced and disseminated scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy, which includes: conference presentations, workshops,

written work (digital or print), successful grant proposals, etc. Non-pedagogical scholarship (monographs, journal essays, published creative writing, conference papers, etc.) is commended and counted positively for the promotion case, but is not required for promotion to Professor of Teaching.

5. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

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

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

6. Regional Campus Faculty

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Teaching

In the area of teaching, the department will look for sustained excellence in undergraduate teaching and mentoring and will not require regional campus candidates for promotion to have a record of graduate teaching or advising.

Scholarship

As members of the Department of English, regional campus faculty are expected to contribute to scholarship in their discipline. These contributions will be evaluated by the same means and according to the same criteria as described above. In recognition of the mission of the regional campuses, however, the department makes adjustments in quantitative scholarship expectations. Because the primary mission of the regional campuses is to provide high-quality undergraduate instruction and serve the academic needs of their communities, the Department will give greater weight to the performances in undergraduate teaching and service of regional campus faculty. For promotion to associate professor, regional campus candidates will be expected to meet the same qualitative scholarship requirement as Columbus faculty—a published book (or a finished and fully revised book manuscript under final, board-approved contract and ready to go to press) or a sustained, original scholarly project appropriate to the field. We adjust the quantitative standard for regional campus tenure candidates, however, by allowing that additional published work beyond the book (or book equivalent) is not, as it is for Columbus faculty, the standard expectation. Similarly, in evaluating the breadth of a candidate for promotion to professor, the heavier course load and scarcity of leave opportunities at regional campuses will be taken into consideration in evaluating the quantity, though not the quality, of a regional faculty member's case for promotion.

Service

Because the responsibility for maintaining strong ties with the local community falls more directly on the regional campus faculty than is the case on the Columbus campus, service for regional campus candidates may be understood to include not only active participation on campus committees and in

professional organizations but also participation in those activities related to their professional expertise that support the academic mission of the University in the community.

In formulating its judgment on regional campus candidates, the department pays close attention to the recommendations of the campus's Promotion and Tenure Committee and the campus Dean/Director.

Promotion to Tenured Professor

The heavier course load and scarcity of Faculty Professional Leave opportunities at regional campuses will be taken into consideration in evaluation of the quantity, though not the quality, of a regional faculty member's case for promotion.

Teaching Faculty

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

B. Procedures

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

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

a) Candidate responsibilities

Candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier in accordance with the OAA dossier outline 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 OAA [dossier outline](#). Candidates should not sign the OAA [Candidate Checklist](#) without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the OAA core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist.

While the department's P&T Committee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidates bear full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by them.

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.

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 scholarly record since the start date or date of last promotion that is to be the focus of the evaluating parties.

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.

All entries in the core dossier should be presented in reverse chronological order.

In addition to the core dossier, the Department requires the following documentation:

- Syllabi, SEI overview reports, and discursive student evaluations for each course taught during the most recent 5 years
- Peer evaluations of teaching (see section IX below). The department is responsible for obtaining these evaluations.
- One (1) electronic copy of each unpublished book-length manuscript that will be considered as part of the record on research, with an attached prefatory note indicating if the work is still under review or has been accepted for publication; if accepted, then state when and with what press it is forthcoming
- One (1) electronic copy of each published article, chapter, essay, review, or other short publication
- One (1) electronic copy of contracts and reports by readers for scholarship (books, articles, book chapters etc.) as yet unpublished but under contract, along with responses to the reports by the candidate and any evidence of acceptance or contract
- One (1) electronic copy of already published books
- Electronic copies of any published reviews of the candidate's work
- Current CV

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

- Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document

Candidates must indicate the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. A candidate may be reviewed using the department's current APT document, or they may elect to be reviewed under the document that was in effect on their start date or the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion (or date of last reappointment in the case of teaching faculty), whichever of these

two latter documents is the more recent. However, for tenure track faculty the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year.

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

- External Evaluations (see also section B4 below)

If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed according to standards for peer review in college and OAA policies, as outlined in section B4 below. The candidate may add up to six additional names but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names. The P and T chair, in consultation with the department chair, decides whether removal is justified.

