# APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE

Criteria and Procedures

Department of History

Division of Arts & Humanities

College of Arts and Sciences

The Ohio State University

Revision OAA Approved 9/29/2025

**APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE**

**Criteria and Procedures for the Department of History**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**


I. PREAMBLE ..... 1

II. DEPARTMENT MISSION ..... 1

III. DEFINITIONS ..... 1

A. COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY ..... 1

1) TENURE-TRACK FACULTY ..... 2

2) ASSOCIATED FACULTY ..... 2

3) CONFLICT OF INTEREST ..... 3

4) MINIMUM COMPOSITION ..... 4

B. PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE ..... 4

C. QUORUM ..... 4

D. RECOMMENDATION FROM THE COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY ..... 4

1) APPOINTMENT ..... 5

2) PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION ..... 5

IV. APPOINTMENTS ..... 5

A. CRITERIA ..... 6

1) TENURE-TRACK FACULTY ..... 6

2) ASSOCIATED FACULTY ..... 7

3) REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY ..... 8

4) EMERITUS FACULTY ..... 9

5) COURTESY APPOINTMENTS FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY ..... 9

B. PROCEDURES ..... 10

1) TENURE-TRACK FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS ..... 10

2) ASSOCIATED FACULTY ..... 12

3) REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY ..... 12

4) COURTESY APPOINTMENTS FOR FACULTY ..... 13

V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEWS PROCEDURES ..... 13

A. DOCUMENTATION ..... 14

B. PROBATIONARY TENURE-TRACK FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS ..... 14

1) FOURTH-YEAR REVIEW ..... 16

2) EXTENSION OF THE TENURE CLOCK ..... 16
C. TENURED FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS ..... 16
D. ASSOCIATED FACULTY ..... 17
E. REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY ..... 18
F. SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 18
VI. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION WITH TENURE, AND FOR PROMOTION ..... 19
A. CRITERIA AND EVIDENCE THAT SUPPORT PROMOTION ..... 19
1) PROMOTION FROM ASSISTANT TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE ..... 19
2) PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR ..... 22
3) ASSOCIATED FACULTY ..... 24
4) REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY ..... 25
B. PROCEDURES ..... 25
1) TENURE-TRACK FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS ..... 25
2) PROMOTION FROM ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO PROFESSOR: REVIEW GROUP RESPONSIBILITIES ..... 31
3) PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES ..... 32
4) ELIGIBLE FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES ..... 33
5) DEPARTMENT CHAIR RESPONSIBILITIES ..... 34
6) PROCEDURES FOR ASSOCIATED FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS ..... 36
7) PROCEDURES FOR REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY ..... 36
8) EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS ..... 36
VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS ..... 38
VIII. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS ..... 39
IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING ..... 39
A. STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING ..... 39
B. PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING ..... 39
X. APPENDIX ..... 41
A. PROSPECTIVE SPOUSAL/PARTNER HIRES ..... 41
1) PROCEDURES ..... 41
2) CRITERIA ..... 43

# I. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty, the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, and any additional policies established by the college and the university. Should university or college rules and policies change, the department 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 four years on appointment or reappointment of the department chair.

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

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

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

# II. DEPARTMENT MISSION

The history department at The Ohio State University aspires to distinction in scholarship, teaching, and service. As a top-tier department in an eminent public university, we seek to advance the highest standards of our discipline. Because we believe that research inspires great teaching, our mission is to promote the finest historical scholarship, and to offer both graduate and undergraduate students the most rigorous and intellectually challenging education. Espousing the values of a collegial community of historians, we explore connections across areas, eras, and themes. We strive to provide comprehensive and challenging understandings of the complexity of the human past to audiences across the state, the nation, and the world at large.

# III. DEFINITIONS

## A. COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY

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

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

## 1) TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

### Initial Appointment Reviews

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

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

### Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

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

## 2) ASSOCIATED FACULTY

### Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- The initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members is based on search committee recommendations to the department chair.

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

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

**Promotion Reviews**

Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have adjunct titles and lecturer titles.

The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the department chair in consultation with the tenure-track faculty.

## 3) 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.

#### 4) MINIMUM COMPOSITION

In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the department chair, after consulting with the dean, will appoint a faculty member from another department within the college.

