

**APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE
CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES**

FISHER COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs:
November 4, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PREAMBLE	1
II. MISSION	1
III. DEFINITIONS	2
A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty within Each TIU of the College	2
B. College Personnel Committee	5
C. Quorum	6
D. Recommendation from a TIU's Committee of the Eligible Faculty	6
IV. APPOINTMENTS	6
A. Criteria	6
B. Procedures	11
V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW PROCEDURES	16
A. Documentation	19
B. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty	20
C. Tenured Faculty	22
D. Clinical Faculty	23
E. Associated Faculty	24
F. Salary Recommendations	24
VI. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS	26
A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion	26
B. Procedures	35
VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS	49
VIII. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS	49
IX. STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING	50
A. Student Evaluation of Teaching	50
B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching	50
X. AFFIRMATION BY FISHER COLLEGE AFFILIATED TIUs	53

Appendix A: Dossier Elements and Requirements	55
Appendix B: Responsibilities of the Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) for the Department (D-POD) and the College (C-POD)	60
Appendix C: Ballots.....	63
Appendix D: TIU Peer and Aspirational Peer Institutions	72
Appendix E: Additional TIU-specific Guidelines	73

I PREAMBLE

This document sets forth criteria and procedures for appointments, promotion, tenure, and rewards for faculty in each department (also equivalently referred to as tenure-initiating unit, or TIU) of the Fisher College of Business. It 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 found 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 college, its TIUs, and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the college will follow the new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document is reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every five years on the appointment or reappointment of the dean. On those occasions, the document, with any proposed revisions, is considered by the college faculty at the level of the tenure-initiating unit. A vote is taken by the tenure-track faculty of each TIU to determine whether its faculty is willing to operate under a college-wide Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) document. The TIUs are also permitted to provide additional TIU-specific guidelines (an appendix to this document provides the TIU-specific guidelines for TIUs that chose this option).

This document is approved by OAA prior to implementation. In approving this document, OAA accepts the stated criteria and procedures of the college and its tenure-initiating units and delegates to the college and the TIUs the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to university, college, and TIU missions.

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

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

II MISSION

The [strategic plan](#) of the Fisher College of Business notes that the college's mission is "to create and disseminate ideas, encourage scholarly thinking and develop principled leaders who serve with impact around the world." In implementable terms for the APT, this translates into the college striving for and achieving excellence in teaching, research, and related service to the discipline, university, and the broader business community in Ohio and beyond. Through its thought leadership and innovative programs, the college seeks to impact academic peers and the practice of business.

The college creates and disseminates knowledge in an environment that is collegial and collaborative, allowing students, faculty, and staff to excel. As an international leader in

research, the college aggressively pursues cutting-edge inquiry influencing theory and practice. As an international leader in teaching, the college strives to deliver academic and professional programs that produce highly valued and ethical individuals for the worldwide business community. The college's educational and research programs lead to a proactive outreach agenda, connecting with alumni through life-long learning, partnering with businesses, leveraging the comprehensive strengths of The Ohio State University, and advancing the welfare of the people of Ohio and the global community.

To support a strong academic community, the expectation is that the college will maintain and support a culture of in-person engagement. An in-person setting enables active participation, dialogue, and informal interactions that are critical to sustaining and nurturing high-quality knowledge creation and dissemination.

This college mission is achieved through the efforts of the college's five TIUs, each of which has also detailed TIU-specific missions in their respective Pattern of Administration. The standards for appointments, promotion, and tenure presented in this document, implemented with judicious professional judgment of the faculty, contribute to the ability of the college and its TIUs to realize their missions.

III DEFINITIONS

A Committee of the Eligible Faculty within Each TIU of the College

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

The TIU head, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president may not participate as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, promotion and tenure, or Fourth-Year reviews. The TIU head attends such personnel-related meetings, but only to provide information that may be requested by the eligible faculty and to communicate the views of the eligible faculty to the dean.

1 Tenure-track Faculty

Appointment Reviews

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

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

2 Clinical Faculty

Appointment Reviews

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

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of assistant clinical professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors, and all nonprobationary associate clinical professors and clinical professors in the TIU of the candidate under review.
- For the promotion reviews of associate clinical professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors and all nonprobationary clinical professors in the TIU of the candidate under review. For the reappointment of associate clinical professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors, and all nonprobationary clinical professors in the TIU of the candidate under review. For the reappointment of clinical professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors and all nonprobationary clinical professors in the TIU of the candidate under review.

3 Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- The initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members is decided by a candidate's TIU head upon

recommendation by the search committee and with the approval of the dean. The TIU head consults with the TIU faculty as needed.

- Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by the eligible faculty (all nonprobationary clinical faculty and tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college dean and OAA.
- Reappointments are decided by the TIU head.

Promotion Reviews

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

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 a significant portion of the candidate's publications since appointment or last promotion (e.g., collaborated on 50% or more of candidate's work);
- in any relationship or circumstance that would prevent a sound, objective, and unbiased decision;
- 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.

In the event a faculty member withdraws from the review process, the faculty member can opt (but is not required) to provide a letter to the department chair that notes their experience of working with the candidate; this letter is shared with the eligible faculty in the department and the dean.

If there is any possibility that an eligible faculty member may have a conflict of interest with the candidate, it is that faculty member's responsibility to report the relationship to the department chair and the dean. Recognizing that subjective judgment may be required in some circumstances to determine whether it is appropriate for a faculty member (or a department chair) to recuse themselves, the final decision on this matter will rest with the dean, who will consult with others as needed. A faculty member (or department chair) who is recused from a case will not attend the meeting of the eligible faculty for that case.

5 Minimum Composition

The committee of eligible faculty must be composed of at least three faculty members. In the event that a department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the department chair, after consulting with the dean, will appoint faculty from another department within the college to reach the minimum membership.

B College Personnel Committee

The college has a Personnel Committee (CPC) that reviews and makes recommendations to the dean on faculty tenure, promotion, and reappointment cases, including Fourth-Year reviews of probationary tenure-track faculty members. The Committee's assessment is advisory to the dean. The college committee provides a vote regarding promotion and/or tenure and consensus that all earlier review processes met written university, college, and tenure initiating units' procedures, as noted in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-04\(C\)](#). The quorum required in the CPC to discuss and vote on cases is two-thirds of its membership. The committee's membership is described in the college Pattern of Administration.

C Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions (new appointments, reappointments, Fourth-Year reviews, promotion and tenure, and promotion reviews) in the TIU is two-thirds of the eligible faculty. Eligible faculty members on an approved leave of absence (e.g., Faculty Professional Leave, Special Assignment, planned Parental Leave) are not considered for quorum or permitted to vote unless they declare, in advance and in writing by August 1 prior to the relevant academic year, their intent to participate in the proceeding for which they are eligible; when an approved leave is due to unexpected reasons, the department chair will confirm the faculty member's intent to participate in a timely fashion. In case the faculty member participates, they are included in the count of eligible faculty, and this number is used to compute the two-thirds quorum requirement. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the TIU head has approved an off-campus assignment. Faculty members who withdraw or are recused because of a conflict of interest are also not counted when determining quorum.

D Recommendation from a TIU's Committee of the Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters, only votes cast (e.g., "yes" and "no" votes) are counted – abstentions are not votes and are strongly discouraged. Faculty members must 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. Only eligible faculty members present at the meeting or participating by teleconferencing may vote. A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty on personnel matters (appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion) is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast is positive (i.e., votes in favor are strictly more than half). In the case of joint appointments, the TIU of a jointly appointed candidate must seek input from the joint-appointment TIU prior to the appointment, reappointment, or promotion and/or tenure of that candidate.

For new appointments, when more than one candidate achieves majority support, the department faculty can choose to rank order acceptable candidates.

IV APPOINTMENTS

A Criteria

Faculty appointments in each TIU of the Fisher College of Business are made with a strong commitment to promoting high academic standards. Important considerations include the candidate's record in teaching, research, and service; the potential for growth in each of these areas; and the potential for interacting with colleagues, students, and the business community in ways that will enhance the academic and professional standing of the TIU and the college, and attract other outstanding faculty and students. 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 TIU and the college. In that event, the search is cancelled or continued, as appropriate given the circumstance.

As stipulated in [Faculty Rule 3335-6](#), faculty peer-review is the fundamental process by which universities make decisions of faculty selection, reappointment, promotion and tenure, and credentialing (the process of affirming the qualifications of a faculty to teach or review a certain curriculum). Faculty therefore play a central role in the recruitment and appointment of other faculty. Qualifications for instructional faculty will be judged primarily on earned degrees, but other factors, including but not limited to equivalent experience, can be considered by TIUs in determining whether a faculty member is qualified. A minimum threshold of equivalent experience shall consider the number of years of real-world experience and/or demonstrated skills, and in some cases professional certifications, in the same area in which the potential instructor of record will be teaching. OAA has final decision-making authority to determine whether the qualification of an instructor of record whose highest degree is less than a master's degree meets the minimum threshold.

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

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 (and associated work visa requirements) have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. Procedures for appointment are identical to that of assistant professor. An appointment to the rank of instructor is probationary and may not exceed three years. Promotion to assistant professor occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. If the terminal degree is not obtained by the date set in the hiring contract, the probationary contract is not renewed. If the hiring contract does not specify such a date, the third year is a terminal year of employment for an instructor who has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor.

When an instructor receives the rank of assistant professor upon receipt of the terminal degree, the tenure clock is set in motion. All faculty starting within the same calendar year are in the same cohort for promotion and tenure reviews. See Section 1 in Chapter 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). Service credit for time spent as an instructor does not count against the period of time during which tenure is evaluated unless the faculty member indicates in writing at the time of promotion to assistant professor that he or she wishes such credit. This request must be approved by the TIU's eligible faculty, the TIU chair, the dean, and OAA. On approval, the tenure review schedule is adjusted accordingly. 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 request to be considered for early promotion. For further information see [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03](#).

Assistant Professor. An earned doctorate (or equivalent degree) is a minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential for high impact scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the department, the college, and the profession is assessed in the weighing of the appointment decision. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory promotion and tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the eligible tenured faculty of the faculty member's TIU determine such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period.

Associate Professor and Professor. Appointment at the rank of associate professor or professor requires that the candidate meet the college's criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to these ranks. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor or professor and offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

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

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

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

2 Clinical Faculty

Clinical faculty members in the college are engaged primarily in instructional activities, in outreach, and in academic program leadership and support. Instructional activities include effective teaching, extensive interaction with students, the application of knowledge to practical problems, the development and dissemination of new teaching materials, experimentation and development of new instructional methodologies, and active participation in curriculum discussions.

Individuals appointed to clinical faculty normally will have an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field, and a proven track record in: a) supervising students in a skills acquisition setting; b) working productively with leaders/managers of organizations in client relationships; c) classroom teaching; d) expanding understanding of business practice through preparation of written materials such as publishable case studies; and e) exemplifying and teaching the ethical standards of the profession.

Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all other clinical faculty members must be for a period of five years. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for assistant and associate clinical professors must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for clinical professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. As with tenure-track appointments at the associate and professor ranks, clinical appointments at the associate and professor ranks will be reviewed by the CPC using the criteria set in Section VI of this document. Tenure is not granted to clinical faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the department wishes to consider reappointment, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. TIUs may determine the process for reappointment according to procedures set forth in the [Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment Policy, III, A-G](#). For more information see [Faculty Rule 3335-7](#).

The POA of each TIU that appoints clinical faculty must describe the governance rights to be extended to its clinical faculty.

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

Assistant Clinical Professor. An earned doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree in their specialty is usually a minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant clinical professor.

Associate Clinical Professor and Clinical Professor. Appointment at the rank of associate clinical professor or clinical professor normally requires that the individual have an earned doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree in their specialty and meet, at a minimum, the college's criteria – in teaching and service – for promotion to these ranks.

3 Associated Faculty

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

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, and Adjunct Professor. Adjunct titles are used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to tenure-track or clinical faculty of equivalent rank, who provide significant, uncompensated service to the instructional and/or research programs of the college and who need a faculty title to perform

that service. Adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track or clinical faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track or clinical faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer. Appointment as lecturer or as senior lecturer is determined by the extent of prior teaching experience, the quality of that prior teaching experience, and the nature of the candidate's academic credentials and work experience in the field in which the teaching is to occur. Lecturers and senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure, but lecturers may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. Senior lecturers are not eligible for promotion. The initial appointment for a lecturer or senior lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for a lecturer or senior lecturer cannot exceed three years.

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

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, and Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank they hold at that institution. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for only three consecutive years.

