

1 **Appointments, Promotion, and**
2 **Tenure**
3 **Criteria and Procedures for**
4 **The Ohio State University**
5 **Department of Germanic**
6 **Languages and Literatures**

7 Revised: 4/22/2025

8
9 Revision Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 10/14/2025
10

Table of Contents

I Preamble	4
II Department Mission	4
III Definitions	4
A Committee of the Eligible Faculty	4
1 Tenure-track Faculty	5
2 Teaching Faculty	5
3 Associated Faculty	5
4 Conflict of Interest	6
5 Minimum Composition	7
B Quorum	7
C Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty	7
1 Appointment	7
2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion	7
IV Appointments	8
A Criteria	8
1 Tenure-track Faculty	8
2 Teaching Faculty	9
3 Associated Faculty	10
4 Regional Campus Faculty	11
5 Emeritus Faculty	11
6 Joint Appointments	11
7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	12
B Procedures	12
1 Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus	12
2 Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus	14
3 Transfer from the Tenure Track	14
4 TIU Transfer	14
5 Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	14
6 Regional Campus Faculty	15
7 Joint Appointments	15
8 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	16
V Annual Performance and Merit Review	16
A Documentation	17

1	B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus	17
2	1 Fourth-Year Review	18
3	2 Extension of the Tenure Clock	19
4	C Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus	19
5	D Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus	20
6	E Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	20
7	F Regional Campus Faculty.....	20
8	G Salary Recommendations	21
9	VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	21
10	A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion	21
11	1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	22
12	2 Promotion to Professor	25
13	3 Teaching Faculty	26
14	4 Associated Faculty.....	27
15	5 Regional Campus Faculty.....	27
16	B Procedures.....	27
17	1 Tenure-Track and Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus	27
18	a Candidate Responsibilities.....	27
19	b Committee of the Eligible Faculty Responsibilities	30
20	c Department Chair Responsibilities	31
21	2 Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	33
22	3 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty	33
23	4 External Evaluations.....	33
24	VII Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals.....	35
25	VIII Seventh-Year Reviews	36
26	IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching	36
27	A Student Evaluation of Teaching.....	36
28	B Peer Evaluation of Teaching	36
29	Appendix A.....	39
30	Appendix B.....	43
31	Appendix C.....	44

I Preamble

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

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

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

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

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

II Department Mission

The Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures has as its mission the pursuit of national and international distinction in teaching, research, and public service within the scope of its expertise: the Germanic languages, literatures, and cultures. In striving for this goal, the Department seeks to address three main constituencies, each of which it recognizes as crucial to its mission: undergraduate students, in particular those majoring and minoring in Germanic languages and literatures; graduate students at the master's and doctoral levels; and, through its research and scholarly activities, the broader community of interested students and scholars around the country and the world.

The department embraces and seeks to implement the university's shared values initiative. We are committed to academic freedom, to ensuring responsible research practices, to building diverse and inclusive cultures, to fostering an ethic of care and mutual respect, and to promoting justice.

III Definitions

A Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

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

1 Tenure-track Faculty

Appointment Reviews

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

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

2 Teaching Faculty

Appointment Reviews

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

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

3 Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- After a formal search following the SHIFT Framework, the initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members is decided by the chair based on recommendation from the search committee.
- Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by the eligible faculty (all non-probationary teaching faculty and tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college dean.
- The reappointment of compensated associated faculty is decided by the department chair in consultation with the departmental Executive Committee.

Promotion Reviews

- Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have adjunct titles, tenure-track titles with service at 49% FTE or below, and lecturer titles.

For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Sections III.A.1 or 2 above.

For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with tenure-track titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section III.A.1.

For the promotion review of a lecturer to senior lecturer, the eligible faculty shall be all tenure-track and nonprobationary teaching faculty at the rank of associate professor and professor.

4 Conflict of Interest

Search Committee Conflict of Interest

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

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

Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest

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

- a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor;
- a co-author on more than 50% of the candidate's publications since appointment or last promotion, including pending publications and submissions;
- a collaborator on more than 25% of projects since appointment or last promotion, including current and planned collaborations;

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

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

5 Minimum Composition

In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the department chair, after consulting with the divisional dean or their delegate, will appoint one or more faculty members from another department within the college so that the minimum number of three faculty members can be reached.

B Quorum

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

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

C Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

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

1 Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment TIU or center prior to his/her/their appointment.

2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion,

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal is secured when a simple majority of votes cast are positive.

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

3 4 **IV Appointments**

5 6 **A Criteria**

7
8 The department is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential
9 to enhance the quality of the department. Important considerations include the individual's record to date
10 in teaching, scholarship and service; the potential for professional growth in each of these areas; and the
11 potential for interacting with colleagues and students in a way that will enhance their academic work and
12 attract other outstanding faculty and students to the department. No offer will be extended in the event
13 that the search process does not yield one or more candidates who would enhance the quality of the
14 department. The search is either cancelled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

15
16 The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, teaching, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank,
17 must be based on a formal search process following the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment.

18
19 All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university's system of record for faculty and staff.
20 Formal interviews are required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected
21 for a position must be entered in [Workday](#) to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not
22 selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

23 24 **1 Tenure-track Faculty**

25
26 **Instructor.** Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of
27 assistant professor, but requirements for the terminal degree have not been completed by the candidate at
28 the time of appointment. Procedures for appointment are identical to those for an assistant professor. The
29 department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is
30 limited to three years. Promotion to assistant professor occurs without review the semester following
31 completion of the required credentialing. When an instructor has not completed requirements for
32 promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the third year of appointment, the third year is a
33 terminal year of employment.

34
35 Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent
36 as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair,
37 the dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior
38 service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked once granted except through an
39 approved request to extend the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have
40 the option to be considered for early promotion.

41
42 **Assistant Professor.** Minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of assistant professor include
43 an earned Ph.D. terminal degree or terminal degree in an appropriate field of study, evidence of potential
44 for scholarly productivity and the potential to develop into an internationally recognized scholar,
45 demonstrated potential for high-quality teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, a
46 willingness to provide high-quality service to the department, the college and the profession, and the
47 strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the ranks in a timely manner. Appointment at the
48 rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth
49 year of service. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review,
50 the 7th year will be the final year of employment. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is
51 possible when the Committee of the Eligible Faculty determines such a review to be appropriate. The

granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period.