- Comments

After candidates receive copies of the completed letters from the P&T chair and the department chair, they may submit comments on the letters up to ten calendar days after receiving them. Only one iteration of comments on the departmental review is permitted.

- Stopping the Review

Only the candidate may stop any review for promotion and tenure once external letters of evaluation have been sought. The candidate may withdraw from review at any stage of the process by so informing the department chair in writing. If the review process has moved beyond the department, the department chair shall inform the dean or the Executive Vice President and Provost, as relevant, of the candidate's withdrawal. Withdrawal from the mandatory tenure review during the final probationary year means that tenure shall not be granted.

- Candidate responsibilities for receiving screening feedback for non-mandatory review

Probationary faculty who ask to be considered for a nonmandatory promotion review are responsible for providing the following for review: (1) the candidate's current core dossier, including complete narrative sections on teaching, scholarship (tenure-track faculty only) and service, plus a cumulative SEI report; (2) a current C.V.; (3) copies of all previous annual review letters and peer evaluations of teaching; and (4) documentation confirming the publication schedule of any book(s) or comparable major project(s) that will be central to the promotion and tenure case. The documentation mentioned under item (4) should include, in the case of books, a final board-approved contract or compelling evidence that such a contract will be in hand by the time the eligible faculty votes in the fall. In the case of articles or other works of scholarship, the documentation required under item (4) may include letters of acceptance or other formal agreements to publish the work(s) in question in the fall semester.

During fall semester, **nonprobationary faculty** who wish to be considered for a nonmandatory promotion review in the following academic year should make that request known to the department chair and/or P&T chair and are responsible for submitting the following documentation.

- The candidate's up-to-date c.v.;
- Three statements—like those required for the core dossier—providing a narrative of the candidate's scholarship and accomplishments in teaching and in service going back five years or to last promotion or reappointment, whichever is more recent; and
- A cumulative SEI report.

The eligible faculty will also have access to the candidate's annual review letters and peer teaching evaluations going back five years or to last promotion or reappointment, whichever is more recent. If a major research project such as a monograph is going to figure prominently in the promotion case but has not yet been published, the statement on scholarship should include a timeline for publication, with a copy of a final board-approved contract (or the equivalent) attached. If such a contract is not in hand by the date of the screening meeting, the candidate will need to present convincing evidence (such as recent correspondence from the press) that a final contract (as defined under VI.A.1) will be in hand by the time the eligible faculty votes in the fall semester. Letters of acceptance for other major publications not yet in print should also be included. The statement on teaching for Columbus campus faculty should include an updated list of graduate student and honors student committees, if these are not included on the c.v.

b) Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

The chair of the P&T Committee oversees the committee; ensures the proper execution of the department's P&T policies and procedures; and participates with the department chair in coordinating and conducting annual reviews of assistant professors. For sixth-year reviews, and reviews regarding promotion from associate professor to professor, the P&T chair notifies candidates of deadlines; contacts external reviewers; ensures the timely distribution of all materials to the eligible faculty; schedules a meeting or meetings early enough to meet subsequent deadlines set by the College of Arts and Sciences; and otherwise oversees the process of the review.

When the Promotion and Tenure Committee is appointed, two members must be selected as the **Procedures Oversight Designee** (one POD, the "junior POD," is assigned for Assistant Professors coming up for promotion to Associate and another, the "senior POD" for probationary faculty coming up for promotion to Professor). The senior POD assists the chair with organizing the annual reviews of nonprobationary professors. Both positions are dedicated to seeing that the department fairly and appropriately carries out its own procedures and those of the College and OAA. The PODs work to ensure that the eligible faculty follows written procedures governing the reviews, that the proceedings are carried out in an ethical, professional manner, and, in particular, that the proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions that could bias the review. The specific responsibilities of the POD and processes for addressing procedural difficulties are described [here](#).

The annual responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are as follows:

- To review this APT document and to recommend proposed revisions to the chair and to the faculty.
- In late spring through early fall semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process:

Spring/early summer:

- Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair.

- Present slates of potential evaluators to the College of Arts and Sciences for approval. The external evaluators will be drawn primarily from the list of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section VI.B.4 below). Justification will be provided in cases in which a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.
- Contact potential evaluators and send packets of materials to those who agree to serve (Also see External Evaluations below).