4 Emeritus Faculty

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

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the TIU head 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 TIU head. The TIU head will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean, who will forward a recommendation to the executive vice president and provost. Should the TIU head deny the request, the faculty member may appeal the decision to the dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule [3335-05-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered.

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

5 Joint Appointments

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

6 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Occasionally the active academic involvement in one academic department by a faculty member from another department in the Fisher College of Business or the involvement in this college by a faculty member from another college at The Ohio State University warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in a department within this college.

Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course from time to time, or a combination of these. The decision to make a courtesy appointment rests with the eligible faculty of the appropriate department within the college, with the approval of the dean. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current rank at The Ohio State University, with promotion in rank recognized.

B Procedures

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

The SHIFT (Strategic Hiring Initiative for Faculty Talent) Framework was designed to identify and recruit broad, qualified applicant pools of extraordinary scholars who are leaders in their respective fields. Deans, department chairs, and search committee members work in partnership with the Office of Faculty Affairs and other key stakeholders in adherence to this framework to ensure a thorough, fair, and consistent faculty search process. The framework consists of four distinct phases – each of which includes a series of core requirements (must-do action steps) and optimal practices (aspirational action steps) – followed by a fifth phase focused on preboarding and onboarding.

All TIUs in this college adhere in every respect to the Framework requirements as detailed at

SHIFT.

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

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

- Recruitment of tenure-track, clinical, and associated faculty
- Appointments at senior rank or with prior service credit
- Hiring faculty from other institutions after April 30
- Appointment of foreign nationals
- Letters of offer

1 Tenure-track Faculty

A national/international 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 OAA in advance. Search procedures must be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

Within all TIUs of the college, searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

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

The department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty members who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the department. In cases of research and teaching overlap across departments, the dean, in consultation with the department chair, may also appoint one or more advisory members from another department to the search committee.

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

If the offer involves senior rank, the applicable eligible faculty members also vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank and the appropriateness of

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

Based on the recommendation of department faculty and, in consultation with the department chair, the dean makes the decision of which, if any, candidate should be extended an offer. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the department chair and the dean. TIUs are advised to discuss potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent residence or nonimmigrant work authorized status with the Office of International Affairs. An [MOU](#) must be signed by faculty eligible for tenured positions who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees.

When an external candidate being hired is to be evaluated for tenure and/or appointment at senior rank (tenure-track or clinical associate professor or professor), the criteria are the same as those described in Section VI.A. for internal candidates. All external candidates must demonstrate rank-appropriate levels of research, teaching, and service/outreach.

The only significant differences between the evaluation of internal and external candidates has to do with the level of required documentation. External candidates are not required to develop a complete dossier in accordance with The Ohio State University regulations. An external tenure-track candidate, guided by the department chair, is required to submit the following promotion and tenure documentation:

- Updated curriculum vitae.
- Examples of research activities.
- An explanation of how these research activities meet college promotion and tenure criteria for their prospective rank.
- Examples of teaching activities including indicators of quality classroom instruction, use of classroom materials by other individuals, textbooks written and adoption information, cases written and adoption information, and any other indicators of teaching accomplishments.
- An explanation of how these teaching activities meet college promotion and tenure criteria for their prospective rank.

Department chairs are responsible for distributing the above information to the eligible faculty at least a week prior to the departmental promotion and tenure review meeting where the formal vote is taken. The other steps and procedures described for evaluating internal candidates also apply to external candidates, including:

- The appropriate number of letters is obtained from evaluators, with the list of names prepared by input from the eligible faculty and candidate.
- There is a formal departmental promotion and tenure review meeting, with an assigned D-POD, a report writer, and a CPC representative in attendance.
- The department chair prepares a separate recommendation letter.

- The departmental faculty report and the department chair's letter, along with the candidate's materials, are forwarded to the CPC for their evaluation.
- There is a formal CPC meeting on the case, with an assigned C-POD, a report writer, and a departmental representative who is invited for clarification.
- The dean receives all documents and reports from the department and the CPC and prepares a separate recommendation letter.

2 Clinical Faculty

Searches for clinical faculty members generally proceed as for tenure-track faculty members, a national/international search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates. Circumstances wherein a national/international search can be waived are provided in Chapter 5 of the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) [*Policies and Procedures Handbook*](#). Campus visits for clinical positions should be similar in structure to those used for tenure-track positions, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the visit is on classroom teaching rather than research. Appointments at advanced rank require prior approval of the college dean and OAA.

For external clinical faculty hires at the associate and professor levels, the criteria and procedures are identical to those for promotion of internal candidates to these ranks with the exception that all evaluators in such cases are external to The Ohio State University, and documentation is adjusted to account for the fact that some internal materials (e.g., annual reviews) are unavailable.

3 Transfer from the Tenure Track

Tenure-track faculty may request transfer to a clinical appointment if appropriate circumstances exist. 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.

Tenure is lost upon transfer, and transfers must be approved by tenured faculty in the candidate's department, department chair, the dean, and the executive vice president and provost.

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

4 TIU Transfer

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

The transfer must be approved by the Office of Academic Affairs and is dependent on the establishment of mutually agreed-upon arrangements among the affected TIU

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

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

5 Associated Faculty

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 department chair, who consults with the department faculty as needed, with the approval of the dean.

The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the TIU head in consultation with a TIU's relevant advisory body.

Initial appointment for a senior lecturer position is usually made on an annual basis; lecturers can be hired on an annual or a semester basis. 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. Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the unit and are decided by the TIU head in consultation with the TIU's relevant advisory body. Adjunct appointments may be renewed only when the uncompensated academic service for which the initial appointment was made continues. Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three consecutive years. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued.

6 Joint Appointments

A TIU may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another OSU TIU as described in Section IV.A.5. The potential for a joint appointment is typically evaluated during the recruitment process and, as such, is subject to all criteria outlined above for each faculty category.

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

7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a faculty member from another department in the Fisher College of Business or another college at The Ohio State University. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to the department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular department faculty meeting. If the eligible faculty approves the proposal, the department chair extends an offer of appointment. The department chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for non-renewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

V ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW PROCEDURES

All TIUs in the college follow the requirements for faculty annual performance and merit review as set forth in the [Policy on Faculty Annual Review, Post-Tenure-Review, and Reappointment](#), which stipulates that such reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all probationary faculty, an opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all other compensated faculty members, as well as a written assessment. The policy requires an annual written performance review that examines past performance and sets future goals for all compensated faculty members.

As the policy notes, annual reviews of faculty, “serve to monitor and support progress toward tenure, promotion, reappointment, and ongoing outcomes, and are to be comprehensive and include standardized, objective, and measurable performance metrics. Written performance reviews serve to assist faculty in improving professional productivity, establish goals against which faculty performance will be assessed, determine salary increases and other resource allocations, define progress toward reappointment and/or promotion, and, in the event of poor performance, establish and explain the need for remedial steps, up to and including a post-tenure review or other disciplinary action.”

- **The Annual Review Process**

- *Faculty member submits materials*

Each compensated faculty member (tenure track, clinical, and associated) must submit the required annual review documentation (see Section V.A. below) by February 1.

Eligible faculty conduct a review of annual review materials for probationary faculty (tenure-track and clinical faculty) every year and for associate professors at least once every three years. The eligible faculty are not to provide a letter to the faculty member; the TIU head provides a single annual review letter.

- *TIU head conducts review*

The annual performance and merit review of a faculty member is the responsibility of that faculty member’s TIU head. The TIU head may delegate responsibility for annual reviews to the following individuals only: TIU

associate chairs or vice chairs. A TIU head who delegates responsibility for reviews is accountable for the process and should maintain regular oversight of the reviews. Faculty who serve in full-time administrative positions (e.g., TIU head, dean) will be reviewed by their direct supervisor.

For each faculty member under their supervision, TIU heads (or designee) must complete a written annual evaluation following OAA's [Annual Review Template](#). Performance over the preceding three calendar years is evaluated.

Given the length of their employment, semester lecturers submit their review materials in the semester of their employment, and the TIU head conducts reviews after receiving the Survey of Student Learning Experience (SSLE) at the conclusion of the semester.

The written evaluation must include a rating for each area in which a faculty member spent at least 5% of their effort during the academic year, including (as applicable) teaching, research, service, administration, and any other categories set by the TIU head. Student evaluations must account for at least 25% of the teaching component where applicable.

BL: this rating denotes faculty performance that *does not meet (i.e., is below) expectations* given the faculty member's appointment and workload.

M-ME: this rating denotes faculty performance that *minimally meets expectations* given their appointment and workload.

ME: this rating denotes faculty performance that *meets expectations* given their appointment and workload.

EE: this rating denotes faculty performance that *exceeds expectations* given their appointment and workload.

S-EE: this rating denotes faculty performance that *significantly exceeds expectations* given their appointment and workload.

The evaluation letter must also include an overall rating. This rating accounts for the faculty member's appointment type (rank, significant administrative assignment, etc.) and workload assignment over the evaluation window. The overall rating uses the same five-point scale.

A necessary condition for a faculty member to receive an *S-EE overall rating* is that they receive an *S-EE* rating in the area most heavily weighted in their assigned workload over the evaluation period. A sufficient condition for a faculty member to receive an *S-EE overall rating* is that they meet the stated necessary condition and receives at least an *EE* rating in all other evaluated areas.

The written evaluation should also specify the faculty member's workload for the following academic year.

The department chairs in the college meet with the associate dean for faculty and research and the dean to ensure consistent application of standards across academic units. Following this meeting, the written assessment by TIU heads is shared with the faculty member; this step must be completed by April 1. Annual reviews must include a face-to-face meeting between the TIU heads and all probationary faculty. TIU heads are to offer all other compensated faculty the opportunity for a face-to-face meeting.

- *The comments period and appeal of the TIU-level review*

Faculty members may provide written comments to the initial review by the TIU head, and should do so within 10 days of receiving their review. The TIU head may respond to the comments and/or revise the written evaluation during this process before finalizing the TIU review. At the conclusion of the 10-day comments period, the TIU's annual reviews, and any comments and responses, are forwarded by the TIU head to the dean.

A faculty member can appeal the finalized TIU-level review to the dean within 14 days of the conclusion of the comments period. The appeal should include the rating decision(s) with which the faculty member disagrees, a rationale for the disagreement, as well as any additional information they would like to provide.

- *Dean review*

The college dean must review and approve or disapprove of each rating for each area of work and overall rating for all faculty annual reviews, and then submit the reviews to the executive vice president and provost for review; this step must be completed by May 5. If the TIU head and dean are not in agreement regarding an evaluation, the executive vice president and provost will be the deciding authority.

Appeals are reviewed and responded to by the dean, who must issue a decision in writing as to whether to approve or modify the TIU-level annual review. If the college dean modifies any rating in the annual review, the annual review will be automatically appealed to the executive vice president and provost for review and final determination. In this event, the faculty member will have 14 days from the date of the dean's decision to submit any written materials to the executive vice president and provost that they want the provost to consider in issuing a final determination. If the dean does not modify any rating in the annual review, the executive vice president and provost will only review.

- *Post-tenure review*

A post-tenure review, in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-5-04.5, will be initiated if a tenured faculty member receives a "does not meet performance expectation" rating (i.e., a *BL* rating) in the same evaluative category in at least two of the past three consecutive annual reviews. A faculty member who retains

tenure following a post-tenure review will be subject to an additional post-tenure review if they receive a “does not meet performance expectations” rating in any area of their annual review in the two years subsequent to a post-tenure review. The department chair, dean, or executive vice president and provost may require an immediate and for cause post-tenure review at any time for a faculty member who has a documented and sustained record of significant underperformance outside of the faculty member’s annual performance evaluation. For this purpose, for cause may not be based on a faculty member’s allowable expression of academic freedom as defined by the university or Ohio law.

A Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, the college requires faculty members to submit the following documents to the college’s Office of Faculty Affairs by February 1 of the subsequent year.

- Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#) (*required for probationary faculty*)
- An updated CV, and
- A report to capture scholarly activities and accomplishments prepared using Interfolio’s [Faculty Activity Reporting](#) tool, which will typically summarize the following information for the evaluation period (previous three calendar years):

Teaching

- Classroom teaching, noting major changes or new preparations to coursework
- Academic advising, directed individual/independent study, nondegree/non-credit instruction
- Other student services

Intellectual Contributions

- Refereed research publications
- Non-refereed publications
- Invited presentations
- Research in progress
- Other scholarly activities

Service

- Service to the department, college, and university
- Service to the academic discipline
- Service to the business community and profession

Honors and Recognitions

Additional Contributions

Other documentation for the annual performance and merit review will be the same as that for

consideration for promotion and/or tenure, as described in Section VI of this document.

