THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

JOHN GLENN COLLEGE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure

Criteria and Procedures for the John Glenn College of Public Affairs (JGCPA)

Date: May 12, 2025

Revision OAA Approved: July 28, 2025

Contents

1. Preamble 3
2. College Mission 3
3. Definitions 4
   3.1 Committee of the Eligible Faculty 4
      3.1.1 Tenure-track Faculty 4
      3.1.2 Professional Practice Faculty 4
      3.1.3 Research Faculty 5
      3.1.4 Associated Faculty 5
      3.1.5 Conflict of Interest 6
      3.1.6 Minimum Composition 7
   3.2 Promotion and Tenure Committee 7
   3.3 Quorum 8
   3.4 Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty 8
      3.4.1 Appointment 8
      3.4.2 Reappointment and Promotion and Tenure 8
4. Appointments 9
   4.1 Criteria 9
      4.1.1 Tenure-track Faculty 9
      4.1.2 Professional Practice Faculty 10
      4.1.3 Research Faculty 11
      4.1.4 Associated Faculty 11
      4.1.5 Emeritus Faculty 13
      4.1.6 Joint Appointments 13
      4.1.7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty 13
   4.2 Procedures 14
      4.2.1 Tenure-track Faculty 14
      4.2.2 Professional Practice Faculty 16
      4.2.3 Research Faculty 16
      4.2.4 Transfer from the Tenure-track 16
      4.2.5 TIU Transfer 17
      4.2.6 Associated Faculty 17
      4.2.7 Joint Appointments 18
      4.2.8 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty 18
      4.2.9 Endowed Chair and Endowed Professorship Positions 18
5. Annual Performance and Merit Review 19
   5.1 Documentation 20
   5.2 Probationary Tenure-track Faculty 20
      5.2.1 Fourth-Year Review 21
      5.2.2 Extension of the Tenure Clock 21
   5.3 Tenured Faculty 21
   5.4 Professional Practice Faculty 22
   5.5 Research Faculty 23

5.6 Associated Faculty 23
5.7 Salary Recommendations 23
6. Promotion and Promotion and Tenure Reviews 24
6.1 Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion 25
6.1.1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure 25
6.1.2 Promotion to Professor 34
6.1.3 Promotion of Professional Practice Faculty 43
6.1.4 Promotion of Research Faculty 44
6.1.5 Promotion of Associated Faculty 45
6.2 Procedures 45
6.2.1 Procedures for Tenure-Track, Professional Practice, and Research Faculty 45
6.2.2 Procedures for Associated Faculty 52
6.2.3 Procedures for External Evaluations 53
7. Promotion and Promotion and Reappointment Appeals 55
8. Seventh-Year Reviews 55
9. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching 55
9.1 Student Evaluation of Teaching 55
9.2 Peer Evaluation of Teaching 55

1. Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapter 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*; and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the college and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the college shall follow those 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 five years on appointment or reappointment of the college dean or upon the request of a simple majority of the faculty.

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

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 of the Administrative Code. All faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 and other standards specific to this college; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted 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.

2. College Mission

The faculty, staff, students, and alumni of the Glenn College embrace the ideals of democratic citizenship and public leadership in our mission to:

- prepare tomorrow's public and nonprofit leaders through education, training, and professional development;
- help solve public problems and build knowledge in the field of public affairs through interdisciplinary research; and,
- integrate knowledge from inside and outside the university and transfer that knowledge to external stakeholders in the public, nonprofit, and private sectors across Ohio, the nation, and the globe.

Our long-term vision is to serve as a model in public higher education for producing democratic citizens and public and nonprofit leaders, and creating, translating, and applying research that serves the public interest across the State of Ohio and the nation.

3. Definitions

3.1 Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

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

3.1.1 Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring) review of an assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, the eligible faculty consist of all tenure-track faculty in the college.

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

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

- For the promotion reviews of associate professors, the eligible faculty consist of all tenured professors.

3.1.2 Professional Practice Faculty

Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a professional practice assistant professor, professional practice associate professor, or professional practice professor, the eligible faculty consist of all tenure-track faculty and all professional practice faculty in the college.

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

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of professional practice assistant professors, the eligible faculty consist of all tenured associate professors and professors, all non-probationary professional practice associate professors, and all non-probationary professional practice professors.

- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of professional practice associate professors, and the reappointment reviews of professional practice professors, the eligible faculty consist of all tenured professors and all non-probationary professional practice professors.

3.1.3 Research Faculty

Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** 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 consist of all tenure-track faculty and all research faculty in the college.

- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and all non-probationary research 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 consist of all tenured associate professors and professors and all non-probationary research associate professors and professors.

- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of research associate professors and the reappointment reviews of research professors, the eligible faculty consist of all tenured professors and all non-probationary research professors.

3.1.4 Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- For the initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members, the appointment is decided by the associate dean for curriculum (ADC) and the dean based on recommendation from the search committee.

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

- The reappointment of compensated associated faculty is decided by the ADC and the dean.

Promotion Reviews

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

- For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Sections 3.1.1, 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 3.1.1.

- The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer requires a vote by the eligible faculty (all non-probationary professional practice faculty and tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested).

3.1.5 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 to the candidate:

- a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor;
- a co-author on more than 50% of the candidate's publications since appointment or last promotion, including pending publications and submissions;
- a collaborator on more than 25% of projects since appointment or last promotion, including current and planned collaborations;
- in a consulting/financial arrangement with the candidate since appointment or last promotion, including receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services) or is dependent in some way on the candidate's services; or
- in a family relationship such as a spouse, child, sibling, or parent, or other relationship, such as a close personal friendship, that might affect one's judgment or be seen as doing so by a reasonable person familiar with the relationship.

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

3.1.6 Minimum Composition

In the event that the college does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review concerning appointment and promotion and tenure, the dean will appoint a faculty member from another college with preference given to joint and courtesy faculty.

3.2 Promotion and Tenure Committee

The college has a promotion and tenure committee that is a subcommittee of the eligible faculty that assists the committee of the eligible faculty in managing the appointment and promotion and tenure issues. The committee consists of three eligible faculty of higher rank than the candidate(s) under review. The three committee members are appointed by the dean. The dean appoints the committee's chair, and the eligible faculty vote to select the procedures oversight designee (POD) from the other two appointed committee members. The committee coordinates the review process with the associate dean for faculty (ADF). The expected term of service is two years for each committee member, with reappointment possible.

When considering cases involving professional practice faculty, the promotion and tenure committee may be augmented by up to two non-probationary professional practice faculty members at the rank of associate professor or professor as appropriate to the case.

When considering cases involving research faculty, the promotion and tenure committee may be augmented by up to two non-probationary research faculty members at the rank of associate professor or professor as appropriate to the case.