## B. PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE

The department has a Promotion and Tenure Committee that assists the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in managing the personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The committee consists of four professors and two associate professors. The committee's chair and membership are appointed by the department chair normally for a single, two-year term. It is desirable that one half of the committee members at each level be replaced each year. The chair shall also appoint a regional campus faculty member of the appropriate rank as the seventh member of the committee to serve when the committee is reviewing regional campus faculty.

## C. QUORUM

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is more than 35 percent of the eligible faculty from all campuses not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

## D. RECOMMENDATION FROM THE COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY

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

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

### 1) APPOINTMENT

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

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

### 2) PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION

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

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

## IV. APPOINTMENTS

The Department of History expects that its senior members will be distinguished scholars within the historical profession and that its junior members will be persons who have reasonable promise of achieving this status. Meritorious research is therefore a necessary condition for appointment or promotion to any continuing tenure-track position.

Other important considerations include the individual's record to date in teaching and service; the potential for professional growth in these areas; and the potential for interacting with colleagues and students in a way that will enhance their academic work and attract other outstanding faculty and students to the department.

No offer will be extended in the event that the search process does not yield one or more candidates who would enhance the quality of the department. The search is either cancelled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track 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.

# A. CRITERIA

## 1) TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

### a. Instructor

Appointments at the rank of instructor should normally be made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor but the appointee has not completed the required terminal degree at the onset of the appointment. Procedures for appointment are identical to those for an assistant professor. The TIU will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment to the rank of instructor is always probationary and may not exceed three years. Promotion to assistant professor occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. An instructor must be qualified for promotion to assistant professor by the end of the third year or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the 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.

### b. Assistant Professor

To be eligible for appointment as an assistant professor, including promotion from instructor to assistant professor, the candidate should have the PhD degree or its equivalent and should have demonstrated potential for significant published contributions to research in his/her field, ability as an effective teacher of history, and potential for high-quality service to the department and the profession. An appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Committee of the Eligible Faculty determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period.

### c. Professor or Associate Professor

Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to these ranks. An appointment as associate professor will generally entail tenure. However, a probationary period not to exceed four years may be granted by the Office of Academic Affairs upon petition of the department and college 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. For the petition to be approved, a compelling rationale must be provided regarding why appointment at a senior rank is appropriate but tenure is not.

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

All appointments to the rank of associate professor or professor require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

## 2) ASSOCIATED FACULTY

The department may extend associated appointments to faculty who provide significant teaching and service. These are not tenured or tenure-track appointments and may or may not have a salary. An individual with an associated appointment may not vote at any level of departmental governance and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters. 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.

In the Department of History, associated appointments include:

### a. Senior Lecturers

To be eligible for appointment as a senior lecturer, the candidate should have the PhD degree or its equivalent and should have demonstrated ability as an effective teacher of history. Senior lecturers will teach courses only at the 5000 level or lower. Their teaching must be evaluated by their students and bythe chair or his/her designee. Senior lecturers may be reappointed only if their teaching is effective and the department has a continuing need for their services. Senior lecturers are compensated but 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.

### b. Lecturers

To be eligible for appointment as a lecturer, the candidate must have

completed the PhD general examination in history, though not necessarily the doctoral dissertation. Lecturers will teach undergraduate courses only. Their teaching must be evaluated by their students and by the chair or his/her designee. Lecturers may be reappointed only if their teaching is effective and the department has a continuing need for their services. Lecturers are compensated but are not eligible for tenure. Lecturers 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.

**c. Visiting Faculty**

To be eligible for appointment as a visiting assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, the candidate must have credentials as a teacher and scholar similar to those of a tenure-track or tenured faculty member at the same rank, as stated elsewhere in this document. 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. The appointment of a visiting faculty member may not exceed three continuous years. Visiting faculty are eligible to teach at every level of the curriculum, as appropriate to their professional standing as scholars. Visiting faculty are compensated.

**d. Adjunct Faculty**

To be eligible for appointment as an adjunct assistant professor, adjunct associate professor, or adjunct professor, the candidate must have credentials as a teacher and scholar comparable to those of a tenure-track or tenured faculty member of the same rank. Adjunct faculty are appointed for renewable terms of one to three years. Appointment as an adjunct faculty member is appropriate for those who do not have an appointment at The Ohio State University in another tenure-initiating unit. Adjunct appointments carry an expectation of substantial involvement with and contributions to the academic work of the department, such as by teaching, or advising, or service on committees. Adjunct faculty may be compensated and are eligible for promotion (but not tenure). The relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

3) **REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY**

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

rank to teaching experience and quality.