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

B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the TIU head (or designee). Until the Fourth-Year review, the process is conducted primarily for the purpose of providing feedback to the candidate. In these early review years, renewal is expected barring compelling circumstances. The key steps in the annual review of probationary tenure-track faculty are as follows.

All eligible faculty members in a department examine the annual performance review documents and narratives of each probationary tenure-track faculty in that department and discuss, with the department chair, the strengths and weaknesses of the record and plans.

Following the above meeting, the department chair prepares a written evaluation of the candidate's research, teaching and service record as part of the annual performance and merit review process; in conjunction with this evaluation, the chair offers a recommendation to the dean about whether the candidate should be reappointed. The department chair's evaluation is shared with the eligible faculty in the department; the eligible faculty do not provide an annual review letter to the candidate.

The department chair meets with the candidate being reviewed to discuss the faculty's evaluation of the candidate's record and plans, and the department chair's written evaluation and recommendation. The candidate may provide written comments on the review. All annual review letters to date (along with the candidate's comments, if provided) shall become a part of the faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure.

The department chair's written evaluation (along with the faculty member's comments) is forwarded to the dean. If the department chair's recommendation is to reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year of service, that recommendation is final. A recommendation from the department chair to not reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year requires a review that follows the procedures laid out for Fourth-Year review (per [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03](#)). Following completion of this review and the associated comments process, the dean shall make the final decision in the matter.

1 Fourth-Year Review

Beginning in the spring of the third year after a probationary tenure-track faculty member is appointed (accounting for any approved extension of the probationary period, per [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03](#)), and continuing through the fourth year, each probationary tenure-track faculty member goes through a mandatory Fourth-Year review. The Fourth-Year review follows the

same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluations are not required and the dean makes the final decision regarding renewal or non-renewal of the probationary appointment. Thus, the Fourth-Year review process requires selection of a department Procedures Oversight Designee (D-POD), an eligible faculty member to draft the initial review report, and a CPC representative to attend the department meeting as is the case in promotion and tenure reviews (detailed in Section VI).

The purpose of the Fourth-Year review is to provide a systematic mechanism through which the candidate becomes aware of the department and college assessment of the quality and impact of his or her research, teaching, and service activities. This process is both developmental and evaluative in nature. For candidates whose records are evaluated as being partially consistent with meeting requirements for promotion and tenure review at the mandated time due to some weaknesses, the eligible faculty should elaborate on the nature of concerns and what needs to be done to address weaknesses. In some circumstances, a Fourth-Year review can lead to a decision not to extend the probationary appointment of the faculty member being reviewed.

Tenure-track faculty members undergoing Fourth-Year reviews are required to use the university's [Interfolio system](#) to generate their dossier. While a summary of the key dossier elements is noted in Appendix A, candidates must adhere to the Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#).

The eligible faculty in the department conducts a review of the candidate. The department chair attends the meeting. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment. Specifically, the voting options on the Fourth-Year review ballot, presented in Appendix C, are as follows (the sum of the votes for the first two options correspond to a "Yes" vote to reappoint):

- *Reappoint – on track*

This choice denotes that the candidate's record is currently progressing in ways that are consistent with meeting requirements for promotion and tenure review at the mandated time.

- *Reappoint – with reservations*

This choice denotes that aspects of the candidate's record are currently progressing in ways that are partially consistent with meeting requirements for promotion and tenure review at the mandated time, but there is a viable path to address the weaknesses in the record by tenure time.

- *Do not reappoint*

This choice denotes that the candidate's record is currently progressing in ways that are inconsistent with meeting requirements for promotion and tenure review at the mandated time, and there is not a viable path to address the weaknesses in the record by tenure time.

The D-POD counts and records the votes of the eligible faculty. A simple majority of “Reappoint” votes (inclusive of both “on track” and “with reservations”) is necessary for the vote to be considered positive. A decision to reappoint, however, does not imply that a positive tenure will necessarily follow; that decision will be contingent on progress and thorough evaluation at the time the candidate is considered for tenure. While every reasonable opportunity should be provided for the candidate to achieve tenure, faculty should vote to decline reappointment if they judge that there is not a viable path for the candidate to address the weaknesses in the record by tenure time.

The eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote, and the written performance review, 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. At the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per [Faculty Rule 3335-6-04](#)) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college (beginning with the CPC) for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or non-renewal.

The dean makes the final decision regarding renewal or non-renewal of the probationary appointment in the Fourth-Year review. Fourth-Year review dossiers are not submitted to OAA. Positive reviews do not need to be reported to OAA but non-renewal decisions are communicated via the “Report of Non-Renewal of Probationary Appointment of Regular Faculty” along with a copy of the non-renewal letter to the faculty member.

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 exclude time from 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 TIU’s right to recommend nonrenewal of an appointment during an annual review.

C Tenured Faculty

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the TIU head or designee, who prepares a written evaluation of each associate professor’s performance, after which they meet with the faculty member to discuss performance and future plans. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review that will be included along with the department chair’s evaluation in the faculty member’s personnel file. At least once every three years, eligible faculty members in a department examine the annual performance review documents and narratives of associate professors in that department and discuss, with the department chair, the strengths and weaknesses of the record and plans. The eligible faculty are not to provide an annual review letter to the faculty member; the TIU head provides a single annual review letter.

Professors are reviewed annually by the TIU head or designee, who meets with the faculty

member to discuss their performance and future plans and goals. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence and ongoing outcomes in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the tenure initiating unit, as demonstrated by ongoing national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and ongoing outstanding service to the TIU, 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. The TIU head prepares a written evaluation of performance against these expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review that will be included along with the department chair's evaluation in the faculty member's personnel file.

D Clinical Faculty

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

The initial clinical contract is always probationary, and the faculty member will be informed at the end of each probationary year as to whether he or she will be reappointed for the following year. During and until the end of the second and subsequent contract terms, clinical faculty appointments may only be terminated for cause (see [Faculty Rule 3335-5-04](#)) or financial exigency (see [Faculty Rule 3335-5-02.1](#)) and the termination decision for either of these reasons shall result from procedures established by faculty rules. In addition, a contract may be renegotiated during a contract period beyond the initial contract period only with the voluntary consent of the clinical faculty member.

In the penultimate contract year of a clinical faculty member's appointment, the department chair and the dean determine whether the position held by the clinical 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](#) are observed.

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the clinical faculty member will be offered a new contract. If the reappointment of the faculty member is being considered at the same rank as the initial appointment, the determination is made by the eligible faculty and chair of the department, with the final decision made by the dean. If the reappointment of the clinical faculty member entails a promotion to a higher rank, then the promotion process for clinical faculty outlined in

Section VI is followed. The materials for promotion of clinical faculty are summarized in Appendix A4; the same materials (other than a dossier) are required for reappointment.

E Associated Faculty

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The TIU head, or designee, consults with the department faculty as appropriate, then prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance, future plans, and goals. The TIU head's decision on renewal of the initial appointment is final. If the decision is to renew, the TIU head may extend a multiple year appointment.

Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment (or hired annually for multiple years) are reviewed annually by the department chair or designee, who consults with the department faculty as appropriate. The department chair or designee prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss performance, future plans, and goals. The chair will decide whether or not to reappoint no later than February 1 of the final year of the appointment. The department chair's recommendation on reappointment is final.

F Salary Recommendations

Following recommendations from TIU heads, the dean makes annual salary decisions. It is the expectation of the college that merit salary increases and other rewards made by a TIU will be made consistent with 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.

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

1 Criteria

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

On occasion, one-time cash payments are made for non-continuing activities and performance that deserve reward but do not justify permanent salary increases; at times, financial constraints too may necessitate the use of such one-time payments. When appropriate, recognition can also be provided in the form of a boost in research support and/or travel funds with amount subject to periodic review. Such payments and rewards are considered at the time of annual salary recommendations

The college seeks to support accomplishment of its mission by motivating and rewarding excellence in scholarly performance; providing rewards to faculty making major contributions in additional priority areas; and responding to market forces in order to retain high performing faculty. Consistent with these goals, individual faculty members are annually evaluated for merit in the following areas – scholarship encompassing research, teaching, and service as well as contributions to additional college priorities. The college uses annual increase funds for scholarship and provides one-time cash awards to recognize contributions to additional college priorities.

a. Scholarly Performance (Teaching, Research, and Service)

Scholarly performance in teaching, research, and service is judged according to department and college missions, with consideration given to a faculty member's specific balance of responsibilities. Performance over the preceding three calendar years is evaluated.

Assessment of scholarly performance focuses on accomplishment and impact. Performance norms are those judged appropriate and consistent with department and college aspirations and performance at business schools with similarly high standards.

b. Contributions to Additional College Priorities (Recognition Awards)

Enhancing scholarship is the primary college priority. In addition, the college also recognizes faculty contributions in other priority areas beyond those that are embodied in scholarly performance. In particular, these awards recognize significant out-of-classroom contributions to enhance student learning and experience in the undergraduate and master-level degree programs as well as significant service contributions to the department, college, university, and the business community during the past calendar year. The dean, in consultation with department chairs, retains discretion to adjust priorities over time.

2 Procedures

a. Scholarly Performance (Teaching, Research, and Service)

Section VI of this document defines Research, Teaching, and Service, and also provides criteria for and examples of excellence in these dimensions. As noted, the annual review process generates an overall performance rating for each faculty member on the following five-point rating scale, accounting for appointment type and workload assignment over the evaluation window:

BL: does not meet (i.e., is below) expectations

M-ME: minimally meets expectations

ME: meets expectations

EE: exceeds expectations

S-EE: significantly exceeds expectations

Faculty members with the same overall rating are treated identically in terms of

recommended salary percentage increases. In addition, department chairs and the dean 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.

b. Contributions to Additional College Priorities (Recognition Awards)

Each department chair, in consultation with program directors in their department, will recommend up to 3-5 individuals from their department who they believe meet one or both of the criteria for these awards, and who are not otherwise compensated for these activities. The associate deans can complement the above list by a few additional names; this addition is unconstrained by department affiliation.

The university's annual merit compensation process (AMCP) determines the funds available for faculty compensation. These are distributed based on assigned scholarly ratings, internal equity and market considerations, with the college adhering to standards and approval process as required by the university. This distribution is discussed and shared in a meeting of the dean with all department chairs and associate deans invited by the dean.

3 Appeals

Faculty members who wish to discuss dissatisfaction with their salary increase with the TIU head 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.

Appeals pertaining to performance and compensation decisions are addressed to the College Investigations and Salary Appeals Committee. This committee provides its report and recommendations to the dean. Faculty may also file a formal appeal with the Office of Academic Affairs.

VI PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

[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 emphasis 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.

Although institutional citizenship and collegiality are expected, they cannot be used as an independent criterion for promotion or tenure. The college and its TIUs recognize, however, that these positive attributes define the ability of a faculty member to contribute effectively to exemplary teaching, scholarship, and service. In addition, a faculty member's commitment to the University's [Shared Values](#) is expected and demonstrated, for example, by participation in faculty governance and community outreach; 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 college and each of its TIUs are committed to assessing the practice of these values and principles as part of all performance evaluations.

While research, teaching, and service activities are defined individually next, the college is cognizant and encouraging of meaningful overlap and synergies between these activities. Following [Faculty Rule 3335-6-02](#), these activities are defined as follows.

Research is broadly defined to include discovery, scholarly and creative work, applied studies, and the scholarship of pedagogy. The results of research will most often appear as articles in peer-reviewed research journals. In some cases, they may also appear as articles in non-peer-reviewed research journals, books or book chapters, or as articles in practice-oriented journals. Research activities can also be indicated by editorship and service on editorial boards of important research journals, presentations in academic meetings and at other universities, contributions to research seminars and workshops, and receiving prestigious research grants.

Teaching is broadly defined to include didactic classroom, non-classroom and distance instruction, extension and executive education, advising, and supervising or mentoring students or postdoctoral scholars. The results of teaching can appear in a variety of forms, including classroom teaching, one-on-one teaching, serving on doctoral dissertations, publishing textbooks, articles in refereed and non-refereed journals on teaching, cases, instructional software and videos, contributions to teaching seminars and workshops, publications in practice-oriented journals, developing new executive education learning programs working with the business community, and so forth.

Service is broadly defined to include providing administrative assistance to the university, engaging in professional activities that promote the faculty member's discipline, and providing disciplinary expertise to public or private entities beyond the university. Accepting service roles in a department, the college, or the university is a necessary but not sufficient condition for being judged to have demonstrated a rank-appropriate level of service. Faculty members must be judged to have made appropriate impactful contributions through their service activities. In general, making significant contributions in a few service roles will be valued more highly than making minor contributions in a large number of service roles.