3.3 Quorum

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

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

3.4 Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on appointment and promotion and tenure matters only "yes" and "no" votes are counted. Abstention votes are not permitted.

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted, but participating fully in discussions and voting remotely is allowed. All votes are private and may be conducted electronically if anonymity can be ensured.

The threshold for a positive vote is 51% of the quorum.

3.4.1 Appointment

- A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast are positive.

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

3.4.2 Reappointment and Promotion and Tenure

- A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast are positive. The outcome of the vote shall be reported to the dean and Office of Academic Affairs.

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

4. Appointments

4.1 Criteria

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

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, 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.

4.1.1 Tenure-track Faculty

Instructor. Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but requirements for the terminal degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. Procedures for appointment are identical to those for an assistant professor. The college will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. Promotion to assistant professor occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. When an instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the third year of appointment, the third year is a 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 college's eligible faculty, the dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor. An earned terminal degree is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the college and the profession is highly desirable. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the seventh year will be the final year of employment.

Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Promotion and Tenure 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 Office of Academic Affairs.

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

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

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

4.1.2 Professional Practice Faculty

Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all other professional practice faculty members must be for a period of five years. The initial contract at all ranks is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for 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 professional practice professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. Tenure is not granted to professional practice faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance.

Professional practice faculty appointments exist for faculty members who focus primarily on supporting the educational mission of the college and are made in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-7. Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the college.

Professional Practice Assistant Professor. At least an earned master's degree in a relevant field of study, or appropriate professional credentials demonstrating expertise in their relevant area of study, and a minimum of five years of experience in the workplace are the minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of professional practice assistant professor. Evidence of current knowledge of research impacting practice with the field of study, evidence of engagement with practitioners in relevant contexts, evidence of potential for high-quality teaching, and evidence of service at the local, state, national or international level are desired.

Professional Practice Associate Professor and Professional Practice Professor. Appointment at the rank of professional practice associate professor requires that the individual have an earned at least a master's degree in a relevant field of study, relevant professional credentials demonstrating expertise in the field of study (if appropriate), evidence of current knowledge of research impacting practice with the field of study, evidence of ongoing engagement with practitioners in relevant context, evidence of high-quality teaching, and evidence of high-quality and impactful service at the local, state, national or international level.

Appointment at the rank of professional practice professor requires that the individual have earned a doctoral degree in a relevant field of study, relevant professional credentials demonstrating expertise in the field of study (if appropriate), evidence of current knowledge of research impacting practice with the field of study, evidence of sustained ongoing engagement with practitioners in relevant context, evidence of sustained high-quality teaching, and evidence of sustained high-quality and impactful service at the local, state, national or international level.

4.1.3 Research Faculty

Appointment of research faculty entails a one- to five-year appointment. 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 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 and meet, at a minimum, the college's criteria for promotion to these ranks.

4.1.4 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 for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. Associated faculty may be reappointed.

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

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

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 or significant related work experience. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is desirable. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer 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, at a minimum, 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. 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.

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for

appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for only three consecutive years.

4.1.5 Emeritus Faculty

Emeritus faculty status is an honor given in recognition of sustained academic contributions to the university as described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-36. Full-time tenure track, 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.

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the dean outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section 3.1.1-4) will review the application and make a recommendation to the dean, who will decide upon the request. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the ten years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule 3335-5-04, emeritus status will not be considered.

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

4.1.6 Joint Appointments

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

4.1.7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Occasionally the active academic involvement in the college by a tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty member from another unit at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in this college. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or

all of a course from time to time, or a combination of these. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

4.2 Procedures

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, 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, professional practice, research, and associated 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.

4.2.1 Tenure-track Faculty

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

The dean provides approval for the college 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 dean appoints a search committee consisting of at least three faculty members who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the college. The dean may appoint non-faculty members to the search committee, but the majority of the search committee must be composed of faculty members. The dean will not chair search committees but will be involved *ex officio* during the search process.

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

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

- "Phase 1 | Search Preparation & Proactive Recruitment" is the earliest stage in the search process. Key steps during this phase include determining faculty needs for the unit, creating a search strategy (including timeline), establishing a budget, and identifying additional partners to include in the process. The steps in this phase provide guidance on forming committees and 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 dean.

- "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 (associate professor or professor), the eligible faculty vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer involves prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty report a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the college dean. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor, with or without tenure, or professor with tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

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

The college will 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.

4.2.2 Professional Practice Faculty

Searches for professional practice faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the interview is on professional practice rather than scholarship.

4.2.3 Research Faculty

Searches for research faculty proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that during the interview the candidate is not asked to teach a class.

4.2.4 Transfer from the Tenure-track

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a professional practice or research appointment if appropriate circumstances exist. Tenure is lost upon transfer, and transfers must be approved by the college's dean, and the executive vice president and provost.

Per Faculty Rules 3335-7-09 and 3335-7-38, the college may provide for the possibility of transfers from the tenure-track faculty to the professional practice faculty or to the research faculty if appropriate to its circumstances. The Glenn College may permit a tenure-track faculty member to transfer to a professional

practice or research faculty position with a simple majority vote from all tenure-track faculty in the college. Transfers must abide by the following:

- 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;
- When a tenured faculty member transfers to the professional practice faculty or research faculty, tenure is lost; and
- All transfers must be approved by the Glenn College dean and the executive vice president and provost.

Per Faculty Rule 3335-7-10, transfers from the professional practice or research faculty to the tenure-track are not permitted. Professional practice or research faculty may apply for tenure-track positions and compete in regular national searches for such positions.

4.2.5 TIU Transfer

Following consultation with the dean of this college (as TIU head) and with the relevant TIU head and college dean, a tenure-track faculty member may voluntarily move from this TIU to another upon approval of a simple majority of the eligible faculty in the receiving TIU. The eligible faculty in such cases are the tenure-track faculty eligible to vote on faculty appointments at the transferee's rank. See Section 3.1.1 above.

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

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

4.2.6 Associated Faculty

The appointment of all compensated associated faculty follows a formal search following the SHIFT Framework, which includes a job posting in Workday (see Section 4.2 above) and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the ADC and the dean based on recommendation from the search committee.

The review and reappointment of compensated associated faculty are decided by the ADC and the dean.

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated lecturers or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the college and are decided by the ADC, ADF, and the dean.

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

Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are usually made on a semester by semester or annual basis. After the initial appointment, and if the college's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple-year appointment may be offered.

4.2.7 Joint Appointments

A TIU may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another Ohio State TIU as described in Section 4.1.6. The potential for a joint appointment is typically evaluated during the recruitment process and, as such, is subject to all criteria outlined above for each faculty category.