Regional campus criteria for the appointment of associated faculty are the same as those for Columbus campus associated faculty.

4) **EMERITUS FACULTY**

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

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the department chair (regional campus dean for associated faculty on regional campuses) outlining academic performance and citizenship. The Committee of Eligible faculty (tenured associate professors and professors) will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair. The department chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean or his or her designee. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule 3335-05-04, emeritus status will not be considered.

See the OAA *Policies and Procedures Handbook* Volume 1, Chapter 1, for information about the types of perquisites that may be offered to emeritus faculty, provided resources are available.

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

5) **COURTESY APPOINTMENTS FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY**

For an individual to hold a 0% FTE courtesy appointment in the Department of History, he/she must have a PhD in history (or a related field) and hold a tenure-track appointment in another unit at The Ohio State University. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized. An individual with a courtesy appointment may not participate in department meetings, be appointed to department committees, or serve as the sole advisor of doctoral students. However, he or she may hold graduate faculty status, if the Graduate Studies Committee agrees, and in that capacity may direct master's theses and serve as co-adviser to doctoral students and as a representative of an

outside field. It is expected that those holding courtesy appointments will be available for such service and may also collaborate with faculty in undergraduate courses, in graduate instruction, in program development, and/or in common research endeavors. The Department of History typically grants courtesy appointments when it seeks to advance these purposes, and terminates such appointments when the same purposes are no longer served.

## B. PROCEDURES

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

See the Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments for information on the following topics:

- recruitment of tenure-track, clinical, 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
- letters of offer

### 1) TENURE-TRACK FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS

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

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

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

After consultation with the faculty in meeting, the department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within

the department. The committee shall also include one non-voting graduate student representative.

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

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

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

on creating a seamless transition for incoming faculty and their partners/families, if applicable.

- "Phase 6 | Reflect and Assess the Search" is a process supported by OAA to reflect on the hiring cycle each year and evaluate areas that may need improvement and additional support.

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor, with or without tenure, or professor with tenure, 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 department chair decides which candidate to approach first. The department chair negotiates the details of the offer, including compensation, with the candidate based on guidelines determined by the College of Arts and Sciences divisional deans and college dean in consultation with the chair.

The department 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.

2) **ASSOCIATED FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS**

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

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

Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one year, 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.

3) **REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY**

The appointment of all compensated regional campus faculty follows a formal

search following the SHIFT Framework, which includes a job posting in Workday and candidate interviews.

The regional campus dean/director has the responsibility for determining the need for a tenure-track or tenured position in history on a regional campus. In such cases, the dean/director should consult with and seek agreement with the chair. The chair and the regional campus dean/director will agree on a single search committee consisting of members of both units. Candidates should be interviewed by the regional campus dean/director, chair, the search committee, and eligible faculty of both campuses. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. Candidates will be evaluated on both campuses, with the Columbus-campus history department faculty taking primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's record and potential as a scholar. At the end of the evaluation process, the faculty will make a recommendation to the chair and the regional campus dean/director. A decision to hire requires agreement on the part of the chair and of the regional campus dean/director. Negotiations with a candidate should not begin without such an agreement, and a letter of offer must be signed by the chair and the dean/director of the regional campus.

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

### 4) COURTESY APPOINTMENTS FOR FACULTY

Individual members of the faculty may propose a courtesy appointment for a tenure-track faculty member from another Ohio State tenure-initiating unit. Courtesy appointments in the Department of History are made by the chair after consultation with the faculty in a meeting. The department chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

## V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEWS PROCEDURES

The department 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.

Depending on a faculty member's appointment type, the annual performance and merit review is based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.

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

## A. DOCUMENTATION

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to the department chair no later than the final day of autumn semester classes:

- Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline (*required for probationary faculty and recommended for associate professors*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (*non-probationary faculty*)
- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)

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

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

## B. PROBATIONARY TENURE-TRACK FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS

At the time of appointment, probationary faculty members shall be provided with all pertinent documents detailing department, college, and university promotion and tenure policies and criteria. If these documents are revised during the probationary period, probationary faculty members shall be provided with copies of the revised documents.

