Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT)
Criteria and Procedures for The Ohio State University Department of Geography

Reviewed by the Faculty: 02/28/2025; College approved 05/13/2025

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 06/03/2025

Revision Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 12/01/2025

I. PREAMBLE 4

II. DEPARTMENT MISSION 4

III. DEFINITIONS 5

A. COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY 5
1. Review of Tenure-Track Faculty 5
2. Teaching and Professional Practice Faculty 6
3. Research Faculty 6
4. Associated Faculty 7
5. Conflict of Interest 7
6. Minimum Composition 8
B. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE 8
C. QUORUM 9
D. RECOMMENDATION FROM THE COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY 9
1. Appointment 10
2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion 10

IV. APPOINTMENTS 10

A. CRITERIA 10
1. Tenure-track Faculty 11
2. Teaching and Professional Practice Faculty 12
3. Research Faculty 13
4. Associated Faculty 14
5. Regional Campus Faculty 15
6. Emeritus Faculty 15
7. Joint Appointments 16
8. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty 16
B. PROCEDURES 16
1. Tenure-Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus 17
2. Teaching and Professional Practice Faculty 19
3. Research Faculty 19
4. Transfer from the Tenure Track 19
5. TIU Transfer 19
6. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus 20
7. Regional Campus Faculty 20
8. Joint Appointments 21
9. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty 21

V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW 21

A. DOCUMENTATION 22
B. PROBATIONARY TENURE-TRACK FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS 23
1. Fourth-Year Review 23
2. Extension of the Tenure Clock 24
C. TENURED FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS 24
D. TEACHING AND PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS 25
E. RESEARCH FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS 26
F. ASSOCIATED FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS 26
G. REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY 26
H. SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS 27

VI. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS 28

A. CRITERIA AND EVIDENCE THAT SUPPORT PROMOTION 28
1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure *29*
a. Teaching 30
b. Scholarship 31
c. Service 34
2. Promotion to Professor *35*
3. Teaching and Professional Practice Faculty *37*
4. Research Faculty *37*
5. Associated Faculty *38*
6. Regional Campus Faculty *38*
B. PROCEDURES 38
1. Tenure-Track, Teaching, Professional Practice, and Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus *39*
a. Candidate Responsibilities 39
b. Personnel Committee Responsibilities 41
c. Committee of Eligible Faculty Responsibilities 42
d. Department Chair Responsibilities 43
2. Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus *44*
3. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty *44*
4. External Evaluations *45*

VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS 47

VIII. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS 47

IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING 47

A. STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING 48
B. PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING 48

APPENDIX 1 51

I. Preamble

This document sets forth criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and for faculty promotion, tenure, and rewards, including salary increases, for the Department of Geography (henceforth 'department' or 'unit'). The document also reviews these criteria and procedures in the context of both the department's mission and the missions of the college and university.

The basic rules and procedures laid out here supplement university-level rules. Specifically, this document supplements Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty, the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Chapter 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, as well as other policies and procedures of the College of Arts and Sciences and university to which the department and its faculty are subject.

This is a living document. Should university 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 of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) before it may be implemented. In approving this document, the dean and OAA accept the mission and criteria of the department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to the department's mission and criteria for excellence.

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 the 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

To support generative and creative science, the department prioritizes a culture of mutual respect, collaboration, and co-learning. The department strives to be a place where ideas can be exchanged and new ideas sparked through dynamic teaching and mentoring, a robust speaker series, and regular intellectual and social interaction. The department welcomes all backgrounds and a wide variety of lived experiences in its composition and scholarly remit, which it considers fundamental to stimulate and support robust and meaningful knowledge creation. The department recognizes the importance of outward-facing science as an essential means to recruit new generations of scholars and to ensure that our insights contribute to addressing the world's social and environmental challenges.

Our mission:

- To support generative, creative, outward-facing science that contributes to addressing the world's social and environmental challenges.
- To recruit and educate new generations of undergraduate and graduate students as critical thinkers with rewarding career paths in academia, private industry, the public sector, and/or non-profit sector.
- To foster the exchange of ideas and spark new ideas through dynamic research, teaching, mentoring, and respectful social interaction.

Our values:

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.

Our ambition:

We are committed to achieving national and international distinction for our research; embracing our duties as educators and our university's land-grant motto of "education for citizenship"; ensuring the academic and personal success of our students; and to supporting the well-being and professional growth of our faculty and staff.

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. Eligibility refers to criteria established by the department, college, and university pertaining to rank, appointment type, affiliation, conflicts of interest, and participation requirements for faculty engaged in the review of colleagues for appointment, reappointment, renewal, and promotion. These criteria are further elaborated below.

The dean and divisional, assistant, and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president are also excluded as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure. The sections below outline what rank and appointment type of colleague may be permitted to participate in the review of another.

1. Review of Tenure-Track Faculty

Appointment Reviews

Initial Appointment Reviews: For an appointment (hiring) review of an assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the department.

Rank Review: A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

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

2. Teaching and Professional Practice Faculty

Appointment Reviews

Initial Appointment Reviews: For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an assistant teaching professor or professional practice assistant professor, an associate teaching professor or professional practice associate professor, or a teaching professor or professional practice professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all teaching and professional practice faculty in the department.

Rank Review: A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all nonprobationary teaching and professional practice faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

For the reappointment and promotion reviews of assistant teaching professors and professional practice assistant professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors, all nonprobationary associate teaching professors, all nonprobationary teaching professors, all nonprobationary professional practice associate professors, and all nonprobationary professional practice professors.

For the reappointment and promotion reviews of associate teaching professors and professional practice associate professors, and the reappointment reviews of teaching professors and professional practice professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors, all nonprobationary teaching professors, and all nonprobationary professional practice professors.

3. Research Faculty

Appointment Reviews

Initial Appointment Reviews: For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a research assistant professor, research associate professor, or research professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track 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.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

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

4. Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

Initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) and reappointment of associated faculty members are decided by the department chair based on recommendations from the search committee.

Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by the eligible faculty (all non-probationary teaching and professional practice faculty and tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college dean or designee.

For reappointments, the eligible faculty are all tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank than the candidate and all non-probationary teaching and professional practice faculty of equal or higher rank than the candidate.

Promotion Reviews

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

For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track, teaching/professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Sections III.A.1, 2 or 3 above.

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

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

5. Conflict of Interest

Search Committee Conflict of Interest

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

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

Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest

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

- a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor to the candidate;
- a co-author on more than 50% of the candidate's publications since appointment or last promotion, including pending publications and submissions;
- a collaborator on more than 50% of the candidate's projects since appointment or last promotion, including current and planned projects;
- 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 are dependent in some way on the candidate's services; or
- in a family relationship such as a spouse, child, sibling, or parent, or other relationship, such as a close personal friendship, that might affect one's judgment or be seen as doing so by a reasonable person familiar with the relationship.

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

6. Minimum Composition

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

B. Personnel Committee

The department's Personnel Committee assists the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in managing unit-level personnel and promotion and tenure processes. The Personnel Committee also helps the department chair with the annual review process for assistant and associate professors. The Personnel Committee consists of five tenure-track Columbus-campus faculty. The committee is supplemented with a sixth tenure-track colleague from a regional campus colleague chosen by the department chair; this member serves only at meetings involving regional campus appointments. The Personnel Committee chair is chosen by the department chair, with a term that corresponds with that of the department chair, i.e., a four-year term. Other members—three professors and one

associate professor—are elected by Columbus-campus faculty using an anonymous ballot procedure. When considering cases involving teaching or professional practice faculty, the Personnel Committee will also include an elected member from the non-probationary teaching or professional practice faculty at the rank of associate professor or professor, as appropriate to the case. Staff support for the committee is provided by the Office Administrative Associate.

Each of the elected members listed above serve a three-year term. Appointments at the rank of professor to the committee will be rotated and staggered to ensure continuity across time and to avoid wholesale committee turnover. If an elected member leaves the committee before completing a full term, a substitute will be elected to complete the remainder of the term. Faculty members who have completed their term are not eligible for re-election to the Personnel Committee for a subsequent period of one year.

Should there be no eligible associate professors or no eligible associate teaching professors, teaching professors, professional practice associate professors, or professional practice professors from whom to elect a Personnel Committee member, those positions will be vacant.

C. Quorum

A quorum is the required number of members present at a meeting for official action to occur. This includes taking a vote. The quorum in the meetings of eligible faculty 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 of absences may not participate in personnel decisions including promotion and tenure reviews and are therefore not considered for quorum unless they declare in advance, and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, only “yes” and “no” votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes but indicate that an individual does not wish to go on the record with a position. As such, abstentions are not counted as votes but are counted when determining a quorum. In the case of appointments, promotion, tenure, and reappointment votes, the faculty are encouraged to exclude abstentions as an option. Indeed, 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. If a member of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty feels they cannot vote for or against a candidate, they should not participate in the discussion and vote. If they are abstaining due to a believed conflict of interest, they should instead recuse themselves and not participate in the discussion or vote.

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

In all votes taken on personnel matters, voting is by secret ballot.

1. Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when more than half of the votes cast are positive.

In the case of a joint appointment where Geography is the tenure-initiating unit, the department must seek input from the other unit. However, the vote involves only faculty in the department.

2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion is secured when more than half of the votes cast are positive.

In the case of a joint appointment where Geography is the tenure-initiating unit, the department must seek input from the other unit. However, the vote involves only faculty in the department.

IV. Appointments

A. Criteria

As stipulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6, faculty peer-review is the fundamental process by which the department makes decisions of faculty selection, reappointment, and promotion and tenure. Faculty therefore play a central role in the recruitment and appointment of other faculty.

The department will only make faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the department. Important considerations include the individual's record to date in teaching, scholarship, and service; the potential for professional growth in each of these areas; and the potential for interacting with colleagues and students in a way that will contribute directly and substantively to the department's mission. No offer will be extended in the event that the search process does not yield one or more candidates who would enhance the quality of the department in these ways. If this happens, the search will be either cancelled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, teaching/professional practice, research, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the SHIFT Framework for faculty recruitment.

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

1. Tenure-track Faculty

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

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the divisional and college deans, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period.

All probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

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

Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary. For example, assistant professors' probationary period is subject to renewal annually with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of appointment. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the sixth-year mandatory review, the seventh year will be the final year of employment.

Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Personnel Committee 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 offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs.

Appointment at the rank of associate professor or professor with tenure requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to these ranks. In all cases, there must be clear evidence that the candidate will sustain a high level of quality research or creative work, along with excellence in teaching and service.

Additionally, the case for the candidate's promotion must demonstrate that their appointment will enhance the overall quality and standing of the department.

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

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

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

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

2. Teaching and Professional Practice Faculty

Except for individuals appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all teaching and professional practice faculty members must be for a period of five years. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for assistant and associate teaching professors and professional practice assistant and associate professors must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for teaching and professional practice professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. These extended appointments are not probationary, and the individual may be terminated only 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 and professional practice faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. The terms of a contract may be renegotiated at the time of reappointment.

Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the department.

Teaching Instructor or Professional Practice Instructor. Appointment is normally made at the rank of teaching or professional practice instructor when the appointee has not completed the requirements for the terminal degree. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to a three-year contract. In such cases, if the instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant

professor by the end of the penultimate year of the contract period, a new contract will not be considered even if performance is otherwise adequate, and the position itself will continue.

Assistant Teaching Professor and Professional Practice Assistant Professor. An earned doctorate in their area of specialty is a minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant teaching professor or professional practice assistant professor. Evidence of ability to teach is highly desirable.

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

3. Research Faculty

Research faculty appointments are driven by capable individuals who recognize the benefits of conducting research within a university setting. These benefits include greater freedom in selecting projects and securing funding, opportunities to collaborate with research students and postdoctoral scholars, and the enriching environment of a university community. Such appointments enable the department to attract high-caliber researchers who might not otherwise be available.