Associate Professor and Professor. 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 both the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs. Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at the rank of associate professor normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at the rank of associate professor is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

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

External hires at the associate professor or professor level with tenure will demonstrate the same accomplishments in research/creative work, teaching and service as persons promoted within the university and the College of Arts and Sciences. In the College of Arts and Sciences, criteria for appointment offers at the rank of associate professor with tenure or professor include: demonstrated excellence in teaching undergraduate and graduate students, and demonstrated excellence in service/outreach to the profession and field as well as locally to their university. Additionally, appointment offers at the rank of associate professor with tenure require national recognition for a high-quality body of scholarship and strong potential to advance to the rank of professor in a timely fashion. Appointment offers at the rank of professor with tenure must have an established national or international reputation as a leading scholar in their field with an outstanding body of scholarship. For all, the substantial probability that a high rate of quality research/creative work and excellence in teaching and service will continue needs to be established. The claim that promotion of the candidate will improve the overall quality and standing of the unit needs to be supported.

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

2 Teaching Faculty

Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for teaching faculty must be a five-year appointment. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. There is no presumption that subsequent appointments will be offered, regardless of performance. The terms of a contract may be re-negotiated at the time of reappointment. Assistant and associate teaching faculty members in their second and subsequent appointment terms may be reappointed for an additional three, four, or five years at the discretion of the department chair. Teaching professors in their second and subsequent appointment terms may be reappointed for a period of at least three and no more than eight years at the discretion of the department chair. These extended appointments are not probationary, and the individual may only be terminated for cause (see rule [3335-5-04](#) of the Administrative Code) or financial exigency (see rule [3335-5-02.1](#) of the Administrative Code). Tenure is not granted to teaching faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. The terms of a contract may be re-negotiated at the time of reappointment.

GLL supports Teaching Faculty. These appointments exist for faculty members who focus principally on the education needs of students in the department or college. Teaching faculty members are expected to

1 contribute to the department's research and education mission as reflected in undergraduate and graduate
2 program development and teaching. Teaching faculty appointments are made in accordance with Faculty
3 Rule [3335-7](#). Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the
4 department.
5

6 **Teaching Instructor.** Appointment is normally made at the rank of instructor of teaching when the
7 appointee has not completed the requirements for the terminal degree. The department will make every
8 effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to a three-year
9 contract. If the instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant teaching
10 professor by the end of the penultimate year of the contract period, a new contract will not be considered
11 even if performance is otherwise adequate and the position itself will continue.
12

13 **Assistant Teaching Professor.** An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field or a
14 master's degree and five years teaching experience at the tertiary level are the minimum requirements for
15 appointment at the rank of assistant teaching professor. Evidence of ability to teach is highly desirable.
16

17 **Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor.** Appointment at the rank of associate teaching
18 professor or teaching professor requires that the individual have an earned doctorate or other terminal
19 degree in the relevant field or equivalent experience, and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria—
20 in teaching, professional practice and other service—for promotion to the rank (see VI [A][4]).
21 Appointment at the rank of teaching professor requires production and dissemination of scholarly
22 materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice.
23

24 **3 Associated Faculty**

25

26 Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a few weeks to assist with a focused project, a
27 semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-
28 term planning and retention. Associated faculty may be reappointed.
29

30 **Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor.** Adjunct appointments
31 may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give
32 academic service to the department, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees,
33 for which a faculty title is appropriate. The adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for
34 appointment of tenure-track or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct faculty
35 members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of
36 tenure-track or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.
37

38 **Lecturer.** Appointment as lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a Master's degree in a
39 field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught and evidence of ability or potential to provide high-
40 quality instruction. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure, but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they
41 meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer cannot exceed one
42 year. Second and subsequent appointments cannot exceed three years.
43

44 **Senior Lecturer.** Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a
45 doctorate in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide
46 high-quality instruction; or a Master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience with
47 documentation of high quality performance. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The
48 initial appointment for a senior lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts cannot
49 exceed three years,
50

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

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for no more than three consecutive years.

4 Regional Campus Faculty

As the mission of the regional campuses emphasizes undergraduate instruction, regional campus criteria for appointment at the tenure-track ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor are similar to those for Columbus campus faculty, but give relatively greater emphasis at each rank to teaching experience and quality.

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

5 Emeritus Faculty

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

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the department chair (regional campus dean for associated faculty on regional campuses) outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-3) will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair. The department chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule [3335-05-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered. Should the department chair deny the request, the faculty member may appeal the decision to the dean.

6 Joint Appointments

Joint appointments are created to leverage a faculty member's unique expertise to advance the mission areas of the academic units involved and promote cross-disciplinary collaboration. To establish a joint faculty appointment, [a memorandum of understanding \(MOU\)](#) is developed by all affected TIUs, centers, and/or institutes. The MOU will clearly define the distribution of the faculty member's time commitment to the different units. The MOU will also state the sources of compensation directed to the faculty member, distribution of resources, the planned acknowledgement of the academic units in publications,

the manner in which credit for any grant funding will be attributed to the different units, and the distribution of grant funds among the appointing units. Unless other arrangements are specified in the MOU, the TIU in which the faculty member's FTE is greater than 50% will be considered that faculty member's TIU. Joint-appointed faculty may vote on promotion and tenure cases only in their TIU.

7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

B Procedures

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

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

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

1 Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

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

The department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the department. At least one student will also be appointed to the search committee. In some cases in which the position is

interdisciplinary in nature, it is expected that members of the search committee will be drawn from other TIUs as well.

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

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

- “Phase 1 | Search Preparation & Proactive Recruitment” is the earliest stage in the search process. Key steps during this phase include determining faculty needs for the unit, creating a search strategy (including timeline), establishing a budget, and identifying additional partners to include in the process. The steps in this phase provide guidance on forming committees, detail training requirements for search committee members, and innovative approaches to advertising and outreach. This section also includes ideas and resources for developing qualified talent pools to ensure alignment with university and unit EEO goals and advance the eminence of the institution.
- “Phase 2 | Preliminary Review of Applicants” focuses on best practices for the application review and candidate screening processes. The guidelines and resources in this section support consistency, and fairness in the review, assessment, and selection of candidates moving forward in the recruitment process. This section also outlines how to select a list of candidates for on-campus interviews.
- “Phase 3 | Finalists Interviews & Evaluations” provides guidance and tools for conducting interviews and campus visits, requesting reference letters (if not requested earlier in the application stage), and collecting feedback from everyone who interacted with the candidates. Adherence to the guidelines outlined in this section has a direct impact on enhancing the candidate experience and ensuring a consistent evaluation process. This phase concludes with the submission of a letter from the search committee to the TIU chair/director.
- “Phase 4 | Extend Offer” provides guidance and resources related to effectively selecting the most qualified candidate(s) for the position(s) and successfully negotiating to result in an accepted offer.
- “Phase 5 | Preboard and Onboard” offers resources to help prepare and support new faculty as they transition to Ohio State. The suggestions in this phase focus on creating a seamless transition for incoming faculty and their partners/families, if applicable.
- “Phase 6 | Reflect and Assess the Search” is a process supported by OAA to reflect on the hiring cycle each year and evaluate areas that may need improvement and additional support.