As part of their service obligation, faculty members at all ranks are expected to demonstrate

professional collegiality. Collegiality includes, but is not limited to, participating in meaningful and positive ways in the activities of the college and university, interacting with others in respectful ways, supporting the intellectual and professional development of colleagues, acting with integrity, and so forth.

1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

The award of tenure is an acknowledgement of evidence indicative of excellence and future preeminence. It is therefore essential to evaluate and judge the probability that faculty members, 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. A decision to promote to associate professor with tenure, however, does not imply that a promotion to professor will eventually follow; that decision will be contingent on progress and thorough evaluation at the time the candidate is considered for promotion to professor.

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

Every candidate is held to high standards in all aspects of performance. Accepting weakness in any aspect of performance in making a tenure decision is tantamount to deliberately handicapping the ability of the department and college to perform and progress academically.

The number of years spent in the Fisher College of Business can vary across candidates, including the possibility of one or more formally approved extensions of the tenure clock. Congruent with [Faculty rule 3335-6-03](#), the standards for tenure are applied uniformly in each case regardless of the candidate's length of service in the college. The eligible faculty in the department retains discretion as to assigning credit for the candidate's research record developed prior to joining the Fisher College of Business. Such decisions by the eligible faculty should be made in consistent fashion and communicated both to potential candidates and to deliberating bodies at each level of review. This can be done, for example, through the initial offer letter, annual reviews, the department Pattern of Administration, or TIU-specific guidelines in this document. Regardless of the choice, following university guidelines, promotion is based primarily on activity conducted after joining the Fisher College of Business.

Successful candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure must demonstrate that they have attained potential for excellence in research, achievement in teaching, and rank-appropriate service. These standards are described in greater detail below.

Potential for Excellence in Research

Criterion: A faculty member is judged to demonstrate potential for excellence in research when they are engaged in the creation of new ideas that are beginning to influence scholarship and thinking in their field, and whose impact can reasonably be expected to grow over time.

Evidence: The following indicators are in line with the "Potential for Excellence in Research" criteria:

- Publish a body of work in high-quality peer-reviewed venues that can either be thematically focused or contribute to multiple areas. In either case, the work must be likely to be impactful.
- While the quality of the ideas is a key determinant, the quality and ranking of the journal (or other outlet) in which the research is published is an informative indicator of likely impact. Archival journal publications are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published research more than unpublished research, and original works more than edited works.
- The candidate's work will appear in the journals recognized as being of the highest quality by the individual's academic department, though such top journals need not necessarily all be focused on a single academic discipline; high-quality work by faculty that bridges disciplines is valued. It is noted that an adequate quantity of publications in top journals will generally be viewed as a necessary but not sufficient condition for granting tenure. Quality and impact are critical to establishing sufficiency.
- The candidate has started developing a national/international reputation in the field as evidenced by external evaluations, invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals, memberships in editorial boards, a trend of positive citations in research publications, evidence of influence on the work of others, as well as significant applications of research insights in practice. A reputation based on the quality of the research contribution is distinguished from one based mainly on familiarity through the faculty member's frequent attendance at conferences.
- Demonstrated a high degree of ethics in the conduct of research including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical behavior with undergraduate, masters, and PhD students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators.

Achievement in Teaching

Criterion: A faculty member is judged to demonstrate achievement in teaching when they are engaged in successful communication of ideas to students.

Evidence: The following indicators are in line with the "Achievement in Teaching" criterion:

- Demonstrated consistently solid classroom teaching, with student evaluations (relative to appropriate comparison group) and peer evaluations serving as informative evidence.
- Provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in instructional situations and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge.
- Demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create a desirable learning environment.
- Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process, treating students with respect and courtesy.

- Contributed to department and college teaching programs through engagement in curriculum revision and development as and when appropriate for rank.
- Engaged with doctoral education. This can include serving as an advisor or a member of PhD dissertation committees, teaching doctoral seminars, and/or guiding doctoral students.
- Engaged in infusing research insights in teaching at all levels, and served as advisor and mentor to students in the college's programs.
- Served as advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the department's graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise.

Rank-Appropriate Service for Promotion to Associate Professor

Criterion: A faculty member is judged to demonstrate rank-appropriate service when they are successfully undertaking assigned committee assignments in the department and college and engaging in activities that are tied to their scholarly role in the discipline.

Evidence: The following indicators are in line with the noted service criterion:

- Assistant professors focus their internal service efforts on attending departmental and college faculty meetings; contributing to student welfare through service on student-faculty committees when assigned; membership on departmental committees and task forces and, occasionally, membership on college committees and task forces.
- Assistant professors focus their external service efforts on activities that will facilitate their scholarly work, e.g., serving as a reviewer for high-quality journals or academic association national or international conferences and memberships in editorial boards.
- While institutional citizenship and collegiality cannot be used as an independent criterion for promotion or tenure, all faculty members, including assistant professors, are expected to demonstrate professional collegiality. Such collegiality includes appropriate interaction with students, staff and faculty members in both verbal and written communications; attending, participating in and showing respect for others in departmental meetings and research seminars; and engaging appropriately with organizations and groups outside the college and in so doing contributing positively to the reputation of the college and university.

2 Promotion to Professor

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

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

In line with the above, in the college and its TIUs, promotion to professor requires a candidate to demonstrate excellence in research and sustained achievement in teaching and service over the length of their career. Notice, whereas the granting of tenure is based on potential for excellence, candidates for professor must demonstrate excellence in research with a national or international reputation in their research field. In addition, following the guidance of [Faculty Rule 3335-6-02](#), the department and college also recognize that 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.”

The standards of excellence in research and sustained achievement in teaching and service are described in greater detail below.

Excellence in Research

Criteria: A faculty member is judged to demonstrate excellence in research when they demonstrate sustained accomplishment and increasing quality of scholarly contributions since promotion to associate professor; show that the work has had a significant impact in a field; and that they have established a national or international reputation in the field.

Publishing research articles in leading research journals is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for demonstrating excellence in research. That is, publishing numerous papers and/or writing several books, does not, by itself, indicate that a person has demonstrated excellence in research. Instead, in addition to publications in top-tier journals that continue to play a key role, determining excellence in research requires thoughtful assessment of the quality of the candidate’s work, and the impact and influence of the ideas that support the work. In effect, in judging the excellence of research activities, faculty need to ask themselves whether or not knowledge in a candidate’s field would be significantly different if the candidate’s research activities had not occurred.

Evidence: The following indicators are in line with the “Excellence in Research” criteria:

- Successfully addressing fundamental questions in a field.
- Identifying important new questions in a field.
- Helping shape the direction of research in a field.
- Being known and respected by numerous leading scholars, and influencing their thinking.
- Mentoring students who subsequently develop into leading scholars in the field.
- Creating ideas that significantly impact management practice in a field, including translating research and engaging in entrepreneurial efforts to further business innovation and applications.
- Developing ideas that significantly impact student learning as evidenced by inclusion of research in textbooks, cases, and professional and practitioner articles.
- Relevant quantitative indicators of impact (which could include, for example, Google

Scholar citations, h-indices, or citations/downloads in SSRN) should be indicative of scholarly success. This data is provided by the candidate for themselves as well as for comparable other faculty in peer institutions who are currently professors or being considered for promotion to professor.

- Statements provided by external letter writers, appointments to high-quality journal editorial boards and editor positions, and editing research-based monographs and books.

While the above list is not exhaustive, an evaluation of both qualitative and quantitative indicators of research excellence listed above are needed to establish a case for promotion to professor.

Sustained Achievement in Teaching

Criteria: A faculty member is judged to have demonstrated sustained achievement in teaching when he or she demonstrates consistently good classroom teaching and appropriately contributes to the broad portfolio of college teaching programs through quality engagement in curriculum development, participation on program policy and/or ad hoc committees, involvement in student recruitment and placement, and so forth.

Evidence: The following indicators are in line with the “Sustained Achievement in Teaching” criteria:

- Student evaluations that are consistently at or above the mean score relative to the appropriate comparison group.
- Advising and serving on PhD dissertation committees, and engaging with doctoral education.
- Up-to-date course content.
- Demonstrated ability to organize and present class material effectively.
- Creativity in the use of various modes of instruction.
- Engaged and respectful interaction with students across degree programs.
- Appropriate and timely feedback to students.
- Engagement in curriculum development.
- Providing meaningful advising services to students.
- Documented efforts to sustain and improve performance in teaching.

Sustained Achievement in Service

To demonstrate sustained achievement in service senior faculty members are expected to:

- Engage in the full range of service activities including attending departmental and college faculty meetings; advising students at all levels; contributing to student welfare through service on student-faculty committees; serving as an advisor to student organizations; involvement in the promotion and tenure review process of faculty in their department.

- Contribute in departmental, college, and university committees and task forces and, at times, in specified faculty leadership roles such as directors of centers or academic programs.
- Meaningfully participate in activities that enhance the profession, including membership and/or leadership in academic and professional organizations.
- While institutional citizenship and collegiality cannot be used as an independent criterion for promotion, all faculty members, especially senior faculty, are expected to lead in demonstrating professional collegiality. Such collegiality includes appropriate interaction with students, staff and faculty members; attending, participating in and showing respect for others in departmental meetings and research seminars; and engaging appropriately with organizations and groups outside the college and in so doing contributing positively to the reputation of the college and university.

3 Clinical Faculty

Criteria: For appointment as assistant clinical professor, a faculty member must complete their doctoral or terminal degree and meet any required licensure/certification in their specialty and be performing satisfactorily in teaching, professional practice, and service. For promotion to associate clinical professor, a faculty member must demonstrate that they have attained excellence in teaching and achievement in service and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of this college. For promotion to clinical professor, a faculty member must demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching as well as excellence in service.

A notable requirement for promotion to clinical professor, one that can span both teaching and service dimensions, is the production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice to external audiences, such as faculty at other universities. The expectations on this front are understandably less for promotion to associate clinical professor, but some progress in production and disseminating is required. Thus, the standard for promotion to clinical professor versus associate clinical professor is expected to be substantially higher and consist of a sustained record over a period of several years with established national/international reputation, as well as enhanced contributions on the service dimension. Promotion at all ranks will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Excellence in teaching requires high-quality performance in classroom teaching as well as provision of effective student services and instructional support, including meaningful contributions to programs. Effective service for a clinical faculty member entails contributions at the college and university level, but also demonstration of a high level of competence in professional practice.

Evidence: Indicators of high-quality classroom teaching, student and instructional support, and service are indicated below:

Classroom teaching

- Consistently good student evaluations.
- Development and use of up-to-date course content.
- Demonstrated ability to organize and present class material effectively.
- Creativity in the use of various modes of instruction.
- Respectful interaction with students across degree programs.
- Appropriate and timely feedback to students.
- Engagement in curriculum improvements in degree and certificate programs, as well as developing non-degree executive education offerings.
- Providing meaningful advising services to students.
- Documented efforts to sustain and improve performance in teaching.

Student and instructional support

- Highly visible and successful leadership in multiple student service activities in the college; these may include attending and organizing outside-of-class events with students; supervision and collaboration with student organizations; participation in student competitions as a judge; engagement with faculty and staff, both from the college and the university as well as with parties external to the university to develop initiatives, classes, and programs.
- Development and dissemination of important new approaches to teaching.
- Adoption of teaching innovations.
- Development of integrated offerings/curriculum that contributes to Fisher being nationally or internationally recognized.
- National or international recognition for shaping the direction of teaching.
- Participation in “train-the-trainer” programs that attract external faculty to the college.
- Development of teaching programs and materials that serves as a major draw for new students and companies coming to Fisher.

Service

- Development of long-term working relationships with highly visible companies, trade and professional associations, and other related organizations.
- Notable contributions to client relationships and development of offerings delivered through executive education programs.
- Professional advising or consulting activities that both improve the curriculum and classroom experience and provide meaningful support to the business community.
- Leadership and other major contributions to academic programs that enhance the reputation of the college. This may include serving in an administrative capacity, engaging in program development or redesign, and undertaking corporate outreach activities that impact student recruitment and placement.

- Development of meaningful course materials that enhance education both within the college and the broader business and academic community, including publishing materials such as teaching cases, articles, and popular trade books.

Achieving a record worthy of consideration for clinical promotion does not rest on documenting activities consistent with a fixed number of items from the above list, nor is the list to be viewed as all inclusive. Rather, the final determination of whether a promotion standard has been reached rests with the evaluative bodies involved in promotion and annual review processes and is a matter of individual and collective professional judgment. This judgment is expected to entail a broad consideration of the college mission and how the candidate can and does uniquely contribute to achieving college goals.