Summer/early fall

- Prepare summaries of discursive teaching evaluations of each candidate, with at least two members of the committee reviewing the evaluations and summaries for accuracy
 - Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with OAA 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 candidates an opportunity to comment on their dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
 - In consultation with the chair, ensure that all review materials are made available to the eligible faculty at least two weeks before any review meeting. If any external letters are received during this two-week period for reasons out of the control of the committee, they should be provided as soon as they are received.
 - Consider the interdisciplinary work of a candidate across multiple units as part of the whole work, especially if the candidate has a joint appointment in another unit.
 - The P&T chair, acting for the eligible faculty, submits a letter reporting on each candidate to the department chair indicating the eligible faculty's vote and recommendation, and an explanation of that recommendation, including a summary of the discussion among those participating in the review meeting. The letter will specify the department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service, summarize the faculty perspectives on whether the candidate has met each criterion, and include the sources of evidence in the dossier on which those perspectives are based. That letter is included in the dossier forwarded to the college and OAA.
 - 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 chair in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit. The eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.
- In fall semester, to send information to associate professors about the process for being screened for non-mandatory promotion review.
 - When there is a question about potential conflicts, the P&T chair in consultation with the POD shall determine whether it is appropriate for the faculty member to recuse himself or herself from a particular review (see III.A.3).
 - In spring semester, to ensure that candidate materials for screening meetings for non-mandatory reviews are provided to the eligible faculty at least one week before the meeting.

c) Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities

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

- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.
 - For all mandatory and nonmandatory promotion reviews, the voting procedure is as follows: Voting will occur after the discussion of each individual candidate (who typically are discussed in alphabetic order). After discussion of each candidate, a motion is made to conduct a straw vote taken by secret ballot. The results are announced to the meeting. Discussion will continue until there is a motion to conduct a final vote by secret ballot. In cases of unanimous affirmative votes, a motion may be made to accept the straw vote as the final vote. A two-thirds majority is required for an affirmative recommendation. Proxy votes are not allowed, but those who have participated in the meeting via Zoom or the equivalent may vote.
- If a candidate provides comments on the letter summarizing the recommendation of the eligible faculty, the eligible faculty review the comments and determine if there is a need for a written response. If the comments indicate that a procedural error may have occurred or that significant new information should be considered, the eligible faculty consult with the P&T committee, POD, and department chair about appropriate next steps.
- To consider annually, in spring semester requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place.
 - This screening meeting for candidates seeking a non-mandatory promotion review should typically occur within the first six weeks of spring semester, and all the relevant materials for review should be available at least one week prior to the date of the screening meeting. However, for candidates undergoing a 4th year review who request that a nonmandatory review for promotion and tenure occur in the upcoming academic year, the screening meeting will occur after the department component of the fourth-year review has concluded.
 - A two-thirds majority of the eligible faculty is required for a promotion and tenure review to be conducted the following year, and the vote on this is to be conducted by secret ballot. If the decision is to move forward with the non-mandatory review, the department chair and the P&T chair begin the same process as that followed for a mandatory sixth-year review. A decision to permit a review to take place in no way commits the P&T Committee, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the promotion and tenure review itself. Nor does a decision to permit a non-mandatory review obligate the candidate to go through with the review should he or she choose, on the basis of feedback from the screening meeting or other factors, to wait until the completion of the full probationary period before undergoing a mandatory sixth-year review. If the recommendation of the eligible faculty at the spring semester or fourth-year review meeting is negative, the matter is considered closed for that year except in the case of tenured faculty who have been previously denied a promotion review.

- Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor.
- The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented by the candidate (see faculty member responsibilities above) as well as on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
- A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04A\(3\)](#) only once. Faculty Rule [3335-7-08](#) makes the same provision for non-probationary teaching faculty. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.

d) Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the 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. (The department must ensure that such questions are asked of all candidates in a non-discriminatory manner.) For tenure-track assistant professors, the chair will confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an [MOU](#) at the time of promotion with tenure.
- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this department. The department chair will seek a letter of evaluation from the TIU head of the joint appointment unit. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.
- To solicit an evaluation from a TIU head where a candidate has a joint appointment and from an interdisciplinary research center in which the candidate plays an active role.
- To ensure that each candidate's dossier is available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To charge each member of the eligible faculty to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To facilitate the meetings in which faculty discuss and vote on cases for fourth-year, sixth-year, and promotion review. This is a long-standing and highly valued practice in the department. Because the department chair writes and submits to the college an independent evaluation of the case and does not vote with the rest of the body, however, the department chair's participation in these meetings

remains as neutral as possible. The department chair will follow normal Rules of Order, refraining from calling twice on any speaker before all who wish to speak have been recognized, except when speakers are responding to questions directed to themselves from the floor. The department chair will not make evaluative comments on cases under discussion, although they may respond to requests from the floor for factual information.

- A department chair who decides for any reason to recuse themselves from the duties of running all or part of a P&T meeting retains the right to be present in order to hear the full discussion. If the department chair is recused from running all or part of a P&T meeting, the chair's duties in that respect will fall to the P&T chair.
- At the request of the eligible faculty, the chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation to be included in the dossier sent to the dean. The purpose of this letter is to present an assessment from the department chair's perspective of the candidate's work in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. While the department chair's letter should not comment on evidence in the case not available to the eligible faculty, the letter may discuss at greater length items in the dossier of which the department chair, by virtue of their position, has special knowledge. The department chair's letter may also comment on the relevant contextual features of the case such as the disciplinary standing of the external evaluators.
- If the department chair's recommendation to the dean differs from that of the eligible faculty, the department chair will communicate in writing to that body explaining the reasons for that recommendation.
- 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 eligible faculty's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the TIU head of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

2. Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Adjunct faculty follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed above, with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the chair's recommendation is negative (a negative recommendation by the chair is final in such cases), and does not proceed to the executive vice president and provost if the dean's recommendation is negative.

3. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

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

In evaluating a regional campus tenure-track faculty member's request for a nonmandatory tenure and/or promotion review, the department uses the screening process outlined above. If the eligible faculty determines that a regional campus faculty member is to be reviewed, the department chair will notify the faculty member, with a copy to the dean/director of the regional campus.

The dean/director will initiate a review by the regional campus faculty according to the procedures established on the campus. This review focuses mainly on teaching and service. The dean/director forwards the report of this review, and a recommendation to the department chair, for inclusion in the candidate's dossier and for the use of the Department's P&T Committee. From this point, the review follows the procedures described for promotion and tenure reviews of Columbus campus faculty. A request to promote requires agreement by the dean/director and the 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.

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

4. External Evaluations

External evaluations of scholarly and creative activity and research are required for all promotion and tenure reviews as well as all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not normally obtained for teaching faculty. The decision to seek external evaluations for a teaching faculty member will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Eligible Faculty Committee if, for example, the candidate has an extensive record of scholarship.

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, former academic advisor, or postdoctoral 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.
- Is written by a person at an appropriate peer or aspirational institution. In keeping with college guidelines, the department will generally obtain evaluations from faculty at R01 institutions that are members of the [Association of American Universities \(AAU\)](#) and the [Big Ten Academic Alliance](#). It also may solicit evaluations from [top quartile departments in English](#) that are not in the AAU, which currently includes the CUNY Graduate Center and the University of Notre Dame. Peer reviewers from other institutions, including universities outside of North America and liberal arts colleges, may be suggested in cases where the external reviewer is 1) a distinguished expert in the field, as indicated by publications; national and international awards; prominence in professional organizations; and presence on editorial boards of major journals; 2) is nationally or internationally known in a field outside of English studies related to a candidate's interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary projects; 3) meets the standards for a peer reviewer in a TIU in which the candidate is joint-appointed; and/or 4) where relevant, is a distinguished, award winning (e.g., Pulitzer Prize or Guggenheim Fellowship) creative writer or artist who is not affiliated with an academic institution.
- 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.

To ensure that the minimum of five letters is met, the department solicits more letters 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.