Research faculty at all ranks are appointed for research in specific areas under the assumption that the cost of the salary (with benefits and overhead) and the associated research will be supported by external funds with full overhead. No research faculty shall have continuing teaching assignments, although occasional use in junior/senior, graduate and specialized courses is possible with consent of the funding source, the majority of tenure-track faculty, and the department chair. Departmental service is limited to mentoring research students at all levels and to selected departmental committees related to the research role of the relevant faculty. Research faculty can be principal investigators on external contracts or grants. Only with permission of the department chair can research faculty compete for internal funding or funding not returning full overhead. The criteria for the appointment of a research faculty member in a specific research area at any level shall be the quality of the research achievements and the potential for significant future research. Letters of recommendation should support these criteria.

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

Research faculty can comprise no more than 20% of the number of tenure-track faculty in the department. Appointments at the rank of research assistant professor require approval of the College of Arts and Sciences. Appointments at the rank of research associate professor or research professor require approval of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs.

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

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

Research Associate Professor and Research Professor. Appointment at the rank of research associate professor or research professor requires that the individual have a doctorate, a substantial record of independent scholarship consistent with what is expected for promotion of a tenure-track faculty member to these ranks, and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria for promotion to these ranks.

4. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a few weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. Associated faculty may be reappointed. Appointments of all associated faculty must be reviewed and approved by the College of Arts and Sciences.

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct titles are used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to tenure-track, teaching, professional practice, or research faculty of equivalent rank. The term of appointment is for one year with renewal contingent on continued significant contributions. Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give academic service to the department, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees, for which a faculty title is appropriate. The adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track, teaching/professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track, teaching, professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

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

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

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. These appointments are 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 uncompensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. They may not be reappointed for more than three consecutive years at 100% FTE.

5. Regional Campus Faculty

Given the regional campuses' mission, which prioritizes undergraduate instruction, the criteria for appointment at the tenure-track ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor are similar to those for Columbus campus faculty but place greater emphasis on teaching experience and quality at each rank.

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

6. Emeritus Faculty

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

An individual seeking emeritus status will send their request to the department chair or to the regional campus dean for associated faculty on regional campuses. This request must outline their research and/or other plans as an emeritus professor and why the appointment is desirable. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-4) will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair. The department chair will decide upon the request and submit it to the divisional dean. Should the department chair deny the request, the faculty member may appeal the decision to the divisional dean. The department is not obliged to grant emeritus status. This honor is reserved for those who have contributed positively and meaningfully to all aspects of the department mission in the past.

Emeritus faculty may not vote at any level of governance and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters. Emeritus faculty may serve on graduate student committees, if granted approval by the Graduate School, but may not serve as primary advisor of any student in the department.

7. Joint Appointments

Joint appointments are created to leverage a faculty member's unique expertise to advance the department's mission areas and promote cross-disciplinary collaboration. To establish a joint faculty appointment, a memorandum of understanding (MOU) is developed by all affected tenure-initiating units, 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 unit in which the faculty member's FTE is greater than 50% will be considered that faculty member's tenure-initiating unit. Joint-appointed faculty may vote on promotion and tenure cases only in their tenure-initiating unit.

8. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Occasionally the active academic involvement in the department by a tenure-track, teaching or practice, or research faculty member from another unit at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment. 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. Courtesy faculty appointments will be reviewed every five years by the department chair in consultation with the Personnel Committee. Renewal of courtesy faculty appointments will be contingent on continued active involvement of that courtesy faculty member in the department.

B. Procedures

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

In addition, see the Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments for information on the following topics:

- recruitment of tenure-track, teaching and professional practice, and research faculty;
- appointments at senior rank or with prior service credit;
- hiring faculty from other institutions after April 30;
- appointment of foreign nationals; and,
- 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 college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection.

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

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

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

Prior to any search, search committee members 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 and well-rounded applicant pools, conduct consistent and equitable evaluations, and successfully hire and properly onboard new faculty members who will continue our tradition of academic excellence.

This framework consists of six phases, each targeting a specific stage of the recruitment process:

- “Phase 1 | Search Preparation & Proactive Recruitment” is the earliest stage in the search process. Key steps during this phase include determining faculty needs for the unit, creating a search strategy (including timeline), establishing a budget, and identifying additional partners to include in the process. The steps in this phase provide guidance on forming committees, detail training requirements for search committee members, and innovative approaches to advertising and outreach. This section also includes ideas and resources for developing qualified talent pools to ensure alignment with the university’s commitment to EEO principles and advance the eminence of the institution.

- “Phase 2 | Preliminary Review of Applicants” focuses on best practices for the application review and candidate screening processes. The guidelines and resources in this section support consistency and fairness in the review, assessment, and selection of candidates

moving forward in the recruitment process. This section also outlines how to select a list of candidates for on-campus interviews.

- "Phase 3 | Finalists Interviews & Evaluations" provides guidance and tools for conducting interviews and campus visits, requesting reference letters (if not requested earlier in the application stage), and collecting feedback from everyone who interacted with the candidates. Adherence to the guidelines outlined in this section has a direct impact on enhancing the candidate experience and ensuring a consistent evaluation process. This phase concludes with the submission of a letter from the search committee to the 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 also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor, with or without tenure, or professor with tenure, or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs.

In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the department chair, in consultation with the divisional dean, decides which candidate to approach first. The department chair must discuss the details of the offer, including compensation, with the divisional dean and receive approval before extending an offer. It is expected that the department chair keep the faculty informed about which candidate has been approached for the hire.

The department is advised to discuss potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status with the Office of International Affairs. An MOU must be signed by faculty eligible for tenured positions who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees.

2. *Teaching and Professional Practice Faculty*

Searches for teaching and professional practice faculty generally proceed in the same way as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the virtual or on-campus interview is on teaching or professional practice rather than scholarship.

3. *Research Faculty*

Searches for research faculty generally proceed in the same way as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that during the interview it is primarily the candidate's research credentials that are evaluated.