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

4.2.8 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

4.2.9 Endowed Chair and Endowed Professorship Positions

Per university policy, the dean or her/his designee will conduct a formal review every five years before submitting an individual for reappointment to an endowed chair or endowed professorship. Endowed positions are described in the college's Pattern of Administration document.

5. Annual Performance and Merit Review

The college follows the requirements for annual performance and merit reviews as set forth in the Policy on Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment which stipulates that such reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting 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 dean may designate the responsibility for annual performance and merit reviews to appropriate college administrators. The designee or a subcommittee of the eligible faculty may provide a written assessment to the dean. However, the dean 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 dean must be provided to all tenured and non-probationary faculty.

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

- Depending on the faculty member's appointment type, the review is based on: expected performance in teaching, research, and/or service as set forth in the college's guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion when relevant.

- The review of faculty with budgeted joint appointments must include input from the joint appointment unit head for every annual evaluation cycle. The input must be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any assignments; and on goals specific to the individual in the joint unit.

- Meritorious performance in teaching, research, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.

- Annual performance and merit reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting as well as a written assessment.

- Faculty Rule 3335-3-35 requires that there be a reminder in annual review letters that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

5.1 Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, compensated faculty members must submit the following documents to the ADF at the beginning of spring semester:

- updated core dossier using the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline (*all faculty*);
- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible location (*all faculty*);
- Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) Overview Reports for the annual review performance period *(all faculty*);
- peer evaluations of teaching, as applicable, during the annual review performance period (*all faculty*); and
- prospective statements of goals for teaching, research, and service for the upcoming annual review performance period (*all faculty*).

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

5.2 Probationary Tenure-track Faculty

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually. The ADF coordinates the review and prepares a written evaluation in consultation with the committee of eligible faculty. The ADF's annual review letter provides the dean with an assessment of performance and recommendations in teaching, research, and service. For faculty members who hold a joint (split FTE) appointment whose TIU is the Glenn College, the ADF will solicit a letter reporting on the activities and accomplishments of the faculty member in the other unit. The dean meets with the faculty member to discuss performance, future plans, and goals. The dean prepares a written evaluation that includes his or her own assessment of the faculty member's performance and a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The ADF and dean's annual review letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if the faculty member so chooses) becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure.

If the dean 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 Office of Academic Affairs and the executive vice president and provost makes the final decision on renewal or non-renewal of the probationary appointment.

5.2.1 Fourth-Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period, the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exceptions that external evaluations are optional, and the executive vice president and provost makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

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

The eligible faculty conduct a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty vote by electronic ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

The eligible faculty forward a record of the vote and a written performance review to the dean, who conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the college review, the formal comments process per Faculty Rule 3335-06-04) is followed and the case is forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs for review, regardless of whether the dean recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

5.2.2 Extension of the Tenure Clock

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

5.3 Tenured Faculty

Associate professors are reviewed annually. The ADF coordinates the review and prepares a written evaluation in consultation with the committee of eligible faculty. The ADF's annual review letter provides the dean with an assessment of performance and recommendations in teaching, research, and service. For faculty members who hold a joint (split FTE) appointment whose TIU is the Glenn College, the ADF will solicit a letter reporting on the activities and accomplishments of the faculty member in the other unit. The dean or the dean's designee meets with the faculty member to discuss performance, future plans, and goals. The dean prepares a written evaluation that includes

his or her own assessment of the faculty member's performance. The ADF and dean's annual review letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if the faculty member so chooses) becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure.

Professors are reviewed annually. The ADF coordinates the review and prepares a written evaluation. The ADF's annual review letter provides the dean with an assessment of performance and recommendations in teaching, research, and service. For faculty members who hold a joint (split FTE) appointment whose TIU is the Glenn College, the ADF will solicit a letter reporting on the activities and accomplishments of the faculty member in the other unit. The dean or the dean's designee meets with the faculty member to discuss performance, future plans, and goals. The dean prepares a written evaluation that includes his or her own assessment of the faculty member's performance. The ADF and dean's annual review letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if the faculty member so chooses) becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure.

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 tenure initiating unit, 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 university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest-ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty. If a professor has an administrative role, the impact of that role and other assignments will be considered in the annual review.

5.4 Professional Practice Faculty

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

In the penultimate contract year of a professional practice faculty member's appointment, the dean must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 must be observed.

If the position continues, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review proceeds identically to the fourth-year review procedures for

tenure-track faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

During and until the end of the second and subsequent contract periods, the dean has the authority to terminate a professional practice faculty member's contract and may do so only for cause (see Faculty Rule 3335-5-04) or financial exigency (see Faculty Rule 3335-5-02.1). Before terminating a professional practice faculty member's contract before the end of the appointment, the dean must consult with the college promotion and tenure committee.

5.5 Research Faculty

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 penultimate contract year of a research faculty member's appointment, the dean must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If it will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 must be observed.

If the position continues, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review proceeds identically to the fourth-year review procedures for tenure-track faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

5.6 Associated Faculty

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

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

5.7 Salary Recommendations

The dean makes annual salary recommendations. The recommendations are based on the current annual performance and merit review as well as on the performance and merit reviews of the preceding 24 months.

In formulating recommendations, the dean consults with college leadership. The dean should proactively engage in an annual audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the college and across the field or fields represented in the college. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

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

Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation (see Section 5.1 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.

6. Promotion and Promotion and Tenure Reviews

The criteria applied in decisions concerning reappointment, promotion, and tenure for tenure-track faculty are informed by Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, which provides the following statement for context for such 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.

6.1 Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

6.1.1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Faculty Rule 3336-6-02 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 college's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university.

Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Above all, candidates are held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. Although criteria will vary according to an evolving college mission and the responsibilities assigned to each individual faculty member, every candidate is held to a standard of excellence in all performance areas. A mediocre performance in one central area would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another area. For example, a high rate of publication would not compensate for a mediocre record of teaching. The pattern of performance over the probationary period should yield a high degree of confidence that the candidate will continue to develop professionally.

Excellence in teaching, research, 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.

While the criteria for promotion are divided into three areas (teaching, research, and service), we recognize that many academic activities span these domains. Faculty members will need to decide which area a specific activity best fits for purposes of evaluation, and a specific activity should not be reported and evaluated in more than one area. The criteria and examples provided below should be used as a guide to inform the decision for reporting activities within specific areas. The ADFR and P&T procedural

oversight designee (POD) can provide additional guidance to ensure activities are not miscategorized.

Teaching

Teaching is broadly defined in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 to include didactic classroom, non-classroom, and distance instruction, continuing education, advising, and supervising or mentoring students or postdoctoral scholars.