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members 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 or 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 College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs.

1 In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the
2 department chair decides, in consultation with the divisional dean, which candidate to approach first. At
3 that time the department chair must discuss the details of the offer, including compensation, with the
4 divisional dean.

5
6 The department will discuss potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent
7 residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status with the Office of International Affairs. An [MOU](#) must
8 be signed by faculty eligible for tenured positions who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent
9 residents, asylees, or refugees.

10 11 **2 Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

12
13 Searches for teaching faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception
14 that the candidate's presentation during the interview will be on teaching practice, rather than scholarship.

15 16 **3 Transfer from the Tenure Track**

17
18 Tenure track faculty may transfer to teaching faculty appointment if appropriate to the individual's
19 circumstances and departmental and college needs, and if funding for the salary has been identified.
20 Tenure or tenure eligibility is lost upon transfer though rank is retained. Such transfers must be approved
21 by the department chair, the Dean, and the Executive Vice President and Provost.

22
23 The request for transfer must be initiated by the faculty member in writing and must state clearly how the
24 individual's career goals and activities have changed.

25
26 Transfers from the teaching faculty to the tenure track are not permitted. Teaching faculty members may
27 apply for tenure track positions and compete in regular national searches for such positions.

28 29 **4 TIU Transfer**

30
31 Faculty requests to move from one TIU to another must be approved by a simple majority of eligible
32 faculty in the receiving TIU, by both TIU heads, the college dean(s), and the Office of Academic Affairs.
33 The eligible faculty in such cases are the tenure-track faculty eligible to vote on faculty appointments at
34 the transferee's rank. See Section III.A.1 above.

35
36 Approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements for the change have been made
37 and requires the establishment of mutually agreed-upon arrangements among the affected TIU heads,
38 college dean(s), and the faculty member. An MOU signed by all parties, including the Office of
39 Academic Affairs, must describe in detail the arrangements of the transfer. Since normally the
40 transferring faculty member will fill an existing vacancy in the receiving unit, the MOU will describe the
41 resources supporting the position, including salary, provided by the receiving unit.

42
43 The College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs can provide guidance to non-
44 tenure-track faculty about the process for transferring from one TIU to another.

45 46 **5 Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

47
48 The appointment of all compensated associated faculty follows a formal search following the [SHIFT](#)
49 Framework, which includes a job posting in [Workday](#) (see Section IV.B above) and candidate interviews.
50 The appointment is then decided by the department chair based on recommendation from the search

committee. The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair in consultation with the department Executive Committee.

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

Compensated associated appointments may be made for a period of up to three years, unless a shorter period is appropriate to the circumstances. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three consecutive years.

Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are usually made on a semester by semester or annual 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.

6 Regional Campus Faculty

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

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

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, the divisional dean or their designee, department chair, and either the regional campus search committee or a broader representation of the regional and Columbus faculties. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. A hiring decision requires agreement by the department chair and regional campus dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the department chair and the regional campus dean.

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

Associated faculty are appointed by the regional campus dean based on recommendation from the search committee and in consultation with the department chair.

7 Joint Appointments

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

Approval of the joint appointment by the 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.

8 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

V Annual Performance and Merit Review

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

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

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

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

Depending on a faculty member's appointment type, the annual performance and merit review is based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. The review of faculty with budgeted joint appointments must include input from the joint appointment TIU head for every annual evaluation cycle. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on goals specific to the individual in the joint unit. Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. Annual performance and merit reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting as well as a written assessment.

It must be recognized that in the Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures some faculty members are primarily engaged in language instruction, others in the teaching of literature, culture, linguistics, civilization, or film. The nature of teaching, and particularly, of research and service will thus vary. Care, reasonable flexibility, and attention to the standards and conventions of these disciplines or

1 sub-disciplines must be exercised in evaluating candidates with varied commitments and responsibilities.
2 In all cases, meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with
3 the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.
4

5 The department chair is required (per Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#)) to include a reminder in the annual review
6 letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#)) to view their primary personnel file and
7 to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.
8

9 Annual review letters should not merely be descriptive summaries of activities but should evaluate
10 performance in relation to the unit's mission and the faculty member's assigned workload and
11 previously articulated goals and expectations for year. The annual review should also describe, when
12 appropriate, actions the unit or its head will undertake to support the faculty member in achieving goals.
13 When relevant, annual review letters should recognize engagement with partners beyond the university,
14 which may take the form of research/creative work, teaching, or service. Annual review letters may also
15 comment upon/or recognize ways in which individual faculty members exemplify and reinforce the
16 university's shared values, including creating unit cultures that are inclusive, supportive, and
17 characterized by civility and mutual respect. The full range of activities assigned to a faculty member
18 should be formally recognized and, when done well, rewarded.
19

20 **A. Documentation**

21
22 For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to
23 the department chair no later than January 31:
24

- 25 • Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#) (*required for probationary faculty and recommended for*
26 *associate professors*) or updated Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures Annual Faculty
27 Report (*non-probationary faculty; see Appendix A*)
- 28 • updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)
29

30 Other documentation for the annual performance and merit review will be the same as that for
31 consideration for promotion and/or tenure. That documentation is described in Section VI of this
32 document.
33

34 Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the annual
35 performance and merit review, as such solicitation places its recipient in an awkward position and
36 produces a result that is unlikely to be candid.
37

38 **B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

39
40 During the Spring Semester of each year the Committee of the Eligible Faculty will conduct a review of
41 each probationary faculty member. This annual review will encompass the candidate's performance in
42 teaching, scholarship, and service, as well as evidence of continuing development. External evaluations
43 of the faculty member's work, required for tenure and promotion reviews, may be obtained for any annual
44 review if judged appropriate by the Committee or the Chair of the Department. This may occur when the
45 candidate's scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel
46 otherwise capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input. If the candidate is affiliated with a
47 center in the College or the University, the Department Chair should ask the center's director (or his/her
48 representative) to provide a written evaluation of the candidate's contribution to the mission of the center.
49

1 The Chair of the Department or the Chair of the Committee will inform probationary faculty members, at
2 the initial appointment and each year thereafter, when the annual review will take place and provide a
3 copy of the Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#) to be completed by the faculty member in
4 reporting accomplishments to date. In accordance with the outline, candidates will then provide
5 appropriate professional materials for review to the Chair, who will make them available to the
6 Committee. The Committee may also seek such additional information as necessary and consult with
7 colleagues as necessary for a fair and thorough review.