4. *Transfer from the Tenure Track*

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

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

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

5. *TIU Transfer*

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

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

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

6. *Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus*

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

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

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

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

Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three years.

Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are made on an as-needed basis, i.e., semester-by-semester or annually. After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment of up to three years may be offered.

All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued.

7. *Regional Campus Faculty*

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

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

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, the divisional dean in the College of Arts and Sciences or their designee, the department chair, and regional campus search committee members 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. The letter of offer must be signed by the department chair and the regional campus dean.

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

8. *Joint Appointments*

The department may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another Ohio State unit as described in Section IV.A.7. 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 and the College of Arts and Sciences is dependent on establishing a mutually agreed-upon arrangement between the department chairs, 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.

9. *Courtesy Appointments for Faculty*

Any of the department's faculty members may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track, research, or teaching/professional practice faculty member from another Ohio State TIU. A courtesy appointment requires a written proposal that describes the utility of the appointment in terms of the department's teaching, research, and/or service needs. Courtesy appointments are considered by the eligible faculty 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 keeps track of all courtesy appointments and convenes a vote by eligible faculty for renewal at the three-year mark. Faculty votes may result in renewal or nonrenewal.

V. Annual Performance and Merit Review

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

- Assist faculty in improving professional productivity through candid and constructive feedback and through the establishment of professional development plans;
- Establish the goals against which a faculty member's performance will be assessed in the foreseeable future; 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 department 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.

Every assistant and associate tenure-track professor is assigned a tenure-track faculty member to advise on strategic approaches to meeting expectations in research, teaching, and service and to offer regular, candid, and supportive feedback on the full scope of the mentee's responsibilities in as a faculty member in the department. See Appendix I for details.

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

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

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

A. Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit an annual activity report modeled on OAA's core dossier and an updated CV to the department chair at the start of the spring semester, in response to a formal request from the department chair.

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

Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the annual performance and merit review. Such solicitations will not be accepted by the department chair or considered in the annual review and merit review process.

B. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the department chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance, future plans, and goals and who prepares a written evaluation with sufficient detail for meaningful evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

Probationary tenure-track faculty members may also receive advice and feedback from the Personnel Committee as part of the annual review process. This input is intended as general advice for career development and is not formally part of the annual review or merit evaluation. To ensure consistency, the department chair and the Personnel Committee chair are expected to coordinate their messaging on annual performance before communicating with the candidate.

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

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

1. Fourth-Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review. One difference is that external evaluations are optional. Another difference is that the dean makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

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

The eligible faculty's review of fourth-year candidates is based on a careful reading of the candidate's dossier. The eligible faculty are also expected to deliberate on the merits of the case. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

The eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department chair, who conducts an independent assessment of the candidate's performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The review thus results in two letters of evaluation: one from the eligible faculty, and a separate letter from the department chair. At the conclusion of the review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

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

2. Extension of the Tenure Clock

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

C. Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the professors in the unit who comment on the faculty member's performance in relation to department and individual goals and on progress toward promotion. The department chair conducts an independent assessment; meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance and future plans and goals, as well as any adjustments to workload, and progress toward promotion; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review and the department chair may respond in writing if warranted. The department chair can invite the Personnel Committee chair into this review as needed.

Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair, who may seek input from the professors in the unit and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the department, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the college, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, in civil and collegial interaction with colleagues, staff, and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest-ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty. The department chair prepares a written evaluation of performance against these expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review and the department chair may respond in writing if warranted.

It is expected that associate professors, and especially professors, as part of a well-rounded career, engage in elevated levels of service on campus, whether at the department, college, or university levels. These contributions will be highlighted in the annual review for associate professors and professors. Significant service on campus, such as administrative roles or committee leadership, will be valued as an essential contribution to the department's success and visibility, and recognized as a valuable part of the faculty member's overall workload. The evaluation process will consider the potential effects of substantial service commitments on research productivity, ensuring that such efforts are fairly assessed within the context of the faculty member's role and responsibilities.

D. Teaching and Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

In the second-to-last contract year of a teaching or professional practice faculty member's appointment, the department chair will determine whether the position held by the faculty member will be renewed. If the position will not be renewed, 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 be renewed, 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 generally proceeds in the same manner as the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure track faculty.

All reappointment decisions are at the discretion of the college dean. There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

E. Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

In the second-to-last contract year of a research faculty member's appointment, the department chair will determine whether the position held by the faculty member will be renewed. If the position will not be renewed, 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 be renewed, 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 generally proceeds in the same manner as the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure track faculty.

All reappointments are at the discretion of the college dean. There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

F. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

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

G. Regional Campus Faculty

The annual performance and merit review of regional campus tenure-track faculty is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then moves to the Department of Geography and proceeds as described above for tenure-track and tenured faculty, respectively.

As part of the process, the department chair meets with the regional campus dean to discuss the regional campus faculty member's research and creative activity during the review period. The regional campus dean provides an annual performance and merit review letter to the department chair. If there are differences in performance assessments between the regional campus and the department, the department chair and regional campus dean work together to clarify and reconcile the reviews, ensuring consistent career assessment and advice for the faculty member. For probationary tenure-track faculty, in the event that the regional campus dean recommends

renewal, and the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the case shall be reviewed by the college dean or their designee, with the college dean's or their designee's judgment prevailing.

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

The annual performance and merit review of regional campus associated faculty is conducted entirely on the regional campus according to the process established on that campus, with the review focusing on teaching and service, as applicable.

H. Salary Recommendations

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

The department chair collaborates with the Executive Committee to develop salary recommendations. As part of this process, the department chair and Executive Committee members review the annual reporting materials submitted by all faculty members. Together, the chair and the committee evaluate faculty performance in research, teaching, and service, assigning a numerical score to each category based on qualitative assessments (e.g., exceeds expectations, meets expectations, below expectations). The department will avoid rigid formulas or weightings of scholarship, teaching and service that might limit recognition of extraordinary one-time commitments in one or more areas, of variations in workload, or of shifts in responsibilities at different stages of professional development. The department chair and the Executive Committee also consider faculty members' contributions to maintaining a collegial work environment. Collegiality encompasses behaviors that demonstrate mutual respect, constructive collaboration, and support for departmental goals and initiatives. Faculty are then ranked collectively based on their overall contributions in these areas. Salary increases are determined using these rankings, along with considerations of market conditions and internal equity.