Teaching is one of the primary functions of the Glenn College and the university, therefore, the demonstration of consistently high-quality teaching is a necessary condition for promotion and tenure in the college. Furthermore, the college expects faculty members to engage in ongoing efforts to improve as educators, improve their courses and other teaching activities for which they have direct responsibility, contribute to the ongoing development of curriculum, explore and adopt appropriate innovations in teaching methods, and contribute to the development of an inclusive instructional environment.

The following criteria are used to evaluate teaching excellence:

- demonstrated high-quality teaching
- engaged in student mentoring and advising
- contributed to curricular development

TEACHING	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Demonstrated high-quality teaching	For *promotion to associate*, candidate demonstrated multiple indicators of high-quality instruction (or a trajectory towards high-quality instruction) and adherence with college teaching policies. Sources of evidence include: - Peer evaluations of teaching - Formal student evaluations of teaching (SEIs), including quantitative scores and summaries of written feedback - Dossier teaching narrative Additional evidence of high-quality instruction may include the following: - Receipt of teaching awards as reported in the dossier

	- Participation in courses, programs, or mentoring activities to improve teaching as documented in the dossier - Scholarship or scholarly activities related to teaching and learning as documented in the dossier
Engaged in student mentoring and advising	For *promotion to associate*, candidate demonstrated engagement in student mentoring activities without the expectation of a primary advising role. Sources of evidence for mentoring activities are documented in the dossier and may include the following: - Involvement in undergraduate, master's, and doctoral student research theses or research projects (including coauthored research with a student) - Involvement in doctoral student first-year paper advising or dissertation committees - Involvement in master's or doctoral candidacy exams when such exams are not part of assigned courseload - Involvement with student internships or student engagement with practitioners - Instructed independent study coursework with undergraduate or graduate students - Mentorship of postdoctoral scholars and researchers
Contributed to curricular development	For *promotion to associate*, candidate demonstrated contributions to course content, including but not limited to courses they taught. Sources of evidence may include the following: - Individual contributions to existing course development as summarized in the dossier narrative and annual review letters - New course development or substantive revisions to existing courses as indicated in the dossier narrative

	- Mentorship and guidance provided to graduate student instructors, lecturers, and other faculty in the college as indicated in the dossier narrative - Provided guest lectures as a topical expert for courses inside or outside of the college

Research

Research is broadly defined in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 to include discovery, scholarly and creative work, applied research, and the scholarship of pedagogy.

The John Glenn College of Public Affairs' reputation is tied closely to the quality of its faculty's scholarly research quality and productivity and its relevance to the field of public affairs. Glenn College does not specify a core set of journals to define research quality, nor does it specify a minimum number of publications to define research productivity. In their dossier narrative statements, faculty are expected to make a case for the quality of their publications and their contributions to scholarship and practice. This will be considered alongside other indicators of quality as detailed in the tables below. Given differences in practices among disciplines, the college does not rely on author order to determine contributions to publications but instead relies on the detailed description of contributions reported on the dossier for each publication.

The following criteria are used to evaluate research excellence:

- demonstrated productivity and quality of scholarship
- demonstrated coherent research agenda relevant to public affairs
- demonstrated research impact
- established independent scholarly reputation
- secured or developed resources for research

RESEARCH	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Demonstrated productivity and quality of scholarship	For *promotion to associate*, candidate published a sufficient record of high-quality peer-reviewed publications, as evidenced by: - Peer-reviewed journal articles, books (other than edited volumes), or monographs

	- External reviewers' assessment of the quality of candidate's published research - Scholarly reputation of publication outlets as described in the research statement, based on evidence (e.g., JCR impact factor, journal rank, university press), and as assessed by external reviewers Additional evidence of scholarship in the dossier may include: - Professional association or journal research awards or other formal recognitions of research excellence - Other publications, such as edited books and chapters in edited books, editor reviewed journal articles, publications in proceedings and publications in professional outlets - Potential publications in review process
Demonstrated coherent research agenda relevant to public affairs	For *promotion to associate*, candidate demonstrated a coherent body of research with relevance to public affairs (public policy and management), as evidenced by: - Coherent research narrative with demonstrated relevance to public affairs - External reviewers' assessments of the candidate's research agenda and research trajectory - Participation in the public affairs research community through public affairs conferences, public affairs journal publications, and other research activities as indicated on the dossier
Demonstrated research impact	For *promotion to associate*, candidate demonstrated research impact which includes contributions to scholarship and the academic community as well as contributions to practice, as evidenced by:

	- Contributions of research to scholarship and practice as described in the research narrative - External reviewers' evaluation of the impact of the candidate's work on scholarship and the academic community - Citation trends of published work through Web of Science and Google Scholar as reported in the dossier Additional evidence of research impact reported in the dossier may include: - Invited research presentations at prestigious academic and non-academic venues - Leadership roles in scholarly journals (e.g. guest editor, editorial board) - Media coverage of the candidate's research - Use or citation of research or research products in policy or practice such as in local, state, or federal legislation, regulations, registers, court cases, policy discussions or processes, or public or nonprofit management practices - Research transition activities including copyrights, patents, trademarks or commercialization of research products to be used by government or industry for an applied purpose
Established independent scholarly reputation	For *promotion to associate*, candidate demonstrated independence as a scholar and an emerging national reputation, as evidenced by: - Substantial contributions to published research as reported on the dossier for each published journal article - Established record of at least some published scholarship independent of advisor or research mentor - External evaluators' assessment of the candidate's independent contributions to scholarship and emerging scholarly reputation of candidate

	Evidence may include: - External recognition for expertise in particular areas relevant to the candidate's research, including being invited by government, media, industry, or other stakeholders to provide expertise, as indicated in the dossier
Secured or developed resources for research	For *promotion to associate,* candidate began to secure and develop resources needed to build and sustain a research agenda. While external funding is one type of resource, external funding is not required. Evidence may include: - Participation in research collaborations and research teams as described in the research narrative - Development of new public or private data (qualitative or quantitative), development of new analytical code or packages, or procurement of existing data for research as described in the research narrative - External research funding applied for and secured and its significance as described in the dossier - University (non-college) funding applied for and secured, such as competitive seed grants or grants to support research development as described in the dossier

Service

Service is broadly defined in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 to include providing administrative service to the university, professional service to a faculty member's discipline, and disciplinary expertise to public or private entities beyond the university.

The John Glenn College of Public Affairs is committed to fulfilling its land grant university mission of public service. As such faculty members are expected to engage in service to the college and university, service to the public, and service to the academic profession. Service responsibilities within the college are assigned by the dean with input from the faculty member and in light of the faculty member's workload, including other service obligations. All faculty members are expected to participate in college peer review processes, including appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure

discussions as defined by Faculty Rule 3335-6. Service activities included in the review process are those that are part of the faculty member's workload. While faculty members may engage in approved activities outside of their faculty workload, these activities are not considered a core part of the faculty member's service activities for review purposes.