4 Associated Faculty

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

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

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

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

B Procedures

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

Candidates for promotion and tenure or for promotion are reviewed at four levels: the eligible faculty in the candidate's TIU, the chair of the candidate's TIU, the dean of the college, and the Office of Academic Affairs. The college has a standing faculty promotion and tenure committee that is advisory to the dean. In the college, this committee is the College Personnel Committee (CPC). The following sections state the responsibilities of each party to the review process.

1 Tenure-Track and Clinical Faculty

a. Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion within the Fisher College of Business are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier and providing a copy of the APT

document under which they wish to be reviewed, if other than the current document. If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators compiled for their case. Each of these elements is described in detail below.

The responsibilities of the candidate are as follows:

- **Dossier**

Every candidate must submit a complete, accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs [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. As directed by OAA, the candidate will use the Interfolio's [Faculty Activity Reporting](#) tool.

While a TIU's eligible faculty will make reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by them.

TIUs will require unit-appropriate documentation. It is the responsibility of the TIU to evaluate and verify this documentation.

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

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

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 to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

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

Every candidate must define their field of work in the dossier research portion since activities and accomplishments are assessed within that context. The college currently recognizes thirteen fields of work: Accounting, Business Law, Decision Sciences, Entrepreneurship, Finance, Human Resources, International Business, Logistics, Management Information Systems, Marketing, Operations Management, Organizational Behavior, and Strategy. The college recognizes that this list may not fully describe all fields of work that are relevant in the study of the theory and practice of business. For example, newly developed fields of work and interdisciplinary fields of work may not be included in this list. With this in mind, candidates can choose to define their own field of work (within the guidelines provided below). The candidate's statement and the department's action with regard to the proposed field of work should be communicated to the dean no later than when the department chair conveys the list of suggested letter writers to the dean for approval.

Self-defined fields of work must meet the same quality standards as each of the thirteen fields of work currently recognized by the college: they must be broad-based, widely recognized, and they cannot be a sub-field of any one of the thirteen fields currently recognized by the college. To be used in a review process, three-fourths of the eligible faculty members in a department must agree that a faculty member's self-defined field of work meets the defined standard. The determination must be made prior to the beginning of the review process, and prior to the seeking of external letters (in reviews for which such letters are required) via the ballot listed in Appendix C. If the candidate's self-defined field of work is not accepted by three-fourths of the eligible faculty members, the candidate must choose from among the thirteen fields of work currently recognized by the college.

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

Faculty members undergoing mandatory or nonmandatory reviews are typically reviewed using the unit's currently approved APT document, available [here](#).

Tenure-track faculty members may choose to be reviewed under the unit's document that was in effect on their start date or on the date of their last promotion, whichever is more recent. The current 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.

Clinical faculty members may choose to be reviewed for promotion under the unit's document that was in effect on their start date or on the date of their last reappointment, whichever is more recent.

Associated faculty members being considered for reappointment at senior rank will be reviewed using the unit's current APT document.

A faculty member who chooses to use an earlier document shall notify their TIU head of this intent by submitting the APT document that was in effect on their start date or on the date of last promotion, whichever is more recent, when submitting their dossier and other materials for review. The deadline for doing so will be the unit's regular deadline for receiving the

dossier and other materials for the review in question.

If a previous APT document is used for a review, only the criteria for evaluation from the earlier document are to be used. All processes and procedures for the review are to align with the currently approved APT document, regardless of whether a previous or current APT document is being used to define criteria for evaluation.

- **External Evaluations** (see also External Evaluations in section V1.B.3)

If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department eligible faculty. The extent to which candidates can supplement or request deletions from the list is noted in section V1.B.3 in this document.

- **Candidate Review and Response**

Candidates will also review and respond to the TIU review report and the department chair's recommendation letter. To do so, the candidate will be given 10 business days following delivery of each document. The university's Interfolio system provides a candidate with means to provide (or decline) comments.

b. TIU Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the eligible faculty in the department are as follows:

Spring Semester

- Consider requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review for promotion and tenure to associate professor, a promotion to professor, or a clinical faculty promotion in the following academic year, and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. In each case, a simple majority vote is required for the review to proceed. After April 15, any non-mandatory requests for Fourth-Year review, tenure, or promotion from a Fisher faculty member will not be considered unless approved by the dean for specific reasons (e.g., in response to a compelling external offer).
 - In the case of non-mandatory promotion and tenure to associate professor or a promotion to professor, the eligible faculty bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's curriculum vitae; his or her research, teaching, and service statements; and student and peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching. In the case of clinical faculty promotions, other than a separate research statement, the same documents are evaluated. Lack of documentation is sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
 - A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under [Faculty Rule 3335-6-04](#) only once. Faculty Rule [3335-7-08](#) makes the same provision for nonprobationary clinical faculty. If the denial is based on lack of required

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

- A decision by the eligible faculty to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to make a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Select from among its members an individual to serve as the Department Procedures Oversight Designee (D-POD) for all mandatory and non-mandatory cases for the upcoming year. The D-POD cannot subsequently serve as author to draft a report for any case on behalf of the eligible faculty. A description of the role of the D-POD is provided in Appendix B.
- Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from peer and aspirational peer programs identified by each TIU (see Appendix D). A TIU will provide the college with justification when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.

Autumn Semester

- The department chair coordinates with the eligible faculty in scheduling one or more meetings for the eligible faculty to review and analyze all tenure and promotion cases in the department, making every effort to schedule the meetings at times when all eligible faculty members can attend. A faculty member being reviewed does not attend the meeting wherein their case is being considered.
 - Prior to the meeting to discuss a candidate's record, the department chair, and the D-POD review the dossier and materials to ensure that it meets all requirements and is ready for distribution to the eligible faculty. Copies of the verified review documents and copies of received evaluation letters are made available to all eligible faculty members in the department in sufficient time to prepare for the meeting (normally no later than one week prior to the meeting). In addition, the eligible faculty is also informed of any member who will not be in attendance due to a conflict of interest, and any letter the recused faculty member may have provided. The eligible faculty review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's materials in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
 - In the meeting, conducted under the direction of the department chair, the first agenda item is the election of one of the present eligible faculty members (other than the D-POD or the department chair) to author the departmental promotion or promotion and tenure review report (hereafter referred to as TIU review report). If more than one person is being reviewed, a different eligible faculty member present can be elected to author each separate TIU review report.
 - The role of the author of the TIU review report, in addition to participating in the discussion as a member of the faculty, is to take careful notes of the discussion. This individual will also typically represent the department in presenting the case to

the CPC (detailed later). The role of the departmental D-POD is to assure that the department's process follows departmental, college, and university guidelines and is fair and unbiased. If the D-POD observes any significant deviations from these guidelines, he or she submits a report to the department chair and to the dean.

- The eligible faculty should consider the strengths and weaknesses of the record of the candidate(s) being evaluated. Discussion should be open and frank and focus on whether or not a candidate's research, teaching, and service activities meet the criteria for promotion and tenure described in this document. The department chair should not make substantive contributions to this discussion given that he or she has an independent opportunity to state views via a written evaluation and recommendation to the dean that accompanies the eligible faculty's evaluation and recommendation document. Among other matters, the faculty should discuss each of the papers sent to the reviewers for tenure-track candidates. The department discussion of the candidate's research should not be limited to referencing the external letter writers' opinions about the papers. The discussion should be an independent assessment of those papers by the eligible faculty. Similarly, the evaluation of teaching should not be limited to only the Survey of Student Learning Experience (SSLE) data, but also include other dimensions listed in this document. The eligible faculty should also 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.
- After faculty members at the departmental promotion or promotion and tenure review meeting (including the assigned CPC representative) feel satisfied that both the strengths and weaknesses of a candidate's record have been thoroughly discussed and evaluated, a formal vote is taken. This vote uses the appropriate ballot presented in Appendix C. A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast is positive.
- Upon completion of its deliberations of each case, a TIU review report is authored and, along with the completed ballots, forwarded to the department chair. The TIU review report summarizes the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's record, providing an in-depth analysis of the case as discussed in the departmental promotion or promotion and tenure review meeting. This report also describes the outcome of the vote of the eligible faculty members taken at this meeting. The process for writing the TIU review report is as follows. The faculty member assigned the task in the department promotion or promotion and tenure meeting initiates a draft. The draft report is distributed by its author to all eligible faculty members in the department no more than one week after the conclusion of the departmental promotion or promotion and tenure meeting. The department chair also receives a copy. Only eligible faculty members that attended the department promotion or promotion and tenure meeting where the case was discussed can suggest revisions to the draft and have one week to do so; however, eligible faculty members who were unable to attend the meeting do receive copies of the TIU review report drafts and its revisions. The department chair does not suggest substantive revisions to the TIU review report draft. Any disagreements about the content of the report must be resolved, with the aid of the department chair and D-POD if necessary, no later than one week after the report draft is first distributed to the eligible faculty. After

the TIU review report is finalized, its author distributes it to all eligible faculty members in the department, the department chair, and to the CPC representative for the case.

- The final TIU review report and the department chair's letter are provided to the college's Faculty Affairs Office by the department chair by October 15. Using the Interfolio system, the college's Faculty Affairs Office contacts the candidate who is given 10 business days to respond. Thereafter, the eligible faculty has the opportunity to provide a written reply to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- A tenured faculty member (or nonprobationary associate clinical professor or professor, as appropriate to the case) from the department (typically the author of the TIU review report) presents the case to the CPC at the beginning of its deliberations. The role of the department representative in the CPC meetings is limited to providing relevant information about discipline norms and to clarify any issue in the letter from the TIU eligible faculty that the CPC has questions about; the CPC should neither ask for nor should the department representative express his/her personal views on the case.
- The eligible faculty also provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the TIU head in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the TIU's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on its own cases.

c. Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

Spring Semester

- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. (The TIU must ensure that such questions are asked of all applicants in a non-discriminatory manner.) For tenure-track assistant professors, TIU heads are to confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an [MOU](#) at the time of promotion with tenure..
- To assure that the department's eligible faculty meet to consider requests from faculty members seeking non-mandatory reviews. The department chair works with candidates to ensure review materials are provided to the eligible faculty in reasonable advance of the meeting.
- To avert and help resolve potential issues of conflict of interest that may arise during the review process.

- To solicit evaluation letters from a list suggested by the eligible faculty and the candidate (by May 15).
- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments. The TIU head in the primary appointment unit 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.

Summer and Autumn Semesters

- To provide candidates in the department with advice and counsel. Along with the designated D-POD, the chair of the department serves as an advisor to the candidate on the development of the dossier, reviews the candidate's materials for completeness, accuracy, and consistency with OAA requirements; and works with the candidate to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the department promotion and tenure meeting.
- To ensure that the candidate's complete dossier and related documents are made available for review in an accessible place to all appropriate parties at least one week in advance of the department's promotion and tenure meeting in which the case will be discussed.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion or promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, a TIU head will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate upon receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation. This letter, addressed to the dean, provides the department chair's evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the record of the candidate being reviewed for promotion and tenure or promotion. The letter concludes by recommending whether or not the faculty member being reviewed should be promoted and tenured or promoted. The department chair uses the same voting categories used by the faculty in the departmental promotion and tenure review meeting. The chair may or may not respond to issues and concerns raised in the departmental promotion and tenure review meeting and report. A copy of this letter is given to all eligible faculty in the department. The department chair meets with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to its recommendation.
- To provide the college's Office of Faculty Affairs a copy of both the finalized TIU review report and a copy of the department chair's recommendation letter by October 15. The Faculty Affairs office transmits this information to the candidate via Interfolio along with means for the candidate to provide (or decline) comments.

- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier. The department chair and/or the eligible faculty may each write replies to a faculty member's response and are encouraged to do so if procedural problems that might reasonably have affected the outcome of a review are alleged. Only one round of the comments process relative to the departmental level review is permitted. Any departmental faculty and chair replies should be provided to the college's Office of Faculty Affairs prior to the scheduled CPC meeting.
- 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 TIU head's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the head of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

d. College Personnel Committee (CPC) Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the CPC are as follows:

- Elect a chair in its first meeting of the year. In this same meeting, for each case, one CPC member is assigned to serve as the CPC representative; the CPC representative is not assigned a case from their own department.
- The CPC representative attends all meetings in which substantive discussions of the case are held, including the departmental promotion and tenure review meeting. In addition, the CPC representative:
 - Ensures that the discussion in the department promotion or promotion and tenure review meeting of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's record is open, frank, and complete and focuses on a determination of impact. In this effort the CPC representative's role is not to participate in the substance of the discussion but to observe and encourage a complete discussion. This includes posing process questions to the eligible faculty to ensure that the department has addressed how the candidate has or has not met the criteria associated with the rank sought by the candidate as outlined in this APT document.
 - Verifies, along with the D-POD, that the votes are correctly counted, that process follows departmental, college and university guidelines, and that the meeting is conducted in a fair and unbiased manner.
 - Serves as a resource to the CPC on the case as a result of having been present at the department promotion or promotion and tenure review meeting. Any concerns as to the thoroughness or appropriateness of the departmental discussion should previously have been expressed to the department chair. These issues may possibly cause the CPC to request the department chair and the D-POD to meet with the CPC to discuss the case and to elaborate on the departmental discussion.
- Review thoroughly and objectively each candidate's dossier (except those involving a candidate from the CPC member's own department) in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.