The department chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall review all untenured

faculty in each year of their probationary service. Faculty shall be reviewed in the areas of research, teaching, and service, and must give evidence of continuing development in each area. The department chair shall inform probationary faculty members at the time of initial appointment and in a timely fashion each year thereafter when the annual review will take place, and provide a copy of the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline to be used by the faculty member in reporting accomplishments to date. Faculty members engaged in ongoing scholarship such as digital archives and data collection should consult annually with the chair regarding the progress and maturation of their projects, what forms and availability the projects will assume, and how and when they will be peer-reviewed. The annual review enables the department to communicate its performance expectations to probationary faculty, to evaluate progress towards those expectations, and to avoid reappointment in cases where the candidate is not likely to earn promotion and tenure.

Faculty under review are responsible for providing an appropriate statement and appropriate professional materials for review to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Such materials are described above in Section V.A). The faculty will submit materials in the format prescribed by the OAA dossier outline, and the materials will constitute the faculty member's dossier. The department chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee may include additional information which they consider relevant for inclusion in the dossier.

At the completion of each annual review, the department chair shall provide the faculty member and the divisional dean a copy of the committee's review as well as the chair's own written assessment of the faculty member's performance and professional development, and an indication as to whether the faculty member should be reappointed for an additional year. The chair's assessment, which may take the form of an addendum to the committee review, will be based on the committee review, the probationary faculty member's current vita and Annual Activity Report, and any other pertinent information that he/she has received in performing the duties of chair. The chair's assessment will constitute the annual performance review of the probationary faculty member and should include both strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate. All annual review letters to date shall become a part of a faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure. Probationary faculty members will meet annually with the chair to discuss their annual reviews and future plans. If they choose, they may respond in writing to the review of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and to the chair's performance review. If the department chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The department chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year.

In the case of a negative review by the Promotion and Tenure Committee or in the case of a negative recommendation from the chair in the candidate's first, second, third, or fifth year, the case will be reviewed by the eligible faculty consistent with fourth-year review procedures (see Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 and section just below). Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

### 1) FOURTH-YEAR REVIEW

Procedures in the fourth-year review and the sixth-year review are the same, except that external letters are optional in the fourth year and the dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

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

The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate. The Promotion and Tenure Committee may ask the candidate to provide additional materials or ask the candidate questions on aspects of the dossier. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

In cases where the faculty member is a member of more than one department, or where the faculty appointment has been funded with the support of a Discovery Theme, in early spring, the department chair will request a comprehensive performance review from the other chair or director of said Discovery Theme for inclusion in the dossier.

The eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review, as drafted by the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee or his/her designee, to the department chair. The department chair conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

### 2) EXTENSION OF THE TENURE CLOCK

Probationary faculty at the rank of instructor, assistant professor, and associate professor may extend the probationary period under Faculty Rule 3335- 6-03 (D). 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. Probationary faculty will be reviewed annually during their probationary periods regardless of time extended or reduced. Approved extensions or reductions do not limit the department's right to recommend nonrenewal of an appointment during an annual review.

## C. TENURED FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS

The chair will review a faculty member's annual review documentation and other documents as appropriate, will seek the advice of colleagues as necessary, and will use this information as the basis for an annual performance review. Following a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting between the chair (or his/her designee) and each tenured faculty member, the chair will provide each faculty member with written feedback regarding his/her performance and future plans. That review will enable the chair to highlight performance problems where they exist and to assist faculty in carrying out their professional plans.

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 college, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest-ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty.

If a professor has an administrative role, the impact of that role and other assignments will be considered in the annual review. The department chair prepares a written evaluation of performance against these expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

A tenured member of the department may respond in writing to the chair's performance evaluations.

## D. ASSOCIATED FACULTY

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

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

## E. REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY

Regional campus tenure-track faculty are reviewed according to the process established on that campus, with the review focusing on teaching and service. Following the review by the regional campus, the regional campus dean meets with the department chair for evaluation of the faculty member's research and creative activity during the review period. The regional campus dean provides an annual performance and merit review letter. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice. For probationary tenure-track faculty, in the event that the regional campus dean recommends renewal and the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the case shall be reviewed by the college dean or their designee, with the college dean's or their designee's judgment prevailing.