The following criteria are used to evaluate service contributions:

- demonstrated service to the college and university
- demonstrated service to the public (local, state, national, or international)
- demonstrated service to the academic profession

SERVICE	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Demonstrated service to the college and university	For *promotion to associate,* candidate contributed service to the college as evidenced by: - Substantive participation in shared governance of the college including in regularly scheduled faculty meetings and peer review processes (including faculty hiring and reappointment decisions), as indicated in annual review letters and dossier - Substantive participation in college-level committees as assigned by the dean, as indicated in annual review letters and dossier Candidate may provide additional service to the college and university, as evidenced by: - Participation in student-facing events and activities (e.g. recruitment sessions, orientation sessions, commencement) - Service as graduate faculty representative for university graduate committees, as reported in dossier - Participation in university committees and committees for other colleges and centers, as indicated in annual review letters and dossier
Demonstrated service to the public (local, state, national, or international level)	For *promotion to associate,* candidate demonstrated service to the public at the local,

	state, national, or international level. Evidence of service to the public may include (but is not limited to): - Service to governmental agencies or nonprofit organizations, including research and educational service activities, as documented in the dossier - Presentations to community or practitioner groups as documented in the dossier - Contributions to professional development programs including those administered by the college (e.g. MAPS, PSLA) as documented in the dossier - Contributions to non-academic media (e.g., creating content or being interviewed for newsletters, radio, television, and magazines) as documented in the dossier - Service as a representative of the college at community events as documented in the dossier or annual review letters
Demonstrated service to the academic profession	For *promotion to associate*, candidate began to engage in service to the academic profession. Evidence of service to academia may include (but is not limited to): - Peer reviews for scholarly journal articles as listed in the dossier - Editorial roles with academic journals (including special issues) - Committee participation and leadership roles with relevant professional academic associations as indicated in the dossier - Reviewer of grant proposals for government or philanthropic funding agencies as indicated in the dossier - Facilitator of scholarly workshops, panels, and events as described in the dossier

6.1.2 Promotion to Professor

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 provides the following general criteria for promotion to professor:

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

In addition, 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. Nonetheless, no area of responsibility (teaching, research, service) should be below the minimum level of excellence identified for promotion, nor should outstanding performance in one dimension be used to overcome deficiencies in another dimension. Promotion to professor should be awarded not only to those faculty who have demonstrated impact of their teaching, research, and service, but also to those who have exhibited excellence in leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the college and university.

Excellence in teaching, research, 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.

While the promotion criteria are divided into three areas (teaching, research, and service), we recognize that many academic activities span these domains. Faculty members will need to decide which area a specific activity best fits for purposes of evaluation, and a specific activity should not be reported and evaluated in more than one area (except publications co-authored with students [See OAA *Policies and Procedures Handbook*]). The criteria and examples provided below should be used as a guide to inform the decision for reporting activities within specific areas. The ADFR and P&T procedural oversight designee (POD) can provide additional guidance to ensure activities are not miscategorized.

Teaching

Teaching is broadly defined in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 to include didactic classroom, non-classroom, and distance instruction, continuing education, advising, and supervising or mentoring students or postdoctoral scholars.

Teaching criteria for promotion to professor include that the candidate has met all criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure, and that these have been consistently demonstrated during the period since last promotion or hire at the rank of associate professor, or the last five years, whichever is more recent. Additionally, it is expected that a successful candidate will have assumed leadership roles in curricular activities as well as mentoring of students and other faculty.

The following criteria are used to evaluate teaching excellence for promotion to professor:

- demonstrated consistent record of high-quality teaching
- demonstrated leadership in student mentoring and advising
- demonstrated leadership in curricular development

TEACHING	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Demonstrated consistent record of high-quality teaching	For *promotion to professor*, candidate demonstrated multiple indicators of a consistent record of high-quality instruction and adherence with college teaching policies as evident in student and peer evaluations. Sources of evidence include: - Peer evaluations of teaching - Formal student evaluations of teaching (SEIs), including quantitative scores and summaries of written feedback - Dossier teaching narrative Additional evidence of high-quality instruction may include the following: - Receipt of teaching awards as reported in the dossier - Participation in courses, programs, or mentoring activities to improve teaching as documented in the dossier - Scholarship or scholarly activities related to teaching and learning as documented in the dossier
Demonstrated leadership in student mentoring and advising	For *promotion to professor*, candidate demonstrated leadership in student mentoring activities and held a primary advising role. Sources of evidence are documented in the dossier and may include the following: - Leadership of undergraduate, master's, and doctoral student research theses or research projects (including coauthored research with a student)

	- Advisor of doctoral student first-year paper or chair of dissertation committees - Involvement in master's or doctoral candidacy exams when such exams are not part of assigned courseload - Instructed independent study coursework with undergraduate or graduate students - Facilitated student internships or student engagement with practitioners - Mentorship of postdoctoral scholars and researchers
Demonstrated leadership in curricular development	For *promotion to professor,* candidate demonstrated leadership in the development of curriculum, including but not limited to courses they taught. Sources of evidence may include the following: - Individual contributions to existing course development as summarized in the dossier narrative and annual review letters - New course development or substantive revisions to existing courses as indicated in the dossier narrative - Mentorship and guidance provided to graduate student instructors, lecturers, and other faculty in the college as indicated in the dossier narrative - Provided guest lectures as a topical expert for courses inside or outside of the college

Research

Research is broadly defined in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 to include discovery, scholarly and creative work, applied research, and the scholarship of pedagogy.

The research and scholarship criteria for promotion to professor include all the research and scholarship expectations for promotion to associate professor with tenure, and that these have been demonstrated during the period since last promotion or hire at the rank of associate professor. OAA recommends using a full history of publications and creative work because it provides context to the more recent and relevant research and creative

activity record and/or demonstrates scholarly independence. It is expected that a successful candidate will have a sustained record of research productivity, quality, and impact and is recognized as an expert nationally or internationally in a particular area of research relevant to public affairs.