- Once materials are submitted to the college for review, with the exception of questions regarding procedural errors and/or the availability of significant new information (see Section V1.B.4 and V1.B.5), no further consultation with TIU heads or committees on substantive matters should take place. This assures that the levels of review are independent.
- The college's Office of Faculty Affairs, in coordination with the CPC chair, schedules meetings of the CPC to discuss cases in a timely fashion (the meetings being held no later than the last day of November). A quorum for the CPC to conduct business is two-thirds of its eligible membership.
 - The first agenda item in the CPC meeting is the election of one of the CPC members to author the CPC report and another member of the CPC to serve as the CPC Procedures Oversight Designee (C-POD) for each of the cases. If more than one person is being reviewed at a particular meeting, more than one CPC member present can be elected to author separate CPC reports, and different CPC members present can be elected as the C-POD for different cases. The CPC chair cannot serve as a C-POD for any case.
 - The C-POD ensures that the CPC's process follows college and university guidelines and is fair and unbiased. If the C-POD observes any significant deviations from these guidelines, he or she submits a report to the dean of the college. Details of POD responsibilities are presented in Appendix B.
 - In CPC deliberations of each candidate, CPC members from the same academic department as the candidate are recused, neither attending, voting or otherwise involving themselves in the process. Consideration of the case then begins with a representative from the candidate's department presenting the case to the CPC. The department representative will be a tenured faculty member (or nonprobationary associate clinical professor or clinical professor, as appropriate to the case) from the department and typically will be the author of the TIU review report. The department representative summarizes the strengths and weaknesses of the case as seen through the eyes of the department faculty and responds to any CPC questions regarding norms in the particular field/discipline. The department representative is excused at the end of his or her presentation. The department representative remains available to the CPC through the remainder of its meeting in case further questions arise warranting the representative being recalled to the meeting.
 - The CPC then proceeds with discussion on the case, with the CPC representative assigned to the case sharing his or her impressions to initiate discussion. All present CPC members express their views on the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's research, teaching, and service and outreach activities, and whether these activities meet the criteria set in this document. CPC discussions should be based solely on the documents generated through the promotion and tenure review process and discussion in the meetings described here. The meeting concludes with a vote that is advisory to the dean, verified and recorded by the C-POD.
 - The CPC produces a report for the dean on each case. The CPC member elected as

the author of the CPC report writes an initial draft shortly after the CPC meeting is adjourned. This report summarizes the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's record as discussed at the CPC meeting and reports the vote of the CPC. The draft report is passed among members of the CPC who were present for the discussion of a particular case for comment. In cases where the CPC feels that that it would be helpful to meet with the dean to discuss a case prior to completing its finalized report, such a meeting will take place assuming that the dean is amenable. When such a meeting occurs all reasonable effort will be made to schedule the meeting such that all CPC members can attend. Once the CPC report is finalized, it is included in the dossier materials submitted to the dean by the chair of the CPC. The CPC report should be completed no later than the last day of the Autumn semester.

- Efforts to influence CPC discussions of individual cases through e-mail, memos, conversations, or other formal or informal means outside the procedures described in this document are considered a serious breach of professional ethics and are unacceptable.
- Review the college's APT document annually and recommend any proposed revisions to the dean. Any revision to the APT document must be affirmed through established process.

e. Dean's Responsibilities

- All documents generated through the promotion and tenure process, including the CPC report, are received by the dean. These documents are advisory to the dean.
- The dean will consider the recommendations of the department faculty, department chair, and the CPC and, at his/her discretion, may also meet with the CPC. The dean makes a recommendation on each candidate's case and forwards this recommendation to the candidate being reviewed, the candidate's department chair, members of the CPC, and OAA (as part of the official dossier by the set deadline).
- The dean also provides the candidate and his/her department chair with copies of the CPC report.
- In accordance with university regulations, candidates have ten business days to write a response to the CPC report and the dean's recommendation letter. This response, if received, is added to the dossier sent to the executive vice president and provost. The CPC and/or the dean may write a reply to a faculty member's response and are encouraged to do so if procedural problems that might reasonably have affected the outcome of a review are alleged. This response is also included in the dossier of the faculty member being reviewed.
- The executive vice president and provost reviews the recommendation consistent with review procedures set forth in Faculty Rules [3335-6-03](#) and [3335-6-04](#). Any decision of the executive vice president and provost shall be final.

- When a promotion and tenure decision is negative, the dean must advise the candidate of their right to appeal and also of their final date of employment under the seven-year rule (if applicable).
- Upon notification of the final disposition of a case, the dean informs all college faculty members of the outcome.

2 Procedures for Associated Faculty

Associated faculty with adjunct and tenure-track titles for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed in Section VI.B above, with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the TIU head's recommendation is negative (a negative recommendation by the TIU head is final in such cases), and does not proceed to the executive vice president and provost if the dean's recommendation is negative. Positive recommendations from the dean likewise do not proceed to the executive vice president and provost.

3 External Evaluations

Tenure-track Faculty

External evaluations of research are obtained for all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews.

TIUs within this college will seek external evaluations predominately from evaluators in peer and aspirational peer programs as noted in Appendix D. Justification will be provided whenever a suggested evaluator is from a program not so specified.

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 three years or who is a current collaborator; c) in a consulting/financial arrangement with the candidate within the past three years, including receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services); d) a relative or close personal friend; or e) 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 evaluations must be obtained, and Appendix D elaborates on these criteria. Since it is impossible to control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, at least twice as many letters are sought as are required, and they are solicited no later than the end of the Spring semester (May 15) prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five letters result from the first round of requests.

The list of potential evaluators is assembled by the department eligible faculty. The candidate may

add up to three additional names to the list provided by the eligible faculty, but is not required to do so. The candidate may also request the removal of no more than two names. The finalized list must be approved by the dean.

Once the final list of outside evaluators is identified, all of them are contacted by the department chair and asked if they would be willing to serve as an external reviewer for the case. Those that agree to serve as an external reviewer receive a cover letter that follows OAA's suggested format. A sample letter for tenure-track faculty can be found [here](#). External reviewers also receive the candidate's curriculum vitae, research statement, and up to six examples of research activities. No materials are sent to the external reviewers after this submission.

[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. The department chair makes every reasonable effort to obtain at least one letter from someone suggested by the faculty member. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither OAA nor the college requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

Under no circumstances may a candidate or any member of the faculty 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 or other faculty member regarding the review, they must inform the evaluator that such communication is inappropriate and report the occurrence to the department chair and to the dean, who will decide what, if any, action is warranted. 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 unless the Office of Academic Affairs approves exclusion. Letters must be signed (pdf versions with signature are acceptable). E-mails are not sufficient. 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.

Clinical Faculty

For promotion from assistant clinical professor to associate clinical professor, letters from reviewers external to The Ohio State University are not required, although such letters may be requested at the discretion of the eligible faculty (a sample letter for clinical faculty can be found [here](#)). However, such promotions require letters from internal evaluators. Internal evaluators include (a) clinical or tenure-track faculty of higher rank than the candidate under consideration in the college or in other TIUs at the university and (b) program chairs, center and institute directors, or senior administrators in the college or university. The eligible faculty, in consultation with the department chair, creates a list of four or more internal evaluators who are likely to have had significant interactions with the candidate. The candidate may add one additional name, but is not required to do so. The candidate may also request the removal of no more than one name. A minimum of three letters is needed to begin evaluation.

For promotion from associate clinical professor to clinical professor, candidates are responsible for reviewing a list of four or more internal evaluators and four or more external evaluators

developed by the eligible faculty in consultation with the department chair. The candidate may add one additional name to the list of internal evaluators and one additional name to the list of external evaluators, but is not required to do so. The candidate may also request the removal of no more than one name from each group. A minimum of five letters is needed to begin evaluation.

All contact with letter writers will be made only by the department chair and the college's Office of Faculty Affairs. Those that agree to serve as reviewers receive a cover letter (a sample letter for clinical faculty can be found [here](#)), along with the candidate's curriculum vitae and teaching and service statements. Again, the letters 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 the required number of letters result from the first round of requests.

4 Procedures if New Information About a Candidate Becomes Available

Generally, reviews proceed on the basis of a candidate's record at the beginning of the review process. Occasionally it may be appropriate to amend the record when significant new information about items already contained in the dossier becomes available that may alter the outcome of the review. Examples include acceptances or publication of works listed as in progress; funding of grants listed as submitted; or contracts or patents that have received a license or other commercial activity. An amended record must be reviewed by all parties to the review process.

If significant new information about items already contained in the dossier becomes available before a case leaves the TIU, but after the TIU eligible faculty has voted, the TIU head may immediately pose to the TIU eligible faculty committee the question of the appropriateness of reconsideration. If the information becomes available after a case has left the TIU, a higher-level review body must return the case to the TIU if either the eligible faculty or the TIU head have given a negative recommendation.

In the above case, following dissemination of the new information (which need not take place in a meeting), the eligible faculty take a preliminary vote to determine whether or not to re-vote the case. This preliminary vote takes the form of a ballot asking each eligible faculty member who had voted originally in the case to indicate whether the new information might change their vote (see Appendix C for the ballot). If at least one person indicates that his or her vote might change, the eligible faculty members who had voted originally meet to discuss the case with the new information and re-vote. The originally generated TIU review report is then amended to reflect the content of the reconsideration and the new vote. In this circumstance, the previously generated report remains in the dossier. In any reconsideration, the candidates retain the right to comment on the (revised) TIU review report. Replies to these responses can also be written and included, as described earlier.

Should significant new information become available about a candidate that may negatively impact the recommendation from the unit, the vice provost for faculty affairs must be contacted to determine whether and how that information may or may not be included. Where the significant new information arises from allegations of misconduct, the vice provost for faculty

affairs will be notified but not tasked to make a decision on its relevance; rather, the allegation will be directed to the appropriate review body following procedures prescribed by OAA.

New information is not accepted after the dossier has been submitted to OAA. Once the dossier has been submitted to OAA, the only information that may be added is information that corrects errors with items already included in the dossier.

5 Procedural Errors

Significant procedural errors (those that reasonably could have affected the outcome of deliberations) are to be corrected before the review continues. If a review body or unit administrator becomes convinced that such an error has occurred, that body or administrator is to take necessary steps to correct the error at the level of review at which it occurred. The case is to be fully reconsidered from that point on.

If internal letters of evaluation and comments letters have already been generated at that level of review and beyond, they are to be saved but not included in the dossier. The new written evaluations should note that reconsideration took place because of a procedural error and state the nature of the error. The comments process must be repeated for the new internal letters of evaluation at the TIU or college level.

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 clinical 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 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 STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

A Student Evaluation of Teaching

The Survey of Student Learning Experience (SSLE) is administered for every course offered in the college. [Faculty Rule 3335-3-35](#) requires that students be given the opportunity to evaluate the quality of instruction provided in each of their courses. The online SSLE is the official university-wide instrument provided for this purpose. The faculty member is to encourage students to complete the SSLE, explaining that the evaluations will be used for both performance evaluation and feedback to the instructor. In the event the faculty member additionally chooses to provide in-class time for students to complete the evaluation using a mobile application, the faculty member should select a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high, and the faculty member must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation.

B Peer Evaluation of Teaching

TIU heads oversee their unit's peer evaluation of teaching process.

Annually the TIU head appoints individuals (or a committee) to conduct the peer reviews. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the unit. 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. For peer reviews of tenure-track faculty, at least half the reviews must be conducted by tenured faculty; for non-tenure-track faculty, at least a subset of peer reviews must be conducted by tenured faculty.

1 Timing of Evaluations

Voluntary Peer Evaluation: Voluntary peer assessment is available at any time to any faculty member. A request is made to the department chair who then works with the faculty member and, if desired, the appropriate program chair. In early stages of their career, faculty are particularly encouraged to seek voluntary peer evaluation to obtain timely feedback for growth and improvement in their teaching. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only; the TIU head is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Use of the [Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#) for developmental assistance is also encouraged.