A list of potential evaluators will be assembled by the P&T chair, in consultation with the P&T committee, the candidate, and senior faculty, especially those with expertise in the candidate's field(s). The P&T chair will also consult candidates about how to define their field(s). If there are no associate professors and professors in the candidate's field(s) within the English Department, the P&T chair and committee will assemble a list of potential evaluators based on advice given by associate professors and professors outside the department in the relevant field(s).

The candidate is responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department and has the option of adding up to three additional names. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names. The P&T chair decides whether removal is justified.

All potential evaluators must be approved by the College of Arts and Sciences through the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs. No written justification is required for tenured professors at peer or aspirational peer institutions as defined above. If the potential evaluator is from an academic institution that is not clearly a peer or aspirational peer for Ohio State, or if the potential evaluator is from a nonacademic institution (e.g., a public policy think tank, a private art academy or music conservatory, a museum, a biomedical company, or a governmental agency), a brief written justification is required. The department's justification should be based on the prestige of the institution, the credentials and experience of the evaluator, and/or the specific relevance of the evaluator's expertise to the candidate's activities. International evaluators from strong institutions are allowed. The research credentials of the evaluators should generally mirror those of a professor at the professor rank at Ohio State. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors. The department should provide justification if more than a minority of the evaluations are from associate professors (e.g., candidate's work is in a small or new field for which more senior people are not available, evaluators have gained prominence as national or international experts in the field). For reviews of associate professors, all evaluators must be professors (or equivalent). Emeritus professors are acceptable as long as they are active researchers.

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

The P&T chair is responsible for determining who will recruit the evaluators but typically this person will be the P&T chair, a member of the P&T Committee, or a senior colleague in the candidate's field.

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

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

After the department has voted and the P&T chair and department chair have given their letters to the candidate, the candidate may read the external letters. The letters may be verbatim or redacted to mask the writers' identity, as the candidate chooses.

VII. Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals

Faculty members who believe they have been evaluated improperly for tenure, promotion, or reappointment may appeal a negative decision to the University Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

Performance that is adequate for annual reappointment may not be adequate for the granting of promotion or tenure with promotion for faculty on the tenure track or, in the case of teaching faculty, for securing a reappointment.

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

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

VIII. Seventh-Year Reviews

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

IX. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Student and peer evaluations of teaching provide tools for assessing faculty teaching effectiveness and for providing faculty with regular opportunities for improvement. Evaluation of teaching should be holistic, considering a variety of evidence of accomplishment in the classroom: for example, student evaluations (quantitative and narrative), peer evaluations, examples of curricular or pedagogic innovation, and efforts to improve teaching by taking advantage of college or university resources. In no case should the evaluation of teaching rely exclusively on quantitative instruments (such as the SEI), which have been shown to be unreliable indicators of overall performance in the classroom and to work systematically to the disadvantage of women, non-native English speakers, and faculty of color. Evaluation of teaching should also be contextual, considering the particular challenges of teaching different kinds of material to different kinds of audiences, and situating each year's performance in relation to previous years and to goals set by the department.

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

All members of the Department must allow students to evaluate their courses. University rules stipulate that all courses should be evaluated by students, and the [Student Evaluation of Instruction](#) (SEI) form or an equivalent end-of-course teaching assessment survey/tool must be offered in every course offered in the departments and schools within the College of Arts and Sciences. All faculty in this department are required to obtain evaluations of every course using the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) form. For purposes of promotion and tenure decisions, assistant professors and associate professors are required to submit SEIs to satisfy the college policy; however, the Department gives more weight to other evaluative sources (such as discursive evaluations and peer observations) in reviewing an instructor's teaching.

In order to encourage participation, teachers may dedicate time during an in-person or synchronous on-line class for students to fill out the SEI using CarmenCanvas or the OSU mobile application as well as to write SEI comments or fill out discursive evaluations (see below). Teachers 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. Teachers must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation. Teachers 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.

All teachers in the department are also required to collect discursive commentary either through the SEI comments feature or through separate evaluation forms in every formal course. Those teaching in person classes generally use evaluation forms, created by the instructor and distributed in class, that solicit information about both the quality of the course's content and the quality of the instructor's performance. The department's [Teaching Resources page](#) provides examples of such forms. Annual review discussions will address the appropriateness and effectiveness of the candidate's discursive evaluation form. Those using separate discursive forms are encouraged, but not required, to turn off the comments feature of the SEI form to avoid duplication. Any comments received should be retained by the instructor and submitted when discursive comments are requested as part of the annual review and promotion and tenure process.