The following criteria are used to evaluate research excellence for promotion to professor:

- demonstrated sustained productivity and quality of scholarship
- demonstrated robust research agenda relevant to public affairs
- demonstrated sustained research impact
- established scholarly reputation in area(s) of expertise
- secured or developed resources for research

RESEARCH	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Demonstrated sustained productivity and quality of scholarship	For *promotion to professor*, candidate demonstrated a sustained record of high-quality peer-reviewed publications, as evidenced by: - Peer-reviewed journal articles, books (other than edited volumes), or monographs - External reviewers' assessment of the sustained quality of candidate's published research - Scholarly reputation of publication outlets as described in the research statement, based on evidence (e.g., JCR impact factor, journal rank, university press), and as assessed by external reviewers Additional evidence of scholarship in the dossier may include: - Professional association or journal research awards or other formal recognitions of research excellence - Other academic publications, such as edited books and chapters in edited books, editor reviewed journal articles, publications in proceedings and publications in professional outlets

	- Research reports and policy briefs - Potential publications in review process
Demonstrated robust research agenda relevant to public affairs	For *promotion to professor*, candidate demonstrated a robust body of research with relevance to public affairs (public policy and management), as evidenced by: - Robust research narrative with demonstrated relevance to public affairs and candidate's novel contributions - External reviewers' assessments of the candidate's research agenda and unique contributions - Leadership in the public affairs research community through organizing public affairs conferences, public affairs journal publications, and other research activities as indicated on the dossier
Demonstrated sustained research impact	For *promotion to professor*, candidate demonstrated research impact with sustained contributions to scholarship and the academic community as well as contributions to policy and practice, as evidenced by: - Sustained contributions of research to scholarship and practice as described in the research narrative - External reviewers' evaluation of the sustained impact of the candidate's work on scholarship and the academic community - Sustained record of citations of published work through Web of Science and Google Scholar as reported in the dossier Additional evidence includes: - Invited research presentations at prestigious academic and non-academic venues - Leadership roles in scholarly journals (e.g. guest editor, editorial board)

	- Media coverage of the candidate's research - Use or citation of research or research products in policy or practice such as in local, state, or federal legislation, regulations, registers, court cases, policy discussions or processes, or public or nonprofit management practices - Research transition activities including copyrights, patents, trademarks or commercialization of research products to be used by government or industry for an applied purpose
Established scholarly reputation in area(s) of expertise	For *promotion to professor*, candidate established an independent scholarly reputation in an area (or areas) of expertise, as evidenced by: - Novel contributions to published research as reported in the dossier for each published journal article - External evaluators' assessment of the candidate's unique scholarly identity and scholarly reputation - Invited contributions of expertise to reputable scholarly endeavors, such as research workshops, keynote lectures or addresses, or research forums, as indicated in the dossier narrative - External recognition for expertise in particular areas relevant to the candidate's research, including being invited by government, media, industry, or other stakeholders to provide expertise, as indicated in the dossier
Secured or developed resources for research	For *promotion to professor,* candidate secured and developed resources for research. While external funding is one type of resource, external funding is not required. Evidence may include:

	- Leadership of research collaborations and research teams as described in the research narrative - Development of new public or private data (qualitative or quantitative), development of new analytical code or packages, or procurement of existing data for research as described in the research narrative - External research funding applied for and secured as a principal investigator and its significance as described in the dossier - University (non-college) funding applied for and secured as principal investigator, such as competitive seed grants or grants to support research development as described in the dossier - Mentorship of junior scholars to secure research funding or develop new research resources as described in the dossier

Service

Service is broadly defined in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 to include providing administrative service to the university, professional service to a faculty member's discipline, and disciplinary expertise to public or private entities beyond the university.

Service criteria for promotion to professor include that the candidate has met all criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure, and that these have been demonstrated during the period since last promotion or hire at the rank of associate professor, or the last five years, whichever is more recent. This includes, but is not limited to, required participation in college governance activities. All faculty members are expected to participate in college peer review processes, including appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure discussions as defined in Faculty Rule 3335-6. Additionally, it is expected *at a minimum* that the successful candidate will have assumed leadership roles in all three of the categories of service listed in the criteria for associate professor.

The following criteria are used to evaluate service contributions for promotion to professor:

- demonstrated leadership in service to the college and university

- demonstrated leadership in service to the public (local, state, national, or international)
- demonstrated leadership in service to the academic profession

SERVICE	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Demonstrated leadership in service to the college and university	For *promotion to professor,* candidate held a leadership role in service to the college as evidenced by: - Leadership in shared governance of the college including active participation in regularly scheduled faculty meetings and engagement in peer review processes and meetings of the eligible faculty as indicated in annual review letters and dossier - Leadership of and substantive participation in college-level committees as assigned by the dean, as indicated in annual review letters and dossier Additional: - Participation in student-facing events and activities (e.g. recruitment sessions, orientation sessions, commencement) - Consistent service as graduate faculty representative for university graduate committees, as reported in dossier - Participation in university committees and committees for other colleges and centers, as indicated in annual review letters and dossier - Recognition by the university for service roles at the university level, including being invited to participate in university leadership activities as indicated in dossier
Demonstrated leadership in service to the public (local, state, national, or international level)	For *promotion to professor,* candidate demonstrated service to the public at the local, state, national, or international level. Evidence

	of service to the public may include (but is not limited to): - Service to governmental agencies or nonprofit organizations, including research and educational service activities, as documented in the dossier, - Presentations to community or practitioner groups as documented in the dossier - Leadership of and contributions to professional development programs including those administered by the college (e.g. MAPS, PSLA) as documented in the dossier - Contributions to non-academic media (e.g., creating content or being interviewed for newsletters, radio, television, and magazines) as documented in the dossier - Service as a representative of the college at community events as documented in the dossier or annual review letters
Demonstrated leadership in service to the academic profession	For *promotion to professor,* candidate demonstrated leadership in service to the academic profession. Evidence may include (but is not limited to): - Peer reviews for scholarly journal articles and awards for peer reviewing, as listed in the dossier - Editorial roles with academic journals (including special issues and serving as editor, coeditor, and on editorial boards), as indicated in the dossier - Leadership roles with relevant professional academic associations as indicated in the dossier - Reviewer of grant proposals for government or philanthropic funding agencies as indicated in the dossier - Organizer of scholarly workshops, panels, and events as described in the dossier

6.1.3 Promotion of Professional Practice Faculty

Promotion to Professional Practice Associate Professor. For promotion to professional practice associate professor, a faculty member 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 this college. Specific criteria for promotion to professional practice associate professor are a subset of teaching and service criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure as listed below and detailed in the tables in section 6.1.1. Research activity is not expected unless it is part of the faculty member's workload. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

The following criteria are used to evaluate teaching excellence for promotion to professional practice associate professor:

- demonstrated high-quality teaching
- engaged in student mentoring
- contributed to curricular development

The following criteria are used to evaluate service contributions for promotion to professional practice associate professor:

- demonstrated service to the college and university
- demonstrated service to the public (local, state, national, or international)

Promotion to Professional Practice Professor. For promotion to professional practice professor, a faculty member must have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching and professional practice and leadership in service to this college. Specific criteria for promotion to professional practice professor are a subset of teaching and service criteria for promotion to professor as listed below and detailed in the tables in section 6.1.2. Research activity is not expected unless it is part of the faculty member's workload. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