Mandatory Peer Evaluation: For full-time instructional faculty, mandatory peer assessment of teaching effectiveness occurs at least three times during the first six years of appointment in the college and at least once every three years thereafter.

In the case of untenured, full-time tenure-track faculty, mandatory peer assessments take place at least once in the first three years of appointment, and at least once in the next two years. Thus, there is at least one formal peer evaluation prior to the Fourth-Year review, and at least two formal peer evaluations prior to the sixth year promotion and tenure review.

Since the timing of reviews for tenure-track faculty is consistent with the promotion and tenure process, any extension of the tenure clock (e.g., due to a professional leave, a leave of absence) modifies the timing of the peer assessment consistent with the modification made to the tenure clock.

In the case of tenured full-time faculty, mandatory peer assessment occurs at least once every five years. There should be at least two completed formal peer evaluations, with at least one conducted since tenure, before commencement of a case for promotion to professor.

For non-tenure-track, full-time faculty, mandatory peer assessment occurs at least once during the first three years of appointment in the college, and at least once in the subsequent three years of appointment. Thereafter, mandatory peer assessments occur at least once every five years. For clinical faculty being considered for promotion to the rank of associate clinical professor there should be at least two formal peer evaluations; for promotion to clinical professor, there should again be at least two peer evaluations with at least one conducted since last promotion.

Outside of mandatory peer assessments, teaching effectiveness is monitored on an on-going basis through department chair review of syllabi and department and program chair review of the SSLE and other relevant teaching data. For any faculty member, peer assessment can take place more frequently than stated above if the department chair and one or more program chairs decide that an assessment is warranted.

2 Components of Review

Faculty members in the college strive for excellence in teaching effectiveness. Assessment of instructional effectiveness is important to continuing excellence. The college peer assessment of teaching effectiveness consists of the review of course content and delivery.

Review of Course Content: The objective of reviewing course content is to assess the quality and appropriateness of course materials. Included is assessment of whether materials are up-to-date, course coverage is appropriate, and student assessment is appropriate.

Review of course content is a department responsibility and is accomplished in accordance with procedures set forth by each department as detailed in its patterns of administration. The assessment is accomplished by the department chair and/or by a faculty committee, depending on department policy.

In the case of peer assessment occurring in the context of promotion and/or tenure decisions, assessment also includes review of new course design efforts, review of activities to improve teaching effectiveness, and all other items referred to in the college APT document as related to evidence of accomplishment in teaching.

Each department chair annually reports to the dean's office on the department's efforts and accomplishments regarding review of course content according to the aspects listed above and in the context of the department's review schedule.

Review of Course Delivery: The objective of course delivery review is to assess the quality of course delivery, including the manner in which course material is conveyed, the degree of faculty-student interaction, the use of appropriate technology and other relevant dimensions. This includes assessing course delivery for clear and effective presentation of course concepts and materials and for effective and productive interactions with students through classroom discussion.

Classroom Observation Procedures: The faculty member being visited provides the department chair, prior to the first week of the semester, with a list of five appropriate class sessions (not to include examinations or other times where the involvement of the faculty member being observed is minimal). The department chair identifies the class session(s) observers will attend, sharing that information with the faculty member at least one week prior to the actual visit. The department chair selects up to two faculty members to constitute a visitation team. The faculty member under review is informed of the composition of the team before it is finalized and has the right to request one change in the membership of the team before the formal assignment is made. Assigned faculty members may or may not visit the same class session but will visit a session from the list provided by the faculty member under review and with at least one week advanced notice to the faculty member. Whenever the assessment is related to a formal promotion and/or tenure review, members of the team must be of higher academic rank than the individual being reviewed.

In visiting class, observers sit in the rear of the classroom. An observer, if he or she deems it appropriate, can inform the students of their presence at the beginning of the class, stating “Consistent with the Fisher College of Business efforts to consistently improve instructional delivery, faculty regularly sit in on classes of all professors. I am/We are here to observe Professor X.” Alternatively, the faculty member being visited may introduce the observer as he or she sees fit.

The record of classroom observation includes: a list of general facts; an assessment of the instructor’s level of organization, command of material, clarity of presentation, and nature and quality of interaction with the students; and a description of any deployment of instructional technology and its impact on the engagement of students.

In the case of classroom observation related to promotion and/or tenure reviews, the report of the assessment team is included in the documentation of the promotion and tenure case.

A classroom observation report is submitted to the department chair. Whether each observer (when there are two) files a separate report or whether a collaborative single report is filed is determined by department level policy. The department chair provides copies to the faculty member reviewed and to the college’s Office of Faculty Affairs. The faculty member has the right to file a response or reaction to the assessment report.

3 Responsibilities

Department Chairs: It is the responsibility of the department chair to:

- Establish and maintain a schedule of mandatory peer assessments consistent with the timing articulated in this policy, to modify the schedule as changes in faculty composition occur, and to assure that an up-to-date copy of the schedule is on file with the dean or dean designee.
- Ensure that review of course content and review of course delivery within the department occurs as outlined in this policy and that all necessary reports are completed and distributed, as described, to faculty and to the dean's office. Reports consist of the visitation reports completed by faculty colleagues (given to the faculty member under review and to the appropriate associate dean for program) and the annual report to the dean on departmental activities consistent with the policy's requirements for review of course content.
- Ensure that departmental policies and procedures pertaining to the peer assessment of instructional effectiveness are included in the department's patterns of administration.
- Use the peer assessment process to provide constructive feedback to individual faculty members thereby fostering instructional development of all faculty members. Although part-time and visiting faculty are not subject to formal review under this document, department chairs are responsible for providing support and oversight to assure an acceptable level of instructional effectiveness in courses taught by this faculty.

Program Administrators: Program chairs and deans with program titles all share responsibility with department chairs for instructional effectiveness. As such, they work to address a variety of issues (i.e., instructional quality, cross course coordination, deployment of instructional resources) with department chairs through regular review of course content and course delivery.

It is the responsibility of the associate dean(s) for programs to work with department chairs to ensure that all reporting requirements mandated under this policy are met and that peer assessment activities in the college are focused on maintaining high standards and improving individual performance within a collegial environment.

To support continued faculty dialogue on teaching and instructional effectiveness, the associate dean(s) for programs, working with department and program chairs, will organize teaching related events/activities (e.g., faculty discussions, presentations on innovations, book discussions) as appropriate.

X AFFIRMATION BY FISHER COLLEGE AFFILIATED TIUs

University rules state that "each tenure initiating unit is responsible for establishing criteria for appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure" and that "each tenure initiating unit shall have an appointments, promotion, and tenure document" ([Faculty Rule 3335-6-02](#)). Through TIU-based voting, the five TIUs affiliated with the Fisher College of Business agree that this document will constitute the APT document under which each TIU will operate until otherwise decided. The TIUs of the Fisher College of Business voted to support the adoption of this document as their APT document on the dates indicated below.

Department of Accounting and MIS: 10/29/2025.

Department of Finance: 10/29/2025.

Department of Management and Human Resources: 10/29/2025.

Department of Marketing and Logistics: 10/29/2025.

Department of Operations and Business Analytics: 10/29/2025.

Fisher College of Business (Interim) Dean: 10/29/2025.

APPENDIX A

Dossier Elements and Requirements

While this Appendix summarizes key dossier elements, candidates must adhere to the Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#).

- A-1** Summary of Dossier Requirements for Fourth-Year Reviews
- A-2** Summary of Dossier Requirements for Promotion & Tenure Review
- A-3** Summary of Dossier Requirements for Promotion to Professor
- A-4** Summary of Dossier Requirements for Clinical Faculty Promotions

APPENDIX A-1

SUMMARY OF DOSSIER ELEMENTS – Fourth-Year Reviews

All candidates must use the university's [Interfolio system](#) to submit their dossier regardless of start date. This appendix lists elements that comprise the materials required for Fourth-Year review.

1. A complete and accurate dossier completed in accordance with the Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#).
2. Updated curriculum vitae.
3. A statement of the candidate's area(s) of research and a description of research activities since hire. The candidate's statement should include an assessment of how his or her research activities show progress toward the college standards for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Also ensure that the narrative for research is provided in the dossier.
4. Copies of representative research publications.
5. A statement of the candidate's teaching activities since hire including his or her assessment of how these activities indicate progress toward the college standards for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Also ensure that the narrative for teaching is provided in the dossier.
6. A copy of syllabi for all courses taught by the candidate since hire.
7. Records of the Survey of Student Learning Experience (SSLE) or the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) instrument for each course taught by the candidate since hire. Verbatim student comments are not to be included. Instead, the candidate will include a representative summary of the comments in the dossier. The TIU head will assign the task of preparing such a summary to a faculty member in the department (e.g., the D-POD). The candidate is given the opportunity to review the summary prior to inclusion in the dossier.
8. A brief statement of the candidate's service activities since hire. Also ensure that the narrative for service is provided in the dossier.
9. The college's Office of Faculty Affairs will provide the following items prior to the meeting of the TIU eligible faculty: (i) peer assessment of teaching reports and (ii) all annual performance reviews since the candidate's date of hire, along with comment forms.

As the case proceeds, the college's Office of Faculty Affairs will also add review letters generated at the department and college levels, along with all completed comment forms.

APPENDIX A-2

SUMMARY OF DOSSIER ELEMENTS – Promotion & Tenure Review

All candidates must use the university's [Interfolio system](#) to submit their dossier regardless of start date. This appendix lists elements that comprise the materials required for promotion and tenure.

1. A complete and accurate dossier completed in accordance with the Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#).
2. Updated curriculum vitae.
3. A statement of the candidate's area(s) of research and a description of research activities since hire. The candidate's statement should include an assessment of how his or her research activities meet the college standards for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Also ensure that the narrative for research is provided in the dossier.
4. Copies of representative research publications.
5. A statement of the candidate's teaching activities since hire including his or her assessment of how these activities meet college standards for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Also ensure that the narrative for teaching is provided in the dossier.
6. A copy of syllabi for all courses taught by the candidate since hire.
7. Records of the Survey of Student Learning Experience (SSLE) or the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) instrument for each course taught by the candidate since hire. Verbatim student comments are not to be included. Instead, the candidate will include a representative summary of the comments in the dossier. The TIU head will assign the task of preparing such a summary to a faculty member in the department (e.g., the D-POD). The candidate is given the opportunity to review the summary prior to inclusion in the dossier.
8. A statement of the candidate's service activities since hire that includes an assessment of how his or her service activities meet the college standards for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Also ensure that the narrative for service is provided in the dossier.
9. The college's Office of Faculty Affairs will provide the following items prior to the meeting of the TIU eligible faculty: (i) peer assessment of teaching reports, (ii) all annual performance reviews since the candidate's date of hire, along with comment forms, (iii) the Fourth-Year review letters written by the TIU eligible faculty, TIU chair, CPC, and the dean, along with any comments provided in the process, and (iv) letters received from external reviewers.

As the case proceeds, the college's Office of Faculty Affairs will also add review letters generated at the department and college levels, along with all completed comment forms.

APPENDIX A-3

SUMMARY OF DOSSIER ELEMENTS – Promotion Review

All candidates must use the university's [Interfolio system](#) to submit their dossier regardless of start date. This appendix lists elements that comprise the materials required for tenure-track promotion to professor.

1. A complete and accurate dossier completed in accordance with the Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#).
2. Updated curriculum vitae.
3. A statement of the candidate's area(s) of research and a description of research activities. The candidate's statement should include an assessment of how his or her research activities meet the college standards for promotion to professor. Also ensure that the narrative for research is provided in the dossier.
4. Copies of representative research publications.
5. A statement of the candidate's teaching activities including his or her assessment of how these activities meet the college standards for promotion to professor. Also ensure that the narrative for teaching is provided in the dossier.
6. A copy of syllabi for all courses taught by the candidate over the last five years or since the last promotion, whichever is less.
7. Records of the Survey of Student Learning Experience (SSLE) or the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) instrument for each course taught by the candidate over the last five years or since the last promotion, whichever is less. Verbatim student comments are not to be included. Instead, the candidate will include a representative summary of the comments in the dossier. The TIU head will assign the task of preparing such a summary to a faculty member in the department (e.g., the D-POD). The candidate is given the opportunity to review the summary prior to inclusion in the dossier.
8. A statement of the candidate's service activities that includes an assessment of how his or her service activities meet the college standards for promotion to professor. Also ensure that the narrative for service is provided in the dossier.
9. The college's Office of Faculty Affairs will provide the following items prior to the meeting of the TIU eligible faculty: (i) peer assessment of teaching reports, (ii) annual performance reviews from the last five years, along with comment forms, and (iii) letters received from external reviewers.