8
9 Annual reviews should be both constructive and candid. Accordingly, the Department commits itself to
10 using the review process as a means to be supportive and helpful to probationary tenure-track faculty as
11 well as to communicate, candidly and clearly, aspects of performance that need improvement if the
12 candidate is to make acceptable progress.

13
14 Following each annual review, the Chair of the Committee will summarize the Committee's deliberations
15 and, after due consultation with the Committee, send the summary to the Chair of the Department. The
16 candidate must be given a copy. Once the Department Chair and the candidate have had a chance to
17 study the memorandum, they will meet jointly with the Chair of the Committee. Sometime after this
18 meeting the Department Chair will provide the candidate and the divisional dean with a formal written
19 assessment of the faculty member's performance and professional development. The Chair's letter,
20 drawing on both the Committee's and his or her own judgment, will address the candidate's strengths and
21 weaknesses, as appropriate, and indicate the Chair's recommendation about the faculty member's
22 reappointment for another year. It will also remind the faculty member of the right to inspect his or her
23 personnel file, as indicated in Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#). Should the Committee's judgment differ from that
24 of the Department Chair, the Chair's letter must explain the reason(s) for the differing assessments. The
25 Chair's annual review letter and the Committee Chair's summary will become part of a faculty member's
26 dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion
27 and tenure. Candidates may respond to the Chair's letter in writing and the Chair may respond in writing
28 if warranted. The annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure
29 along with any written comments, if provided.

30
31 If the department chair recommends renewal of the probationary appointment, this recommendation is
32 final. If the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process, per Faculty Rule
33 [3335-6-03](#) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded
34 to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the
35 probationary appointment.

36 37 **1 Fourth-Year Review**

38
39 During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the
40 mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluations are optional and the Dean of the
41 College or their delegate (not the Department Chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or
42 nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

43
44 External evaluations are only solicited when either the Department Chair or the eligible faculty determine
45 that they are necessary to conduct the Fourth-Year Review. This may occur when the candidate's
46 scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise
47 capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input.

48
49 The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty
50 votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment.
51

1 The eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department
2 chair. The department chair conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written
3 evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the
4 conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)) is
5 followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the department chair
6 recommends renewal or nonrenewal. Renewal of the appointment of a probationary faculty member for
7 the fifth year requires the approval of the divisional dean. If either the department chair or the dean
8 recommends nonrenewal of a faculty member's probationary contract, the case will be referred to the
9 college's Promotion and Tenure Committee, which will review the case, vote and make a
10 recommendation to the dean. The dean, in consultation with the divisional dean, makes the final decision
11 regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.
12

13 **2 Extension of the Tenure Clock**

14
15 Faculty Rule [3335-6-03 \(D\)](#) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure-track faculty
16 member may extend the probationary period. Faculty Rule [3335-6-03 \(E\)](#) does likewise for reducing the
17 probationary period. A faculty member remains on duty regardless of extensions or reductions to the
18 probationary period, and annual reviews are conducted in every probationary year regardless of time
19 extended or reduced. Approved extensions or reductions do not limit the department's right to
20 recommend nonrenewal of an appointment during an annual review.
21

22 **C Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

23
24 Associate Professors are reviewed annually by the professors in the department who comment on the
25 faculty member's performance in relation to individual and department goals and on progress toward
26 promotion. The Department Chair conducts an independent assessment and meets with the faculty
27 member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals and any relevant adjustments to
28 workload, and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written
29 comments on the review and the Department Chair may respond in writing.
30

31 Professors are also reviewed annually by the department chair who meets with the faculty member to
32 discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals. The annual review of professors is based on
33 their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge
34 relevant to the mission of the tenure initiating unit, as demonstrated by national and international
35 recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate
36 education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the
37 college, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of
38 assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, in
39 civil and collegial interaction with colleagues, staff, and students, and in the recruitment and retention
40 of junior colleagues. As the highest-ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic
41 leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty.
42

43 If an associate professor or professor has an administrative role, the impact of that role and other
44 assignments will be considered in the annual review.
45

46 The department chair offers, and may require, a meeting with the faculty member to discuss their
47 performance and their future plans and goals, and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The
48 faculty member may provide written comments on the review and the department chair may respond in
49 writing.
50

D Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

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

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review proceeds in the same manner as the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure track faculty. There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

E Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The department chair, or designee, will meet with the faculty member to discuss his, her, or their performance, future plans, and goals and will add a letter of evaluation to each associated faculty member's file based on:

- SEIs & SRTs for the previous calendar year and a cumulative report of SEIs;
- A brief (1-2 page) self-evaluation by the faculty member of classes from which SEIs and SRTs are drawn, as well as of other contributions to the department and profession;
- A peer evaluation of teaching;
- The conversation with the faculty member regarding her, his or their performance, future plans, and goals.

The department chair's decision on renewal of the appointment is final. If the decision is to renew, the department chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

Compensated associated faculty members beyond their initial appointment year or on a multiple-year appointment are reviewed annually by the department chair, or designee. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation based on the procedure outlined in the previous paragraph with the exception that the peer evaluation of teaching need only be repeated bi-annually. Requests from associated faculty members for more frequent observations will be honored. No later than October 15 of the final year of the appointment, the chair will decide whether or not to reappoint. The department chair's decision on reappointment is final.