The following criteria are used to evaluate teaching excellence for promotion to professional practice professor:

- demonstrated consistent record of high-quality teaching
- demonstrated leadership in student mentoring
- demonstrated leadership in curricular development

The following criteria are used to evaluate service contributions for promotion to professional practice professor:

- demonstrated leadership in service to the college and university
- demonstrated leadership in service to the public (local, state, national, or international)

6.1.4 Promotion of Research Faculty

Promotion to Research Associate Professor. For promotion to research associate professor, a faculty member must have a substantial record of high-quality focused research consistent with an appointment devoted solely to research. A record of continuous external research funding is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation. Specific criteria for promotion to associate research professor are a subset of research criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure as listed below and detailed in section 6.1.1. Evidence includes external reviews for promotion of research faculty. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

The following criteria are used to evaluate research excellence for promotion to research associate professor:

- demonstrated productivity and quality of scholarship
- demonstrated coherent research agenda relevant to public affairs
- demonstrated research impact
- established independent scholarly reputation
- secured or developed resources for research

Promotion to Research Professor. For promotion to research professor, a faculty member must have a national and international reputation. A record of continuous external research funding is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding. Specific criteria for promotion to research professor are a subset of research criteria for promotion to professor as listed below and detailed in section 6.1.2. Evidence includes external reviews for promotion of research faculty. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

The following criteria are used to evaluate research excellence for promotion to research professor:

- demonstrated sustained productivity and quality of scholarship
- demonstrated robust research agenda relevant to public affairs
- demonstrated sustained research impact

- established independent scholarly reputation
- secured or developed resources for research

6.1.5 Promotion of 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, 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. For promotion to senior lecturer, a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and contributions to the college's curricular offerings and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and curricular service relevant to the mission of this college. Specific criteria for promotion to senior lecturer are a subset of teaching criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Research and service activity is not expected.

The following criteria are used to evaluate teaching excellence for promotion to senior lecturer:

- demonstrated high-quality teaching
- engaged in student mentoring
- contributed to curricular development

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

6.2 Procedures

The college'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 professional practice faculty, and 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*.

6.2.1 Procedures for Tenure-Track, Professional Practice, and Research Faculty

6.2.1.1 Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier and providing a copy of the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed, if other than the college's current document. If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for recommending reviewers and reviewing the list of potential external evaluators compiled for their case according to college 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 format. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Dossier Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline, including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist.

While the Promotion and Tenure Committee 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 them.

Candidate statements regarding teaching, research, and service are embedded in the dossier per the format adopted by OAA. The complete dossier is forwarded when the review moves beyond the college. The documentation of research and service noted below is for use during the college review only, unless reviewers at the university level specifically request it.

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

Required documentation includes:

- cumulative SEI reports for every class, provided by the dean's office;
- peer evaluation of teaching reports (see Section 9.2, Peer Evaluation of Teaching) provided by the dean's office; and
- documentation of teaching activities as listed and described in the core dossier (see Section 6.1, Criteria and Evidence).

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

it is the scholarship performance since the start date or date of last promotion that is to be the focus of the evaluating parties.

Required documentation includes:

- electronic or PDF copies of books, articles, and scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. PDF copies are not required if electronic copies are available online.
- documentation of grants and contracts applied for and received, as confirmed by the associate dean for faculty and research.
- documentation of resources secured or developed for research (per Section 6.1, Criteria and Evidence).
- documentation of research activities as listed and described in the core dossier (see Section 6.1, Criteria and Evidence).
- materials provided for external review
    - Extended research statement. Separate from the dossier research narrative, candidates going up for promotion are required to prepare a research statement for external reviewers. The recommended length of the statement is no more than five pages. Within the statement, the candidate should describe the nature of their contribution in the five to six representative publications.
    - PDFs for five to six representative publications
    - Curriculum Vitae (CV)

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

Required documentation includes:

- documentation of service activities as listed and described in the core dossier (see Section 6.1, Criteria and Evidence); and
- any available documentation (e.g., letters from committee chairs) of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier.

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document
Candidates must indicate the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. A candidate may be reviewed using the college's current APT document, or they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion (or last reappointment in the case of 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 on the OAA website, 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 college.

External Evaluations (see also External Evaluations below)
If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed according to college guidelines. The candidate may add no more than three additional names but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names. The dean decides whether removal is justified.

6.2.1.2 Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

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

- to review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.

- to consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a 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 committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.

    - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.

    - A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 A(3) only once. Faculty Rules 3335-7-08 and 3335-7-36 make the same provision for non-probationary 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 dean, 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:** The dean will select the chair and the two members of the P&T committee to serve the following academic year. The eligible faculty will then select the Procedures Oversight Designee from among the two members of the P&T committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.

    - **Late Spring**: Suggest names of external evaluators to the ADF following the procedures described below.

    - **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates and the ADF to ensure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.

    - Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary (not required) and 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, research, and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. In presenting the analysis of the record, the committee does not take a position on the record.

    - Consider the interdisciplinary work of a candidate across multiple units as part of the whole work, especially if the candidate has a joint appointment in another unit.

    - Revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of the full eligible faculty, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the ADF and dean.

    - 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 dean in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit. The full eligible faculty do not vote on these cases since the college's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on the college's cases.

6.2.1.3 Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

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

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

6.2.1.4 Associate Dean for Faculty Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the ADF are as follows:

- to determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. For tenure-track assistant professors, the ADF will confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an MOU at the time of promotion with tenure.

- to attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting (the ADF is an *ex officio*, non-voting member of the CEF). At the request of the eligible faculty, the ADF will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.

- Annually, to lead the administration of the promotion and tenure review process as described below.

    - **Early Spring**: To identify potential faculty for mandatory and nonmandatory promotion and tenure review and to provide information about the college's process.

    - **Early Spring:** In the case of nonmandatory reviews, collect required materials from the candidate and administrative files (i.e., full CV with information on teaching, research and service, SEI's and peer evaluations) and make them available to the P&T committee for their review and recommendation whether to proceed.

    - **Late Spring**: To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the eligible faculty, the dean and the candidate.

- **Early Autumn**: 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.

- **Early Autumn**: 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.

6.2.1.5 Dean Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the college dean are as follows:

- to attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting (the dean is an *ex officio*, non-voting member of the CEF). At the request of the eligible faculty, the dean will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.

- to charge each member of the eligible faculty to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.

- to review faculty with budgeted joint appointments. The TIU head from the joint appointment unit must provide a letter of evaluation to the primary TIU head. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.

- **Late Autumn:** to provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.

- **Late Autumn:** to meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.