In order for the students to feel free to express their opinions without fear of reprisal at grading time, the following procedures should be followed in distributing, collecting, and reading evaluations for in-person classes:

- the instructor should not be in the room when the evaluations are filled out.
- the evaluations should be collected by someone other than the instructor (it may be one of the students or a TA), who should then place them in the distributed envelope labeled with the course number and the instructor's name, seal the envelope, and bring them to front desk in Denney Hall 421.
- the instructor should not pick up and read the evaluations until after the final grades are posted to the Registrar.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Peer evaluation of teaching is required for all faculty members in the College of Arts and Sciences with teaching responsibilities. Peer evaluation should fulfill two basic goals: 1) provide constructive feedback to faculty on both the content and the quality of their instruction, and 2) help faculty to continually improve the overall effectiveness of their teaching at all levels. The department chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process and may delegate this responsibility to the chair of the P&T committee.

Tenure-track assistant professors, Columbus campus: Peer evaluations of probationary tenure-track faculty must be conducted at least once per year during the probationary period, with the goal of adequately assessing teaching at all levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. For tenure-track assistant professors, by the time of the fourth-year review, the department requires four peer evaluations of teaching, and by the time of the mandatory review for promotion and tenure, the department requires a minimum total of five such evaluations. All Columbus campus faculty at the associate and professor rank are expected to serve as peer evaluators, and the P&T chair assists in these

arrangements. Regional campus faculty may be invited to serve as peer evaluators of Columbus campus faculty upon approval of the regional campus dean. No more than two of the required five evaluations should be prepared by the same colleague. Candidates' teaching at different levels of the curriculum should be evaluated. If a course is taught on-line, evaluations may be done of recorded synchronous classes held on Zoom or another web conferencing platform or of asynchronous materials posted on Carmen.

Tenure-track assistant professors, regional campuses: Tenure-track assistant professors on the regional campuses follow the peer review process stipulated by the APT document on their campus. The department requires that at least three of the five reviews required at the time of the mandatory promotion and tenure review be completed by English faculty, at least one of whom must be from the Columbus campus. The P&T chair and the regional campus English coordinators will work together to provide guidance for individual candidates, in consultation with the relevant regional campus dean. All evaluative peer reviews collected during the probationary period will be included in the materials submitted as part of the promotion and tenure dossier.

Tenured associate professors, Columbus campus: The teaching of tenured associate professors must be reviewed at least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. When associate professors are reviewed for promotion to the rank of professor, they must have a minimum of three peer reviews covering the five years preceding the promotion case. All tenured associate professors and professors on all campuses are eligible and expected to do these evaluations, and the department encourages faculty in Columbus to be reviewed by faculty on a regional campus when possible. 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. Candidates' teaching at different levels of the curriculum should be evaluated, and (except for regional campus faculty) at least one graduate course should be evaluated, if taught while in rank.

Tenured associate professors, regional campuses: Associate professors on the regional campuses also follow the peer review process stipulated by the APT document on their campus. The department requires that at least two of the three reviews required for promotion be completed by English faculty, at least one of whom must be from the Columbus campus.

Tenured professors, all campuses: The teaching of tenured professors should be evaluated at least once every four years.

Teaching Faculty, all campuses: Assistant professors of teaching should be evaluated at least once per year. Associate professors and professors of teaching should be evaluated at least once every three years.

Teaching Faculty, associate professor and professor, all campuses: Associate

Associated faculty: Associated faculty on all campuses should receive a peer evaluation of instruction at least once every year.

Peer evaluators should visit at least one class meeting of a course. Peer reports should be thorough, detailed, honest, and fair. Peer evaluations of teaching are comprehensive and include, in addition to classroom visitation (or the equivalent for an online course), review of course syllabi, instructional

materials, assignments, and exams. 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, the quality and effectiveness of instructional materials and assessment tools and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. Effective peer reports are generally at least two pages long, single spaced, but may run longer if the observer attended more than one class.