As the case proceeds, the college's Office of Faculty Affairs will also add review letters generated at the department and college levels, along with all completed comment forms.

APPENDIX A-4

SUMMARY OF DOSSIER ELEMENTS – Clinical Faculty Promotions

All candidates must use the university's [Interfolio system](#) to submit their dossier regardless of start date. This appendix lists elements that comprise the materials required for clinical faculty promotion.

1. A complete and accurate dossier completed in accordance with the Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#).
2. Updated curriculum vitae.
3. A statement of teaching activities that includes an assessment of how these teaching activities meet the college standards for promotion.
4. A copy of syllabi for all courses taught by over the last five years or since the last promotion, whichever is less.
5. Examples of published books, articles, resource guides, programmatic materials and other teaching materials.
6. Records of the Survey of Student Learning Experience (SSLE) or the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) instrument for each course taught by the candidate over the last five years or since the last promotion, whichever is less. Verbatim student comments are not to be included. Instead, the candidate will include a representative summary of the comments in the dossier. The TIU head will assign the task of preparing such a summary to a faculty member in the department (e.g., the D-POD). The candidate is given the opportunity to review the comments prior to inclusion in the dossier.
7. A statement of service activities that includes an assessment of how these service activities meet the college standards for promotion.
8. The college's Office of Faculty Affairs will provide the following items prior to the meeting of the TIU eligible faculty: (i) peer assessment of teaching reports, (ii) annual performance reviews for the last five years, along with comment forms, and (iii) any letters received from external and internal reviewers.

As the case proceeds, the college's Office of Faculty Affairs will also add review letters generated at the department and college levels, along with all completed comment forms.

APPENDIX B

Responsibilities of the Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) for the Department (D-POD) and the College (C-POD)

APPENDIX B

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PROCEDURES OVERSIGHT DESIGNEE (POD)

The Procedures Oversight Designees (POD) are appointed by the eligible faculty at the department level and by the CPC at the college level. A summary by OAA of the duties of the POD is found [here](#).

Duties of the Department POD (D-POD)

- The eligible faculty of each department selects one of its members as D-POD in the Spring semester prior to discussing all mandatory and non-mandatory Fourth-Year, promotion and tenure, and promotion cases. The D-POD should not be the department chair or the report writer for a case.
- The D-POD must be familiar with the written guidelines on the promotion and tenure process at the department, college, and university levels.
- Prior to the departmental promotion and tenure meeting the D-POD, along with the department chair and the assigned CPC representative, reviews the dossier to ensure that it meets all requirements and is ready for distribution to all eligible faculty. This includes:
 - Assuring that the dossier is prepared correctly using the applicable format, verifying any included SSLE comments, asking the candidate to make any needed changes, and verifying that requested changes have been completed; and
 - Affirming the accuracy of all publications listed in the dossier. If anyone other than the D-POD performs this function it must be noted on the Dossier Checklist.
- The D-POD works with the department chair to address and resolve any conflicts of interest.
- The D-POD assures that proper criteria are applied when candidates are considered for early review or have an approved extension of the tenure clock.
- During the review meeting the D-POD ensures that the proceedings are carried out in a highly professional manner and that the process follows college and university guidelines.
- If the D-POD has concerns about a review, he or she submits a report to the department chair and to the dean (see below for a more detailed outline of steps).
- The D-POD is responsible for recording the votes of the eligible faculty of the department in the Dossier Checklist.

Duties of the College POD (C-POD)

- The CPC selects one of its members to serve as C-POD for each case during the meeting scheduled to review cases. The C-POD should not be the chair of the CPC and should not be the report writer for the case.
- If more than one person is being reviewed at a particular meeting, different CPC members present can be elected as the C-POD for different cases.
- The C-POD must be familiar with the written guidelines on the promotion and tenure process at the departments, college, and university levels.
- The C-POD works with the CPC chair to address and resolve any conflicts of interest.
- If the C-POD has concerns about a review, he or she submits a report to the department chair and to the dean (see below for a more detailed outline of steps).
- The C-POD is responsible for recording the votes of the CPC in the Dossier Checklist.

If the D-POD or the C-POD observe any significant deviations from college or university guidelines or has any concerns about a review, these concerns should first be brought to the attention of the person or review body generating the concerns. For example, if a dossier is not prepared correctly, the POD should ask the candidate who prepared the dossier to make needed changes. If appropriate procedures are not being followed by either faculty or staff, then those individuals should be promptly informed of the problem.

If concerns cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of the POD, then they should be brought to the attention of the relevant administrator (department head, CPC chair, or dean, depending on the level of review). The administrator must look into the matter and respond in writing to the POD regarding either the actions taken or the reasons that action was judged to be unwarranted.

Although a single committee member is assigned oversight responsibility, all members of review bodies must accept personal responsibility for assuring that reviews are procedurally correct, fair, and free of bias for all faculty members. Review bodies, not the POD, are ultimately responsible for the integrity of the review process.

APPENDIX C

Ballots

- C-1** Ballot for Fourth-Year Review – Department
- C-2** Ballot for Fourth-Year Review – CPC
- C-3** Ballot for Promotion to Associate Professor – Department
- C-4** Ballot for Promotion to Associate Professor – CPC
- C-5** Ballot for Promotion to Professor – Department
- C-6** Ballot for Promotion to Professor – CPC
- C-7** Ballot for Reconsidering a Case Should New Information Become Available
- C-8** Ballot for Evaluating Self-Defined Fields of Work

APPENDIX C-1

Ballot for Fourth-Year Review – Department Meeting

Candidate Being Reviewed: _____ Date: _____

As prescribed by the Fisher College of Business appointments, promotion, and tenure document, this ballot presents three options for evaluating Fourth-Year review candidates. Please select one option below that you feel most accurately represents this case, with the sum of votes for the first two options corresponding to a “Yes” vote to reappoint:

_____ *Reappoint – on track*

_____ *Reappoint – with reservations*

_____ *Do not reappoint*

In Fourth-Year reviews it is particularly important to provide the candidate with developmental feedback. Please take the time to provide such feedback in the space below. Likewise, if you have information that you would like to share with the CPC and with the dean with regard to this case, please do so.

Comments

APPENDIX C-2

Ballot for Fourth-Year Review – CPC Meeting

Candidate Being Reviewed: _____ Date: _____

As prescribed by the Fisher College of Business appointments, promotion, and tenure document, this ballot presents three options for evaluating Fourth-Year review candidates. Please select one option below that you feel most accurately represents this case, with the sum of votes for the first two options corresponding to a “Yes” vote to reappoint:

_____ *Reappoint – on track*

_____ *Reappoint – with reservations*

_____ *Do not reappoint*

In Fourth-Year reviews it is particularly important to provide the candidate with developmental feedback. Please take the time to provide such feedback in the space below. Likewise, if you have information that you would like to share with the dean with regard to this case, please do so.

Comments

APPENDIX C-3

Ballot for Promotion to Associate Professor With Tenure – Department Meeting

Candidate Being Reviewed: _____ **Date:** _____

The candidate meets the criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure as articulated in the Fisher College of Business appointments, promotion, and tenure document:

YES _____

NO _____

Comments

Note:

In the case of clinical faculty, the ballot (and criteria) for “associate professor with tenure” is reworded as the ballot (and criteria) for “associate clinical professor.”

APPENDIX C-4

Ballot for Promotion to Associate Professor With Tenure – CPC Meeting

Candidate Being Reviewed: _____ **Date:** _____

The candidate meets the criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure as articulated in the Fisher College of Business appointments, promotion, and tenure document:

YES _____

NO _____

Comments

Note:

In the case of clinical faculty, the ballot (and criteria) for “associate professor with tenure” is reworded as the ballot (and criteria) for “associate clinical professor.”

APPENDIX C-5

Ballot for Promotion to Professor – Department Meeting

Candidate Being Reviewed: _____ **Date:** _____

The candidate meets the criteria for promotion to professor as articulated in the Fisher College of Business appointments, promotion, and tenure document:

YES _____

NO _____

Comments

Note:

In the case of clinical faculty, the ballot (and criteria) for “professor” is re-worded as the ballot (and criteria) for “clinical professor.”

APPENDIX C-6

Ballot for Promotion to Professor – CPC Meeting

Candidate Being Reviewed: _____ **Date:** _____

The candidate meets the criteria for promotion to professor as articulated in the Fisher College of Business appointments, promotion, and tenure document:

YES _____

NO _____

Comments

Note:

In the case of clinical faculty, the ballot (and criteria) for “professor” is re-worded as the ballot (and criteria) for “clinical professor.”

APPENDIX C-7

Department Ballot for Reconsidering a Case Should New Information Become Available

Candidate Being Reviewed: _____ Date: _____

Brief description of new information provided by the candidate:

Choose One:

_____ Yes, the new information about this case might change my previous vote.

_____ No, the new information about this case does not change my previous vote.

Note:

In the event at least one eligible faculty member indicates that his or her vote might change, the faculty will meet to discuss the case with the new information and re-vote.

APPENDIX C-8

Department Ballot for Evaluating Self-Defined Fields of Work

Candidate Being Reviewed: _____ Date: _____

Brief description of self-defined field of work provided by the candidate:

Is this self-defined field of work broad-based, widely recognized, and not a sub-field of one of the thirteen fields currently recognized by the college?

YES _____

NO _____

Note:

The candidate's self-defined field of work is accepted if at least three-fourths of the eligible faculty supports the choice.

APPENDIX D

TIU Peer and Aspirational Peer Institutions

In keeping with the national standing of The Ohio State University, the College's departments will generally obtain evaluations from faculty in programs that are nationally and internationally recognized in their field or subfields. They will follow these principles in identifying external reviewers: the external reviewer will be 1) a distinguished expert in the field, as demonstrated by publications; national and international awards; and prominence in professional organizations; and/or 2) will be nationally or internationally known in the field related to a candidate's scholarship. If a potential evaluator is from an academic institution that is not viewed as at least 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 governmental agency, etc.), the department will submit a brief written justification to the College for approval by the Dean and the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Research. 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.

APPENDIX E

Additional TIU-specific Guidelines

E-1 Department of Finance

APPENDIX E-1

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

This appendix provides additional guidelines to supplement those provided in Section VI, as they pertain to the standard for demonstrating “Potential for Excellence in Research” when evaluating candidates in the Department of Finance who seek to be appointed to or promoted to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure. In providing these guidelines, we reiterate and fully concur with the pervasive theme in the APT that prescribed standards are intended to be guides rather than substitutes for professional judgment.

In particular, this appendix lays out the minimum requirements for a candidate to demonstrate the “Potential for Excellence in Research.” Meeting the Department’s minimum requirements is a necessary, but not sufficient condition for a candidate to qualify for promotion. For example, some candidates who satisfy the minimum requirements may not be recommended for tenure because the impact of their work is deemed insufficient.

Publication Record

- **Minimum Publication Threshold:** A minimum of four publications considered top-tier by the finance department (listed below) is viewed as a necessary but not sufficient condition for the department to recommend tenure. *In particular, the impact of the publications and the nature of the candidate’s contribution in co-authored publications will be assessed.*

For candidates who have spent an entire probationary period in the department, these four journal articles must have been accepted either during the probationary period or during the calendar year of the initial tenure-track appointment (for example, for an appointment beginning on August 15, 2025, acceptances in the January 1, 2025 to August 14, 2025 timeframe count towards the minimum publication threshold). For candidates who have spent only a partial probationary period in the department, these four publications must have been accepted during the five academic years before the candidate is considered for tenure.

An exception to the minimum publication threshold can be made (although in the history of the Department it never has been made) but only in rare and justifiable circumstances, for example, if the candidate has a “home run” publication that has radically transformed the way an important problem is addressed and has been recognized as such. The standard for a “home run” publication would be some type of recognition (such as the AFA Fischer Black Prize) or evidence of impact (such as Web of Science citation counts) that is unquestionably extraordinary for an Assistant Professor

- To satisfy the minimum threshold requirement, an article has to be accepted in one of the following journals:

- Top Finance Journals: *The Journal of Finance*, *The Journal of Financial Economics*, and *Review of Financial Studies*.
 - Top Economics Journals: *American Economic Review*, *Econometrica*, *Journal of Political Economy*, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, and *Review of Economic Studies*.
- Single-Authored Paper: To be considered for tenure, a candidate should have at least one single-authored publication in a high-quality refereed journal in finance or a related field (i.e., economics or accounting).