F Regional Campus Faculty

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

1
2 For probationary tenure-track faculty, in the event that the regional campus Dean/Director recommends
3 renewal and the Department Chair recommends nonrenewal, the case shall be reviewed by the Dean of
4 the College or their delegate. The disagreement shall be considered during that review, with the Dean of
5 the College or their delegate's judgment prevailing. If the Dean of the College or their delegate
6 recommends nonrenewal and the Department Chair recommends renewal, the Dean of the College or
7 their delegate's judgment shall prevail.
8

9 Regional campus teaching faculty are reviewed according to the process established on that campus, with
10 the review focusing on teaching and service. The regional campus dean will provide the department chair
11 a copy of a teaching faculty member's annual performance and merit review letter.
12

13 Regional campus associated faculty are reviewed according to the process established on that campus,
14 with the review focusing on teaching and service, as applicable.
15

16 **G Salary Recommendations** 17

18 The Department Chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the
19 divisional dean, who may modify these recommendations. Meritorious performance in research/creative
20 work, teaching, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for
21 promotion decisions. The time frame for assessing performance will be the past 36 months, with
22 attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity. Faculty with high quality performance in all
23 three areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored.
24 Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal
25 or no salary increases.
26

27 In formulating recommendations, the department chair consults with the department Executive
28 Committee. Salary increases are formulated in dollar amounts rather than percentage increases, with the
29 goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries. As a
30 general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the department chair divides faculty into at
31 least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) and considers
32 market and internal equity issues as appropriate. The Department Chair should proactively engage in an
33 annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department
34 and across the field or fields represented in it.
35

36 Faculty members who wish to discuss dissatisfaction with their salary increase with the department chair
37 should be prepared to explain how their salary (rather than the increase) is inappropriately low, since
38 increases are solely a means to the end of an optimal distribution of salaries.
39

40 Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation (see Section V-A above) for an annual
41 performance and merit review at the required time will receive no salary increase in the year for which
42 documentation was not provided, except in extenuating circumstances, and may not expect to recoup the
43 foregone raise at a later time. (See also updated Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures
44 Annual Faculty Report in Appendix A.)
45

46 **VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews** 47

48 **A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion** 49

50 Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

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

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

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

This department is committed to assessing the practice of these values and principles as part of all performance evaluations. Except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increase, all funds for annual salary increases will be directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and the active promotion of an enriching working and learning environment through collegiality, civility, and openness to diverse ideas and opinions.

1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

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

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

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

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

Consistent with these guidelines, promotion to associate professor with tenure in the College of Arts and Sciences requires excellence in both research/creative work and teaching. Evidence of service to the unit and the promise of excellence in service beyond the unit are desirable. Excellence in

research/creative work means attainment of measurable national or international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of high-quality published research and/or other relevant creative endeavors. A successful candidate will have an emerging national reputation as a scholar or creative artist. Excellence in teaching means the provision to all students of the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning and, to the most capable and motivated students, an enhanced learning experience. Excellence in service means the provision of a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more publics – including the university, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations. The substantial probability that a high rate of quality research/creative work and excellence in teaching and service will continue needs to be established. The claim that awarding tenure to the candidate will improve the overall quality and standing of the unit needs to be supported.

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

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

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

TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met (include but not limited to)
Demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge;	• New or updated syllabi that demonstrate content, assignments, and activities in line with learning outcomes and department's instructional mission; • Student evaluation of instruction reports and independent summary of student comments (SRTs and SEIs); • Peer evaluations of teaching; • A statement on teaching that summarizes candidate's teaching approach, effectiveness, and impact on student learning • Continuing education or research on topic or focus area and adopted new materials in class; • Information about curriculum development and specific outcomes
Developed new and effective modes of instructional techniques and materials appropriate for the learning objectives and level of courses taught;	
Engaged students actively in the learning process and encourages independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process;	
Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm;	
Served as advisor and mentored students	

Provision to all students of the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning and, to the most capable and motivated students, an enhanced learning experience.	• Information about teaching endorsements and other activities with the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning or at a professional conference; • List of supervised thesis and dissertations, and other evidence of student advising and positive outcome at the undergraduate and graduate level
--	--

SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarship is central to the mission of the Department: it leads to better teaching, to innovation in the continuing review of the curriculum, and to the professional growth of the faculty. Accordingly, any departmental recommendations for the promotion of a candidate to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure must be based on convincing evidence that the candidate has achieved excellence and recognition in this area, as is appropriate to faculty at a major research institution; that the candidate has taken an active role in the community of scholars by publications, regular conference participation, and other professional activities; and that the candidate can be expected to continue to develop a program of high-quality scholarship relevant to the mission of the Department.

In evaluating scholarly and creative work, the kind, scope, and quality of each publication will be considered.

SCHOLARSHIP	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met (include but not limited to)
Demonstrated thematically focused scholarship outcomes based on original research that contributes to knowledge in area of expertise and relevant field(s) of inquiry Completed comprehensive works in English or other languages, published in high-quality and peer-reviewed venues, presented at professional scholarly organizations nationally and/or internationally Emerging national reputation as a scholar	<u>Candidates in literature and cultural studies and related fields:</u> • Book or book manuscript • Evidence of scholarly productivity in the form of refereed journal articles and/or book chapters and conference papers • Scholarly translations that explicate the historical, aesthetic, cultural, and/or social importance of the original work • Papers presented at national and international professional conferences • Invited lectures or readings • Digital work (e.g., artwork, moving images, multimedia, performances, recitals, websites, etc.) that includes scholarly contribution and impact • Research statement that demonstrates a research program and continuing growth and contribution to knowledge in the focus area and related/other disciplines • Applied to and/or receiving internal or external grants

	Candidates in Linguistics Language Pedagogy: • A body of publications in peer-reviewed journals, editions of texts and accomplishment comparable to the publication of a book in other fields that contribute to knowledge/outcomes in the focus area and related fields • Publication of textbooks, books on pedagogy, articles in peer-reviewed journals, chapters in refereed edited volumes, instructional software, online teaching resources that incorporate or present theoretical ideas or advances in methods of teaching may be judged to be equivalent to monographic works • Papers presented at national and international professional conferences • Invited lectures or readings • Digital work that includes scholarly contribution and impact • Research statement that demonstrates a research program and continuing growth and contribution to knowledge in the focus area and related/other disciplines • Applied to and/or receiving internal or external grants
--	---

The service contribution during the probationary period of assistant professors is limited by design. The most important judgment is that the candidate will achieve excellence in service in the future.

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met (include but not limited to)
Demonstrated excellence in service to the department Demonstrated service to the college and university at any level Demonstrated contribution to the profession	• Recognition for service to the department, and/or college, and/or university • Annual evaluations document excellent service to the department • Served effectively on college or university committees, faculty senate, or collaborating on college and university-wide service initiatives • Involvement with professional organizations, journals (journal editorships, reviewer), and/or professional societies (offices or committees) • Effective service to local and regional community partners • Demonstrated efforts in community-engagement

2 Promotion to Professor

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

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

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

The Department also recognizes that a career may consist of various phases in which a concentration on scholarly activity, teaching, or administrative/professional service creates a composite professional life. Promotion to professor typically requires excellence in scholarship. Where a candidate has made truly extraordinary contributions in the areas of teaching or service, that record may warrant promotion in combination with a less extensive, though excellent record of continued productivity in scholarship.