- **Late Autumn:** to inform each candidate in writing after completion of the college review process:

    - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and dean;

    - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and dean; and

    - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the eligible faculty, for inclusion in the

dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the dean, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.

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

- to forward the completed dossier to the executive vice president and provost, who will review the decisions of the dean and the eligible faculty.

- to receive the Promotion and Tenure Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with his or her own independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the head of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

In the instance that the dean is not a professor and thus may not participate in the review, the executive vice president and provost or his or her representative will assume the duties of the dean. The executive vice president and provost will appoint the Promotion and Tenure Committee and oversee the review process.

6.2.2 Procedures for Associated Faculty

Adjunct faculty and associated faculty with tenure-track titles for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed in Section 6.2.1 above, with the exception that the review does not proceed to the executive vice president and provost if the dean's recommendation is negative (a negative recommendation by the dean is final in such cases). Positive recommendations shall proceed to the executive vice president and provost.

For the promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer, candidates are responsible for submitting documentation of their teaching approach and teaching effectiveness. The time period for teaching documentation is the start date to present, or the last five years, whichever is more recent. The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the ADC in consultation with the eligible faculty for tenured associate professors and professional practice associate professors. The Executive Vice President and Provost should notified of positive recommendations.

Required documentation includes:

- teaching narrative statements (includes "Approach to and Goals in Teaching" and "Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness," as defined in the core dossier outline);
- cumulative SEI reports for every class, provided by the dean's office; and
- peer evaluation of teaching reports (see section Chapter 9.1, Peer Evaluation of Teaching), provided by the dean's office.

6.2.3 Procedures for 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 promotion and tenure or promotion reviews and all research appointment contract renewals and promotion reviews. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for professional practice or associated faculty unless research is a significant part of the faculty member's workload. The decision to seek external evaluations for a professional practice or associated faculty member will be made by the dean after consulting with the candidate, the ADF, and the chair of the Promotion and Tenure committee.

In keeping with the national standing of The Ohio State University, the Glenn College will generally obtain evaluations from faculty in programs that are nationally recognized in their field or subfields. Because of the multidisciplinary nature of the college's faculty, a specific list of institutions or even programs cannot be easily drawn for the college. However, the following principles will be followed in identifying external reviewers: the external reviewer will be 1) a distinguished expert in the field, as demonstrated by publications; national and international awards; prominence in professional organizations; and presence on editorial boards of major journals; and 2) will be nationally or internationally known in the field related to a candidate's interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary projects. Justification will be provided in each case when a suggested evaluator is from a program that does not meet these criteria.

A conflict of interest for external reviewers exists if the reviewer is or has been to the candidate: 1) a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor; 2) a research collaborator, which includes someone who has been a coauthor on a publication within the past 3 years, including pending publications and submissions; 3) a collaborator on a project within the past 3 years, including current and planned collaborations; 4) in a consulting/financial arrangement with the candidate within the past 3 years, including receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services); 5) a relative or close personal friend; or 6) 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 (5) credible and useful written evaluations must be obtained. A credible and useful evaluation:

- is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate, or someone who has collaborated extensively with the candidate or is currently collaborating with the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This college will solicit

evaluations from professors with institutional affiliations from programs that meet the criteria described above. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.

- provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will “usefulness” be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the college 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 ADF and dean in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure committee, the committee of eligible faculty and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this college requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The college follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format for letters requesting external evaluations. See a sample letter for tenure-track and research faculty and a sample letter for professional practice faculty.

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 dean, who will decide what, if any, action is warranted (requesting permission from the Office of Academic Affairs to exclude that letter from the dossier). It is in the candidate's self-interest to ensure 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 college’s written evaluations or brought to the attention of the Office of Academic Affairs for advice.

7. Promotion and Promotion 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 review may not be adequate for the granting of promotion or tenure with promotion for faculty on the tenure track or, in the case of 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 university 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.

8. 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.

9. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

9.1 Student Evaluation of Teaching

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

9.2 Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The ADF and ADC jointly oversee the college's peer evaluation of teaching process.

Annually, the ADF and ADC identify the faculty to be reviewed each year. The following decision criteria are used when identifying faculty for peer review:

- Probationary tenure-track and professional practice faculty members should receive a peer evaluation of teaching for at least one course per year prior to going

up for review for promotion or reappointment, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.

- Tenured associate professors and nonprobationary professional practice professors (any rank) should receive a peer evaluation every other year and at least twice prior to going up for promotion, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.

- Tenured professors should receive periodic peer evaluations, but this does not need to take the form of a classroom observation and peer written evaluation.

- New associated faculty members (lecturers) should receive a peer evaluation during the first semester that they teach a course for the college or when teaching again after a lag.

- Doctoral students should receive a peer evaluation each time they teach a course until they have taught the same course at least twice successfully.

- New or substantially revised courses should be considered for a peer evaluation the first time they are taught.

- Faculty or lecturers with substantially below-average student teaching evaluations should be considered for peer evaluation in a subsequent semester.

- Faculty members not currently scheduled for review may request a review, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. Such reviews may focus on specific aspects of instruction requested by the faculty member and may or may not include class visitations. The ADF and ADC are informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning.

Peer evaluators are identified by the ADF and ADC annually. Peer evaluations of teaching for tenure-track and professional practice faculty members are conducted by college faculty, generally at a higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed (e.g., probationary faculty are reviewed by tenured faculty). Peer evaluations of teaching for associated faculty members or doctoral students may be conducted by experienced

college lecturers, teaching staff, or faculty members (of any rank). The following decision criteria are used when identifying peer evaluators:

- Faculty members at the rank of assistant professor should conduct no more than one peer review per academic year depending on other service commitments in the college, with no reviews expected in the first three years of an appointment.

- Faculty members at the rank of associate professor should conduct at least one peer review per year unless they receive a reduction for other service performed in the college.

- Faculty members at the rank of professor should conduct two peer reviews per year unless they receive a reduction for other service performed in the college.

- Faculty members of any rank should not be assigned to conduct peer reviews during an off-duty semester (typically summer or during leave).

- Affiliated faculty (lecturers) who have successfully taught multiple courses for the college and teaching staff members may serve as peer reviewers for other affiliated faculty members or doctoral students.

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instruction materials. The peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to establish a time for the visit and to understand the goals of the course and the candidate's teaching philosophy. For online courses, reviewers should join the course as a student to review materials and should sit in on or review synchronous sessions at least once during the semester, if such sessions are a part of the course.

In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should focus on such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the class visits, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give feedback and also submits a written report to the ADF and ADC, copied to the candidate. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if desired. The reports are included in the candidate’s promotion and tenure dossier, as appropriate.

Additionally, college curricular chairs and deans meet at the conclusion of each semester to review student and peer observation course feedback and to coordinate written and oral feedback.