The following guidelines are intended to assist peer evaluators in writing evaluative reports that will be useful to those who will review the candidate's record as well as to the candidate:

- Written reports of peer evaluation of teaching should focus not only on classroom performance but also on curricular choices, implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and engagement with current disciplinary knowledge.
- Before attending the class, the peer evaluator should communicate with the candidate to establish a time for the visit and to understand the goals of the course and the candidate's teaching philosophy. The evaluator should also be given a copy of the syllabus and any relevant materials for the day of the visit, such as assignments, examinations, study guides, and handouts. If there are relevant materials posted on Carmen or pre-class discussions taking place there, the instructor should provide the peer evaluator with access to the Carmen site.
- As part of the peer evaluation report, the evaluator should describe the syllabus, including objectives, schedule, assignments, method/s of assessment, classroom policies and rules. The evaluator should also identify any stand-out strengths or potential weaknesses of overall course design, given the goals and levels of the course.
- The peer evaluation report should note the number of students in the class, the number who attended on the day (or days) of the visit, and, if relevant (i.e., in a discussion class), how many students contributed to class discussion. Other details—such as the course modality, room layout or student composition (e.g., an interdisciplinary class vs. a class of all or mostly English majors)—that may assist in explaining the effectiveness of the class should also be included in the report.
- The peer report should consist of an evaluative account of what the person observed. This will include a descriptive overview of how the class was structured and how each part unfolded over the allotted time. But the evaluator should also assess the success of the approach and might also cover topics such as the instructor's effectiveness as a lecturer and/or as a moderator of class discussion, the clarity of the class objectives for the day, how well the instructor meets the aims of the course as outlined in the syllabus, the instructor's command of the material and knowledge of the subject matter, and the instructor's engagement with the students and helpfulness in answering questions.

After the class, the peer evaluator should discuss his/her/their observations with the faculty member, and an account of this discussion may become part of the report.

The peer evaluator should complete a draft of the written report by the end of the semester of review and share their draft report with the faculty member. The purpose of such sharing is to give the instructor a chance to point out any (and only) factual errors. Having a report in hand can also assist the faculty member in promptly acting on recommendations that will improve their teaching.

Peer reviewers should address their final written report to the chair as a letter on electronic letter head and include a digital signature. Reviewers should send a copy of the final written report both to the candidate and to the chair, who maintains them in departmental files. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond in writing if desired. All such comments are appended to the report for inclusion in the faculty member's subsequent tenure and/or promotion dossier (if relevant), unless the faculty member requests that the comments be excluded.

In addition to the required evaluative reviews described above, the chair may request a peer review of teaching for a any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally initiated by 1) the desire to create a portfolio for a teaching award at the university or national level or another professional purpose; 2) faculty requests; or 3) evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.

Any faculty member may request additional peer reviews of teaching. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews may also seek the services of the [Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#).

Reviews conducted upon the request of the chair or the faculty member are considered formative and focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the chair or faculty member. They may or may not include class visitations and may instead, for example, focus solely on a review of syllabi and course materials.

II. Appendix 1: Mentorship Plan

The department uses the annual review process as the formalized mechanism for mentorship. Details of this process for tenure-track faculty, teaching faculty, and associate faculty is outlined above in section IX.B.

Every newly appointed professor and associated faculty is assigned a tenure-track faculty member as a resource partner to help navigate their introduction to the procedures and policies in the department, college, and university. Mentors are also expected to advise mentees on strategic approaches to meeting expectations in research, teaching, and service and to offer regular, candid, and encouraging feedback on the full scope of the mentee's responsibilities throughout the probationary period. This may include reviews and comments on manuscripts and funding proposals, teaching plans and materials, advice on managing courseloads and classroom issues and guidance on professional skills and opportunities. Mentors should initiate meetings with their mentees at least twice each semester they are on duty and are also expected to respond to additional requests from their mentees as needed throughout the semester.

The department also assigns several faculty members the service responsibility of being available to provide class observations, teaching letters, and discussions about teaching to all faculty (tenure-track and tenured professors and associate faculty) who request them.