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

3 Teaching Faculty

a) Promotion to assistant teaching professor requires that a faculty member has completed their doctoral or other terminal degree in the relevant field or have a master's degree along with five years of experience teaching at the tertiary level and be performing satisfactorily in teaching, and service. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

b) Promotion to associate teaching professor requires that a faculty member hold a doctoral or other terminal degree in the relevant field or a master's degree along with five years of experience in teaching at the tertiary level; and display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of the department of GLL. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to associate teaching professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

c) Promotion to teaching professor requires that a faculty member hold a doctoral degree or other terminal degree in the relevant field or a master's degree along with five years of experience in teaching at the tertiary level, have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching and/or practicum supervision and professional practice; leadership in service to GLL and to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

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 teaching 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.

5 Regional Campus Faculty

The primary function of the regional campuses is to provide high-quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic and other needs of their communities. With this consideration in mind, in evaluating regional campus faculty for promotion and tenure or promotion, the department will give greater emphasis to the quality of teaching and service relative to scholarship. Recognizing that the character and quantity of scholarship by regional campus faculty may differ from that of Columbus campus faculty, due to the weight of other responsibilities and lack of access to comparable resources, the department nevertheless expects regional campus tenure-track faculty to establish a program of high-quality scholarly activity.

In evaluating regional campus teaching faculty for promotion, the department will use the same criteria as described above for the promotion of teaching faculty. Regional campus associated faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean. The decision of the regional campus dean is final.

B Procedures

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

1 Tenure-Track and Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus

a Candidate Responsibilities

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

- **Dossier**

Every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#). Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs [Candidate](#)

[Checklist](#) without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist.

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

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

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

1 Teaching

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

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

2 Scholarship

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

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

3 Service

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

- service activities as listed in the core dossier including
 - involvement with professional journals and professional societies
 - consultation activity with industry, education, or government
 - clinical services
 - administrative service to department
 - administrative service to college
 - administrative service to university and Student Life
 - advising to student groups and organizations
 - awards and prizes for service to profession, university, or department
- any available documentation (e.g. letters from committee chairs) of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier
- **Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document**

Candidates must indicate the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. A candidate may be reviewed using the department's current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion (or last reappointment in the case of teaching faculty), whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, for tenure-track

1 faculty the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more
2 recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year.
3

4 If a candidate wishes to be reviewed under an APT other than the current approved version available
5 [here](#), a copy of the APT document under which the candidate has elected to be reviewed must be
6 submitted when the dossier is submitted to the department.
7

8 • **External Evaluations** (see also External Evaluations below)
9

10 If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential
11 external evaluators developed by the department chair and the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. The
12 candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate
13 may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The
14 department chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
15

16 **b Committee of the Eligible Faculty Responsibilities**
17

18 The responsibilities of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty are as follows:
19

- 20 • To review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
21
- 22 • To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-
23 mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such
24 a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review
25 requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request
26 must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
27
 - 28 ○ The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty
29 member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for
30 a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required
31 documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory
32 review.
33
 - 34 ○ A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule
35 [3335-6-04A\(3\)](#) only once. Faculty Rule [3335-7-08](#) makes the same provision for non-
36 probationary teaching faculty. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation
37 and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite
38 incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is
39 unlikely to be successful.
40
 - 41 ○ A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the
42 eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a
43 positive recommendation during the review itself.
44
- 45 • Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the
46 promotion and tenure review process as described below.
47
 - 48 ○ **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will
49 serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be

the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described [here](#).

- **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section VI.B.4 below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.
 - **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
 - Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
 - Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.
 - Consider the interdisciplinary work of a candidate across multiple units as part of the whole work, especially if the candidate has a joint appointment in another unit.
 - Revise the draft analysis of each case following the faculty meeting, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting. The revised document must specify each of the unit's criteria in teaching, scholarship and service, summarize the faculty perspectives on whether the candidate has met each criterion, and include the sources of evidence in the dossier on which these perspectives. The completed written evaluation and recommendation is forwarded to the department chair.
 - Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
 - Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure-initiating unit is another department. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.
- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
 - To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.

c Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To charge each member of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty 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. For tenure-track assistant professors, the department chair will confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an [MOU](#) at the time of promotion with tenure.
- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the chair and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this department. The department chair will seek a letter of evaluation from the TIU head of the joint appointment unit, as well as from the director of any interdisciplinary center or institute in which the candidate plays an active role. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.
- To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To explain via email or letter to the eligible faculty any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate via email or in writing after completion of the department review process:
 - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair
 - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair

- of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.

- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline.
- To receive the Committee of the Eligible Faculty's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the department chair of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

2 Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

3 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

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

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

Regional campus teaching faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean. Following the review, the dean consults with the department chair. A request to promote follows the same procedures as tenure-track faculty except that external letters are not needed unless scholarship is a component of the assigned role.

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

4 External Evaluations

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track faculty promotion and tenure or promotion reviews and all teaching faculty promotion reviews to the level of Teaching Professor. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor or for associated faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of

scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations in these cases will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.

A conflict of interest for external reviewers exists if the reviewer is or has been to the candidate: a) a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor; b) a research collaborator, which includes someone who has been a coauthor on a publication within the past 3 years, including pending publications and submissions; c) a collaborator on a project within the past 3 years, including current and planned collaborations; d) in a consulting/financial arrangement with the candidate within the past 3 years, including receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services); e) a relative or close personal friend; or f) in any relationship, personal or professional, that could reduce the reviewer's objectivity. Also excluded are reviewers from the same institution, or those who had previous employment in the same institution within the past 12 months, or those who are being considered for employment at that institution.