Executive Committee members are evaluated by the chair alone in terms of salary recommendations. Executive Committee members do not evaluate each other.

Collegiality among the Executive Committee members involved in the ranking process is essential to ensure fairness, transparency, and mutual trust. The ranking process requires open and respectful communication, a commitment to shared governance, and a focus on the collective well-being of the department. Faculty members participating in this process must demonstrate professionalism, maintain confidentiality, and approach discussions with integrity and objectivity.

Except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increases, all funds for annual salary increases are directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and assuring, to the extent possible given financial constraints, that salaries are aligned with the market and are internally equitable. Accordingly, the department chair should proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in it.

Faculty members who wish to discuss their salary increase with the department chair can do so when the chair invites faculty members to a review of the annual merit process at the start of each autumn semester. These individualized, one-on-one meetings review merit rankings for each faculty member and explain how their ranking translated into a percentage raise. Faculty members who are dissatisfied with their review should be prepared to explain how their increase is inappropriately low, with respect to the rubric provided to faculty. Generally, faculty should keep in mind that salary increases are a means to the end of an optimal distribution of salaries.

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

VI. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

> In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the university enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new 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. As noted above, 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 differing 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.

Every candidate is expected to meet the criteria for promotion in all aspects of performance.

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

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

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 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 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.

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 department needs to be supported.

a. Teaching

High-quality teaching is an expectation for all tenure-track faculty in the department. The department recognizes that evidence of teaching excellence may vary by faculty member due to their assigned work. The evidence of teaching excellence should thus be based upon an individual's assigned work, recognizing that not all assignments are readily comparable. For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have met teaching criteria addressed in the table below.

TEACHING	
Criteria for Faculty Engaged in Teaching	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Successfully taught a total of three courses per year unless otherwise stipulated in institutional rules, contract, or course releases	• Fulfilled teaching duties as outlined in dossier and annual review letters
Successfully developed student interest in Geography and/or Atmospheric Science	• Teaching experience outlined in dossier • Peer teaching evaluations on course design and teaching methods • Positive evaluations from continuing education programs, internal and external to the university
Developed new and effective instructional techniques and materials appropriate for the objectives and level of the courses they teach	• Updated or developed syllabi, exams, or assignments demonstrating current subject knowledge • Contribution of subject area teaching expertise to program-level curricular development and/or development of General Education classes • Summary of student feedback on instructional content • Peer teaching evaluations on course design and teaching methods • Evidence of continuing education adoption in teaching • Attending continuing education opportunities on a topic or focus area and adopted new materials in class • Participation in teaching-focused programs (e.g., Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning)
Demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge	
Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm	• Peer teaching evaluations on course design and teaching methods • Positive evaluations from continuing education programs, internal and external to the university • SEI scores on relevant items equal or greater than department average

Demonstrated creativity in modes of instruction, classroom or online technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment	• Peer teaching evaluations on course design and teaching methods • SEI scores on relevant items equal or greater than department average
Engaged students actively in learning, independent thought, creativity, critical thinking, and the knowledge creation process	• Peer teaching evaluations on course design and teaching methods • SEI scores on relevant items equal or greater than department average
Appropriate and timely student feedback throughout the instructional process	• Positive qualitative student comments • Peer teaching evaluations on course design and teaching methods
Treated students with respect and courtesy	• Positive qualitative student comments • Peer teaching evaluations on course design and teaching methods
Served as advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the department's graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise	• Advising/mentoring activities as listed in the dossier including involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, as well as mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers
Served as advisor to an appropriate number of undergraduate students given the department's undergraduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise	• Advising/mentoring activities as listed in the dossier including involvement in honors research theses and undergraduate student research activities

b. Scholarship

High-quality research is an expectation for all tenure-track faculty in the department.
For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have published a body of work in high-quality peer-reviewed venues that is thematically focused, contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and is beginning to be favorably cited or otherwise show evidence of influence on the work of others. Moreover, while collaborative work is encouraged, and indeed is essential to some types of inquiry, the candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described to permit accurate assessment. Quantity of output must be evaluated with appropriate attention to the candidate's contribution of effort to co-authored publications. It is desirable that at least some of the publications in the dossier represent primary authorship, as a demonstration of the ability to work independently.

The rigor of the peer-review process for published research will be closely scrutinized, along with the quality and impact of publication venues. Journal publications and monographs will be weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published scholarship more than unpublished scholarship, and original works more than edited works. Books and book chapters that are peer reviewed and published by well-regarded scholarly and commercial presses are preferred over those that are not.

All scholarship outcomes will be reviewed for increasing independence over time. There should also be an increasing trajectory of significant scholarly outcomes over time.

The department will also be looking for a record of applying to external sources for major research funding. Receipt of such funding, although desirable, is not a requirement for promotion to associate professor with tenure. However, candidates should be able to demonstrate that they are actively seeking extramural support. Competitive peer-reviewed funding is weighted more favorably than other types, since it serves as a quality indicator of research programs, and grants requiring the exercise of intellectual creativity are weighted more heavily than those that largely dictate the work to be done. Research funding is a means to an end; funding that has not led to research productivity is disregarded in the review.

The department also expects that candidates for associate professor with tenure demonstrate a high degree of ethics in the conduct of research including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators.

Although not required, the department will recognize successful entrepreneurship activities related directly to the candidate's scholarly record and area of focus, as a component of a tenurable file. This is in keeping with the college's focus on patents and commercialization and cannot replace the department's primary focus on peer-reviewed publications, grant activity, and research dissemination.

Lastly, the department expects candidates for associate professor with tenure to have developed national/international reputation in their field. This can be evidenced by external evaluations, invitations to present at prestigious forums, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals, and a trend of positive citations in other researchers' publications. A reputation based on the quality of the research contribution is distinguished from one based mainly on familiarity through the faculty member's frequent attendance at national and international conferences. The table below expands on the criteria enumerated above.

SCHOLARSHIP	
Criteria for Faculty Engaged in Research	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Demonstrate thematically focused research which contributes to knowledge in area of expertise	• A body of work in high-quality peer-reviewed venues that clearly demonstrates creation of an independent research/scholarship/creative program over time, and which contributes substantively to a substantive area of focus • Complete publication record including journal papers, conference papers and posters (both refereed and otherwise), monographs, books, book chapters, textbooks based on

	scholarship, magazine articles and on-line publications, patents and invention disclosures • Sustained grant writing activity targeting foundations, federal agencies, and/or major industry and private sector sources, either as Primary Investigator or Co-Investigator, and with a documented and focused contribution • Additional creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus including collections, compositions, curated exhibits, multimedia, radio, recordings, television, websites, and other works suitable to the faculty member's research portfolio • External awards from national/international agencies, associations, and private foundations • Keynote lectures/presentations at conferences, symposia, and other invited talks • Patents and licenses of invention disclosures, software development, and materials transfers • Technology commercialization • Formation of startup companies • Licensing and options agreements • Consulting work with industry and other external partners
Demonstrated influence on the work of others	• Markers of excellence in the faculty member's field and publicly that indicate the quality and impact of the candidate's scholarship • Development of program materials, exhibits, shows, and technical reports • Colloquia, keynotes, webinars, and other invited research dissemination activities of note • Significant portion of the publications authored with the faculty member's graduate students and other mentees and/or collaborators • Team-based research demonstrating the candidate's contributions to collaborative publications, and recognizable as a unique and creative contribution to the overall body of work • Positive reviews from external reviewers • Citations
Demonstrated high quality research	• Publication in peer reviewed books, journals, and monographs • Journal ranking, citation index, H-index, impact on field • Primary journal of faculty member's area of research, for example a flagship journal • Reviews of faculty member's monographs in prominent journals and other media • Grants and contracts in recognition of innovative research • Documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options and commercial licenses • List of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, outreach, or creative work • External reviewer positive comments

	• Inventions, patents, disclosures, options, and commercial licenses • Intellectual property such as copyrighted materials, software, multimedia presentations
Provided ongoing quantity of research outcomes	• Expectation is for an average of two peer-reviewed articles per year over the probationary period, or equivalent scholarly output as per the candidate's subfield • Expectation is for a steady output of research, although consideration will be given to journal publication schedules and other publication timelines not controlled by the faculty member
Demonstrated unique contribution to a line of inquiry	• External peer reviewers comment that the faculty member has made a substantial contribution to the discipline or profession in an area and the extent to which that person has been recognized by other scholars, public policy makers and/or practitioners • Consistent contribution demonstrating expertise to multiple scholarly, research or engagement outcomes • Narrative describing the activity, the reasons why it was undertaken, the faculty member's intellectual contribution and leadership role, and how the activity contributed to his/her/their scholarly advancement
Developed national/international reputation in the candidate's field	• Recognition by external reviewers that the faculty member has made a substantial contribution to the discipline or profession and the extent to which that person has been recognized by other scholars, public policy makers and/or practitioners • External evaluations, invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals, and a trend of positive citations in other researchers' publications
Demonstrated a high degree of professional ethics	• High degree of ethical conduct of research including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of undergraduate, graduate and professional students, residents, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators • Contributes to a positive and compelling working environment, particularly one that welcomes all faculty, staff and students

c. Service

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have made substantive contributions to the governance of the department in a manner that facilitates positive contributions by others. We also expect faculty members to have demonstrated the potential for useful contributions to the profession.

The table below expands on the department's service expectations for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

SERVICE

Criteria for Faculty Engaged in Service	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Demonstrated service to department	• Service as documented in dossier and annual reviews, e.g., actively serving on and participating in departmental committees as appointed by the chair of the department, active participation in departmental faculty meetings • Annual evaluations documenting service to department • Quality indicators of the outcomes of service contributions in dossier and annual reviews, with the understanding that service-based commitment, leadership, quality, and competence are more important than the number of service activities
Demonstrated service to Ohio State students	• Advising student clubs, College Honors Committee, or other organizations • Serving on advisory and as outside representative on graduate student examination committees • Serving on university student committees (e.g., Judicial and Academic misconduct), STEP mentor, etc. • Quality indicators of the outcomes of service contributions to students
Demonstrated service to a profession or field	• Quality indicators of the outcomes of contributions • Involvement with professional journals (journal editorships, reviewer) and professional societies (offices or committees) • Professional conference organization • Consultation activity with industry, professional discipline education development, other universities, or government • Awards and prizes for service to profession • Evidence of professional expertise to public and private entities as a reviewer for funding proposals, study sections, external examiner, member of panels and commissions, professional consultant to industry, government, and education organization • External reviewers of academic programs, national laboratories and research centers. • Contributions to national and international scholarly advisory bodies

In the evaluation of untenured associate professors for tenure, the same criteria will apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

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 College of Arts and Sciences establishes the following additional criteria for promotion to the rank of professor:

Promotion to professor in the College of Arts and Sciences takes the pursuit of research and creative excellence as our core value. The college also recognizes that a career may consist of various phases in which a concentration on research/creative work, teaching, or service creates a composite professional life. Promotion to professor typically requires excellence in scholarship/creative work. 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 research/creative work.

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 achieved national distinction as a researcher or creative artist and have an emerging international reputation. 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. It can be measured by the attainment of national or international recognition, as evidenced by pedagogical publications, awards, honors, and/or critical student outcomes. 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 specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national or international reputation in the field.