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

- Is written by a recognized expert in a field relevant to the candidate's areas of expertise. In keeping with college and university guidelines, the department will generally obtain evaluations from faculty at R01 institutions, which include members of the [Association of American Universities \(AAU\)](#) and the [Big Ten Academic Alliance \(BTAA\)](#). The department further defines peer or near-peer institutions to include the institutions listed in Appendix B. Justification will be provided in each case in which a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists. Peer reviewers from other institutions, including universities outside of North America and liberal arts colleges, may be suggested in cases where the external reviewer is a distinguished expert in the field or in a field outside of German, Scandinavian, and Yiddish studies related to a candidate's interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary projects, as indicated by publications; national and international awards.
- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate, or someone who has collaborated extensively with the candidate or is currently collaborating with the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This TIU will solicit evaluations from professors with institutional affiliations predominately in the programs listed above. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

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

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the department chair, and the candidate. All potential evaluators must be approved by the College of Arts and Sciences through the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. No written justification is required for

tenured professors at peer or near peer institutions as defined above. If the potential evaluator is from an academic institution that is not clearly a peer or aspirational peer for Ohio State, or if the potential evaluator is from a nonacademic institution (e.g., a public policy think tank, a private art academy or music conservatory, a museum, a biomedical company, or a governmental agency), a brief written justification is required. The department's justification should be based on the prestige of the institution, the credentials and experience of the evaluator, and/or the specific relevance of the evaluator's expertise to the candidate's activities. International evaluators from strong institutions are allowed. The research credentials of the evaluators should generally mirror those of a professor at the professor rank at Ohio State. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors. The department should provide justification if more than a minority of the evaluations are from associate professors (e.g., candidate's work is in a small or new field for which more senior people are not available, evaluators have gained prominence as national or international experts in the field). For reviews of associate professors, all evaluators must be professors (or equivalent). Emeritus professors are acceptable as long as they are active researchers.

If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that none of the person(s) suggested by the candidate agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

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

Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit external evaluations or initiate contact in any way with external evaluators for any purpose related to the promotion review. If an external evaluator should initiate contact with the candidate regarding the review, the candidate must inform the evaluator that such communication is inappropriate and report the occurrence to the department chair, who will decide what, if any, action is warranted (requesting permission from the Office of Academic Affairs to exclude that letter from the dossier). It is in the candidate's self-interest to assure that there is no ethical or procedural lapse, or the appearance of such a lapse, in the course of the review process.

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

VII Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals

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

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

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

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

VIII Seventh-Year Reviews

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

IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

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

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

In no case should the evaluation of teaching rely exclusively on quantitative instruments (such as the SEI), which have been shown to be unreliable indicators of overall performance in the classroom.

Evaluation of teaching should also be contextual, taking into account the particular challenges of teaching different kinds of material to different kinds of audiences, and situating each year's performance in relation to previous years and to goals set by the department.

A Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) and the Student Reports on Teaching (SRT) is required in every course offered in this department. Faculty members should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if s/he is going to provide in-class time for students to complete the evaluation using a mobile application. The faculty member must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation. The faculty member should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and to provide feedback that can be taken into account in future teaching.

SEI scores are primarily an indicator of student satisfaction and may not be used as the sole evidence for teaching effectiveness. In units in which one-on-one instruction or other small formats make use of the SEI impractical, care should be taken to develop alternative means of assessing the effectiveness of that pedagogy. Units may not rely on anecdotal evidence of proficiency.

B Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Peer evaluation of teaching is required for all faculty members in the College of Arts and Sciences. Peer evaluation should fulfill two basic goals: 1) provide constructive feedback to faculty on both the content and the quality of their instruction, and 2) help faculty to continually improve the overall effectiveness of their teaching at all levels. The Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the tenured faculty in order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the department. Although

1 there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member
2 being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible.

3
4 The responsibilities of the Committee with regard to peer evaluation of teaching are as follows:

- 5
6 • to review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and probationary teaching faculty, and all
7 associated faculty with multiple year appointments at least once per year during the probationary
8 period, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty
9 member is assigned. When assistant professors are reviewed for tenure and promotion, they are
10 required to have a minimum of five peer evaluations of teaching from the probationary period.
11 When probationary teaching faculty are reviewed for reappointment or promotion, they are
12 required to have a minimum of four peer evaluations of teaching from the probationary period.
13 No more than two evaluations should be prepared by the same colleague
14
- 15 • to review the teaching of tenured associate professors and non-probationary associate teaching
16 professors at least once per year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction
17 to which the faculty member is assigned over a three year period. When associate professors are
18 reviewed for promotion to professor, they will be required to have a minimum of two peer
19 evaluations of teaching. Reviews should follow the format described above for probationary
20 faculty.
21
- 22 • to review the teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary teaching professors at least
23 once every four years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which
24 the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review
25
- 26 • To review, upon the department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently
27 scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student
28 evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.
29
- 30 • To review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that
31 individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the
32 faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review
33 took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty
34 seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the [Drake Institute for Teaching and](#)
35 [Learning](#).
36

37 Reviews conducted upon the request of the department chair or the faculty member focus on the specific
38 aspects of instruction requested by the chair or faculty member and may or may not include class
39 visitations
40

41 Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations (the first three situations listed above) are comprehensive
42 and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instruction
43 materials. Faculty under review should provide peer reviewers with the course syllabus and other
44 materials well in advance of the classroom visit or visits. They should also provide reviewers with a list of
45 preferred visitation dates. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, the
46 class visitation is conducted by one or more senior peers whom the promotion and tenure chair has
47 identified in consultation with the candidate. The peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to
48 establish a time for the visit and to understand the goals of the course, the candidate's teaching
49 philosophy, and any challenges related to instruction (including feedback from previous evaluations of

1 teaching). If possible, the peer reviewer should attend two different class sessions over the course of the
2 semester.

3
4 In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should focus on
5 such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality
6 and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the
7 approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the class visits, the reviewer
8 meets with the candidate to give feedback and also submits a written report to the department chair,
9 copied to the candidate by the end of the semester of review. Written reports of peer evaluation of
10 teaching should focus not only on classroom performance but also on curricular choices, implicit and
11 explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and engagement with current
12 disciplinary knowledge. For probationary faculty, the reports are included in the candidate's promotion
13 and tenure dossier. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may
14 respond if desired. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier. Comments
15 are also included, unless the faculty member requests that the comments be excluded.

16 17 **Faculty Mentorship Program**

18
19 Overall, the GLL Mentorship Program seeks to cultivate a supportive environment that enhances
20 professional and academic growth and provides GLL tenure-track and teaching faculty with guidance and
21 resources to help them navigate the challenges of academic life, including research, teaching, service, and
22 work-life balance. See Appendix C for detailed description of the program.
23

Appendix A

Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures Annual Faculty Report

Name

Calendar Year

I. Courses Taught

	Course number, title and number of students
SP	
SU	
AU	

Comments:

II. **Scholarship** (Please give complete bibliographical details; attach additional pages(s) if necessary; include items officially accepted for publication in the calendar year that have not yet appeared; with the one exception of category K, list only work that appeared, was accepted, or was undertaken in the year previous to the calendar year of this report).