Appropriate levels of doctoral level advising, college, university and professional service, and other demonstrated leadership are expected. Our goal is the continuation of the factors listed in the case of promotion to associate professor, with the expectation of enhanced and deepened effort in all areas. For example, evidence of an established national and international reputation in research is expected. While individual activities will vary, among our valued activities, we expect to see effective committee service and leadership; and reviewing for a wide range of professional journals.

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

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

inquiry, teaching and learning, and service, but also to those who have exhibited excellence in leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the department, college and university.

3. Teaching and Professional Practice Faculty

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

Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor or Professional Practice Associate Professor. For promotion to associate teaching professor or professional practice associate professor, a faculty member must hold a doctoral degree; must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service; must have a documented high level of competence in professional practice; and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of the department. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to associate teaching professor or professional practice associate 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.

Promotion to Teaching Professor or Professional Practice Professor. For promotion to teaching professor or professional practice professor, a faculty member must hold a doctoral degree; have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching and professional practice; leadership in service to the department 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. Research Faculty

Promotion to Research Associate Professor. For promotion to research associate professor, a faculty member must have a record of excellence in scholarship, including a substantial record of high-quality focused research consistent with an appointment devoted solely to research. Publications must appear in high-quality peer-reviewed venues and be judged by external evaluators as having substantial positive impact on the field. A record of significant and continuous peer-reviewed extramural funding for research and a substantial probability that such funding will continue are required along with evidence of a growing national reputation. The claim that retention of the candidate will improve the overall scholarly quality and standing of the department must be supported. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Research Professor. For promotion to research professor, a faculty member must have a record of excellence in scholarship including a national or international reputation built on an extensive body of high-quality publications and with demonstrated impact on the field. A record

of significant and continuous peer-reviewed extramural funding is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding and a substantial probability that external research support will continue. The claim that retention of the candidate will improve the overall scholarly quality and standing of the department must be supported. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

5. Associated Faculty

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

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

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

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

6. Regional Campus Faculty

The primary function of the regional campuses is to provide high-quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic 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 faculty to establish a program of high-quality scholarly activity as a fundamental requirement for promotion.

In evaluating regional campus teaching, professional practice, and research faculty for promotion, the department will use the same criteria as described above for the promotion of faculty in each of these categories. 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 Rules 3335-6-04, for tenure-track faculty, 3335-7-05 for teaching/professional practice faculty, 3335-7-32 for research faculty, and the Office of Academic Affairs' annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Chapter 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook.

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

a. *Candidate Responsibilities*

Candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier and providing a copy of the APT 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 both the Personnel Committee and the Committee of the 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 time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

Teaching documentation should include:

- Cumulative and course-specific SEIs
- Peer evaluations of teaching
- Other documentation of teaching as appropriate and outlined in the core dossier

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

Scholarship documentation should include:

- Copies of all books, papers, book chapters, or other book reviews outlined in the dossier that have been published, or accepted for publication. If a paper has been accepted for publication, but not yet published, a letter from the editor should be submitted that details that the paper has been accepted and no further revisions are needed

- Documentation of grants
- Documentation of any relevant creative works
- External letters by experts in the field, to be solicited by the department chair
- Other relevant documentation of scholarship as appropriate

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

Service documentation should include:

- Administrative service to the department, college, or university
- Advising to student groups and organizations
- Involvement with professional societies and/or documentation of relevant professional service
- Consultation activity
- Awards for service
- Any available documentation (e.g., from annual review letters) of the quality of service that characterizes the list of service activities in the dossier

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

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

Candidates must indicate the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. A candidate may be reviewed using the department's current APT document; or, 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, professional practice, and research faculty), whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, for tenure-track faculty the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year.

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

- **External Evaluations**

If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair and the Personnel Committee chair. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names. The department chair decides

whether removal is justified. (See External Evaluations below.) Under no circumstances should a candidate solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review; evaluations will be solicited by the department chair alone.

b. Personnel Committee Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Personnel Committee are as follows:

- To review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the Personnel Committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
    - Candidates interested in promotion to professor must notify the Personnel Committee chair of their intention early in the Spring semester, before January 15.
    - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review such as student and peer evaluations of teaching. The committee will also require a one-page statement from the candidate as to why promotion is being sought, referencing the promotion criteria listed above. Lack of required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
    - A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 only once. Faculty Rules 3335-7-08 and 3335-7-36 make the same provision for non-probationary teaching/professional practice and research faculty, respectively. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
    - A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
    - **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are here.

- **Late Spring**: The committee chair suggests 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 OAA requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.

- Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on their dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.

- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship, and service to provide to the eligible faculty with the dossier; and clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.

- 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.

- 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.

- Revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of the eligible faculty, 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 are based. 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 from another tenure-initiating unit. The eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on the department's cases.

c. Committee of Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

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

- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.

- To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.

d. Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the U.S. and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. (The department must ensure that such questions are asked of all applicants in a non-discriminatory manner.) For tenure-track assistant professors, to 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 Personnel Committee, the Department of Geography 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. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.

- To solicit an evaluation from a TIU head where a candidate has a joint appointment and from an interdisciplinary research center in which the candidate plays an active role.

- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.

- To charge each member of the Committee of Eligible Faculty to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.

- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.

- To 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.

- To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.

- To explain to the eligible faculty any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.

- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department's 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 calendar days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier.

- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.

- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline.

- To receive the Personnel Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the 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 decision by the department chair is final in such cases.

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. The regional campus review focuses on teaching and service.

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

Regional campus teaching and professional practice 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 regional campus 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.

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

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

4. External Evaluations

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, all research faculty promotion reviews, and all teaching and professional practice faculty promotion reviews to the rank of teaching professor or professional practice professor. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for promotion to associate teaching professor or professional practice associate 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 Personnel Committee.

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

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

- Is written by a person at an appropriate peer or aspirational institution. In keeping with college guidelines, the department will generally obtain evaluations from faculty at R01 institutions that are members of the Association of American Universities (AAU) and the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA). The department further defines peer or near-peer institutions to include the major top-ranked departments in Geography and Atmospheric Science as indicated by major reputable ranking systems such as the Times Higher

Education World University Rankings, QS World University Rankings, U.S. News and World Report Best Global Universities, and others. Justification will be provided by the department chair to the college in each case in which a suggested evaluator is from a non-AAUP or non-BTAA program.