A. Books:

B. Edited Volumes:

C. Journals Edited:

D. Articles and Essays:

- E. Book Reviews:
- F. Invited Lectures:
- G. Panels and Papers (give title of panel or paper, sponsoring organization, location of meeting, and month):
- H. Research in Progress (be as specific as necessary to convey the theme, nature, and envisioned result of your work; what precisely was accomplished in the calendar year):
- I. Evaluation of Scholarship (reading scholarly manuscripts; contributing editor, editorial board, external P&T reader):
- J. Other:
- K. List here books that appeared in the year previous to the calendar year of this report:

Comments:

III. Involvement with Graduate Students and Undergraduate Honors Students

- A. Dissertation Advising
 - (1) Completed (give name of student, title, and month of completion):
 - (2) In Progress (give name of student and topic or title):
- B. Dissertation Committees
 - (1) Completed (give name of student, title, and month of completion):

(2) In Progress (give name of student and topic or title):

C. M.A. Thesis Committees

(1) Completed (give name of student, title, and month of completion; asterisk those where you served as chairperson):

(2) In Progress (give name of student and topic or title; asterisk those where you are serving as chairperson):

D. Honors Thesis Committees

(1) Completed (give name of student, title, and month of completion; asterisk those where you served as chairperson):

(2) In Progress (give name of student and topic or title; asterisk those where you are serving as chairperson):

E. Departmental Candidacy Examination Committee(s) (indicate name of student, month, and asterisk those where you served as chairperson):

F. Master's Examination Committee(s) (indicate name of student, month, and asterisk those where you served as chairperson):

G. Graduate School Representative at Candidacy Examinations in other departments (indicate name of student, department, and month):

Comments:

IV. Offices Held and Committee Assignments

A. Department:

B. College of Arts and Sciences:

C. University:

D. Profession:

Comments (note any especially time-consuming committee assignments and briefly describe what was involved):

V. Grant Proposals (list title of proposal; name of agency or award; and amount of funding sought or received):

A. Awarded:

B. Submitted (give date(s)):

Comments:

VI. Recognitions, Honors, and Awards Received:

APPENDIX B

Below is a list of institutions not listed under R01 institutions that GLL considers as peer or near-peer institutions. Note that this is not a comprehensive list.

Georgetown University
University of Maryland
University of Pennsylvania
University of Cincinnati
Bowling Green State University
University of Utah
Bowdoin College

APPENDIX C

GLL Faculty Mentorship Program¹

1. Tenure-track Faculty

Assistant Professor: The mentorship program aims to provide new and early-career probationary tenure track faculty support in their academic progress and professional development and help them become well-oriented citizens of the department, their professional community, and the university while maintaining a healthy work-life balance.

Objectives:

- Academic and Professional Development: Providing help to understand the tenure process and expectations for promotion, guidance on effective work during the tenure track period, publication strategies, and research funding. Encouraging new faculty to consider participating in the Faculty Success Program offered by [NCFDD](#) and take advantage of their program including Mentoring Map resource.
- Teaching Support: Offer guidance on effective teaching practices, course development, student engagement, peer teaching observations, and support resources.
- Research and Scholarship: Encourage scholarly productivity by offering insights on research methodologies, grant writing, and collaboration opportunities.
- Work-Life Balance: Promote a healthy work-life balance by discussing time management strategies and personal well-being, and available resources.
- Networking and Integration: Help faculty integrate into the university culture and connect with other faculty members across departments.

Structure of the Program:

- Mentor-Mentee Matching: The department chair will assign early-career faculty a mentor based on academic interests and navigating the tenure track and will require that the mentor and mentee meet a certain number of times.
- Regular Meetings: Mentors and mentees will meet regularly to set goals, discuss progress, and address any challenges.
- Peer Support Group: When appropriate and upon mentee's agreement, together with the Lecture Committee and their mentor, the mentee arranges brown bag lunch opportunities to share their current research (e.g., work in progress or a recent publication) with their colleagues for informal conversation and their input and to better familiarize colleagues with their work.

Expectations for Mentors:

- Provide constructive feedback on teaching, research, and career development.
- Share insights and experiences regarding department and university policies and procedures.
- Encourage the faculty to take advantage of professional development opportunities offered within the College, University, and beyond.
- Actively listen and provide support, fostering a trusting and open mentor-mentee relationship.

Expectations for Mentees:

- Take initiative in scheduling meetings and setting goals for the mentorship relationship.
- Be open to feedback and willing to implement suggestions for improvement.
- Engage in the program's activities and make the most of the resources offered.

¹ GLL's mentorship program was inspired by [this program](#). Feel free to refer to this link as needed.

Associate Professor and Professor. Mentorship for mid-career and senior faculty is provided informally through the chair and collegial networks. The support includes guidance on transitioning to new roles, leadership, and continuous success beyond tenure and promotion, and identifying external structured mentorship programs upon mentee's request.

2. Assistant Teaching Professor

The mentorship program aims to provide new and early-career probationary teaching faculty support in their teaching progress and career and leadership development and help them become well-oriented citizens of the department, their professional community, and the university while maintaining a healthy work-life balance.

Objectives:

- Teaching and Service Support: Provide guidance on teaching effectiveness, curriculum development, peer teaching observations, student engagement, and navigating service responsibilities.
- Professional Development: Help identify opportunities and resources (e.g., workshops, conferences, teaching excellence certificate) for teaching enhancement and curriculum development at the University and beyond.
- Work-Life Balance: Promote a healthy work-life balance by discussing time management strategies and personal well-being.
- Networking and Integration: Help faculty integrate into the university culture and connect with other teaching faculty members across departments.

Structure of the Program:

- Mentor-Mentee Matching: The department chair will assign early-career teaching faculty a mentor based on their teaching interests and experience and will require that the mentor and mentee meet a certain number of times.
- Regular Meetings: Mentors and mentees will meet regularly to set goals, discuss progress, and address any challenges.

Expectations for Mentors:

- Provide constructive feedback on teaching, service, and career development.
- Share insights and experiences regarding department and university policies and procedures.
- Encourage the faculty to take advantage of teaching and professional development opportunities offered by the College, University, and beyond.
- Actively listen and provide support, fostering a trusting and open mentor-mentee relationship.

Expectations for Mentees:

- Take initiative in scheduling meetings and setting goals for the mentorship relationship.
- Be open to feedback and willing to implement suggestions for improvement.
- Engage in the program's activities and make the most of the resources offered.

Non-probationary Teaching Professor. Mentorship for mid-career and senior teaching faculty is provided informally through the chair and collegial networks. The support includes guidance on transitioning to new roles, leadership, and continuous success during extended appointments.