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. 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 Personnel Committee chair, 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 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 the department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The department follows the OAA format for letters requesting external evaluations. A sample letter for tenure-track faculty and research faculty can be found here. A sample letter for teaching/professional practice faculty can be found here.

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

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

VII. Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals

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

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

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

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

VIII. Seventh-Year Reviews

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

IX. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

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) is required in every course offered in the department.

Faculty should take the scores provided for questions 1-9 and analyze them according to three distinct measures of teaching: class organization, student perceived learning, and instructor caring. These numerical averages should be compared by individual class over time, not across instructors or different classes. The department does not evaluate item 10.

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 department's core means of assessing teaching excellence is a peer teaching exercise run annually by the Personnel Committee chair, in consultation with the department chair. This exercise documents faculty members' growth in teaching expertise and accomplishments and it coaches colleagues on teaching. Faculty at all ranks and all appointment types are expected to undergo a peer teaching review, although assistant professors are prioritized for review in any given semester. Peer teaching reviews are conducted by faculty at all ranks. Although there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible. Most peer review work is expected to be done by associate professors and professors in order to minimize the service burden on assistant professors.

The responsibilities of the Personnel Committee chair with respect to the peer teaching review are:

- To review the teaching of probationary tenure-track, teaching and professional practice faculty, and all associated faculty with multiple year appointments at least once per year during each year of service, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of

instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. When assistant professors are reviewed for tenure and promotion and when probationary teaching and professional practice faculty are reviewed for reappointment, they are required to have a minimum of five peer evaluations of teaching from the probationary period. No more than two evaluations should be prepared by the same colleague.

- To review the teaching of tenured associate professors and non-probationary assistant teaching professors, non-probationary associate teaching professors, non-probationary professional practice assistant professors, and non-probationary professional practice associate professors at least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a six-year period and of having at least four peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion review.

- To review the teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary teaching and professional practice professors of at least once every four years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review.

- To review, upon the department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance to improve teaching.

- To review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning.

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

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations (the first three situations listed above) are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instruction materials (e.g., assignments and exams). Faculty under review should provide peer reviewers with the course syllabus and other materials well in advance of the classroom visit or visits. They should also provide reviewers with a list of preferred visitation dates. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, the class visitation is conducted by one or more senior peers whom the promotion and tenure chair has identified in consultation with the Personnel Committee chair and the candidate. The peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to discuss the candidate's goals and expected outcomes for the course, the candidate's teaching philosophy, and any challenges related to instruction including feedback from previous evaluations of teaching. If possible, the peer reviewer should attend two different class sessions over the course of the semester.

In observing the course, reviewing the syllabus and other materials, and writing the report, the peer reviewer should focus not only on classroom performance but also on curricular and pedagogical choices, such as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the class visits, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give feedback and also submits a written report to the department chair, copied to the candidate by the end of the semester of review. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if he/she wishes. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier unless the faculty member requests that the comments be excluded.

APPENDIX 1

Mentorship Plan

Every newly appointed probationary tenure-track professor is assigned a tenure-track faculty member to advise mentees on strategic approaches to meeting expectations in research, teaching, and service and to offer regular, candid, and supportive feedback on the full scope of the mentee's responsibilities throughout the entire probationary period. This may include reviews and comments on manuscripts and funding proposals, teaching plans and materials, advice on managing courseloads and classroom issues, and guidance on professional skills and opportunities. Mentors should also serve as a resource partner to help their mentees navigate the procedures and policies in the department, college, and university.

Mentors are assigned by the department chair and Personnel Committee chair, in consultation with the probationary tenure-track faculty member.

Mentors are expected to initiate meetings with their mentees at least twice each semester and to respond to additional requests from their mentees as needed. Mentors who will be on leave should ask the department chair to assign another tenure-track faculty member to the mentee until they return.

Mentees who would like additional mentorship support or otherwise believe that their current mentoring relationship is not meeting their needs should discuss the issue with the department chair or Personnel Committee chair). The department chair or Personnel Committee chair will seek a resolution, which may include assigning a new mentor or adding an additional mentor to the mentorship team. If the probationary faculty member's concerns are not resolved through this process, they should schedule a meeting with the Divisional Dean or the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs in the College of Arts and Sciences.

In addition, each Spring semester, the Personnel Committee and its chair meet individually with all probationary tenure-track faculty to support career planning and provide broad guidance on departmental norms and expectations for promotion and tenure. These meetings offer candid, constructive advice on research productivity, teaching effectiveness, service contributions, and overall progress toward tenure. The aim is to help junior colleagues understand how to align their work with promotion timelines and criteria, and to provide a forum for addressing questions about both departmental and university standards.

These meetings are mandatory but are distinct from the formal annual evaluation conducted by the department chair. To ensure consistency of expectations and messaging, the Personnel Committee chair provides the department chair with a brief written summary of each meeting.

The Personnel Committee and its chair meet individually with all associate professors—whether tenured or not—to support career planning and to provide general guidance on departmental norms and expectations. For associate professors without tenure, the focus is on progress toward tenure. For those with tenure, the focus is on promotion to full professor. These meetings are mandatory. The chair of the Personnel Committee provides a report on each meeting to the department chair.

The department also assigns senior faculty members to conduct regular, annual peer evaluations of teaching for probationary tenure-track faculty. The peer evaluations of teaching include a course design and material evaluation as well as a teaching observation exercise based on at least one classroom visit. Senior faculty will meet with the junior faculty member before the classroom visit to understand their teaching goals and approach, and again afterward to discuss observations, offer troubleshooting support, and identify helpful resources. Senior faculty are expected to provide candid, constructive, and supportive feedback in a spirit of collegial mentoring.

As part of a reciprocal learning process, junior faculty will also participate in teaching evaluations of senior colleagues.