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

## F. SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS

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

In formulating recommendations, the department chair consults with a Salary Advisory Committee consisting of the vice chair, three elected members of the Advisory Committee from the Columbus campus and the elected member of the Advisory Committee from the regional campuses. (See the department's Pattern of Administration for a full description of this committee.) As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the department chair divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) and considers market and internal equity issues. The department chair should proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in it. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

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

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

# VI. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION WITH TENURE, AND FOR PROMOTION

## A. CRITERIA AND EVIDENCE THAT SUPPORT PROMOTION

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

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

### 1) PROMOTION FROM ASSISTANT TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE

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

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

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

Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Above all, candidates are held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. For example, if a candidate's primary teaching role is and will continue to be undergraduate teaching, then excellence in undergraduate teaching is required. A mediocre performance in this area

would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another aspect of teaching that is a significantly smaller part of the individual's responsibilities.

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

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

The content below is not meant to be exhaustive but is provided to demonstrate the types of criteria and evidence that may support promotion to associate professor with tenure in this department.

| **TEACHING** | |
|---|---|
| **Criteria** | **Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met** |
| 1. Candidate must have demonstrated excellence as a teacher of history on his or her campus.<br><br>2. Candidate must have developed and applied effective instructional techniques and materials appropriate for the objectives and level of the courses taught. | • Peer reviews of candidate's instruction report effective classroom teaching and a positive trajectory during review period.<br>• Peer reviews of course materials demonstrate course materials (syllabus, assignments, examinations, additional assigned activities) are up-to-date and appropriate for the topic and the audience.<br>• Overall SEI scores regularly meet or exceed average for Department of History.<br>• If submitted, discursive student evaluations demonstrate qualitative instructional excellence.<br>• Instructional report demonstrates effective instruction at various levels across the curriculum.<br>• Developing new curricula and courses.<br>• Mentoring undergraduate students through independent studies, supervising honors theses, the Drake Institute, STEP, or other, similar programs.<br>• Earning awards or other positive recognition for undergraduate instruction and mentoring.<br>• Graduate student advisees earn awards.<br>• Graduate student advisees complete program and earn placement in appropriate professional position.<br>• Completed Foundations, Impact Teaching through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning.<br>• Completed Teaching at Ohio State through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning.<br>• Awarding of "Endorsement" from Drake Institute of Teaching and Learning. |

| **SCHOLARSHIP/RESEARCH** | |
|---|---|
| **Criteria** | **Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and** |

| | Showing Criteria Have Been Met |
|---|---|
| Candidates must have published a significant body of research in his/her field showing that he/she is capable of sustained original work and significant achievements in research. In the discipline of history, a candidate for promotion with tenure at major research institutions is typically expected to have at least one book published or under final board-approved contract and in production, and to show other evidence of scholarly productivity based on original research. Such work can include refereed journal articles and/or book chapters; digital and public-history projects; and conference papers. There must also be evidence that he/she will continue to make original and significant scholarly contributions in the future. | • A book manuscript that is either published or in production with a letter from the press affirming that the book is under contract and has been accepted for publication with no further revisions required.<br>• A body of published work including peer-reviewed journal articles and book chapters consistent with the standards of the discipline of history and the candidate's specific field.<br>• Published reviews of the candidate's work indicating that the candidate has made substantial contributions to the discipline or their field of history.<br>• Qualitative evaluations of the candidate's scholarship completed by at least five external reviewers.<br>• Complete publication record including edited and co-edited volumes, editor-reviewed and other journal articles, conference papers, monographs, books, book chapters, textbooks based on scholarship, magazine articles and on-line publications.<br>• Success at securing competitive national or international grants, fellowships, and other support for research.<br>• Research awards and other positive recognition for research achievements (internal and external).<br>• Keynote presentations at international conferences.<br>• Invited talks at symposia, conferences, other field specific venues that demonstrate the recognition of the intellectual leadership of the candidate.<br>• Forthcoming publications, essays submitted for publication, and conference presentations delivered demonstrate progress on new research projects. |

| SERVICE | |
|---|---|
| **Criteria** | **Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met** |
| Candidate must have an excellent record of service as a member of the department, university, and scholarly communities. | • Evidence of service contributions to the Department of History and quality indicators of the outcomes of the contributions.<br>• Annual evaluations document excellent service to Department of History.<br>• Evidence of service contributions to the College and University and quality indicators of the outcomes of those contributions.<br>• Advising student clubs, College Honors Committee, or other organizations.<br>• Serving as an outside representative on graduate student examination committees.<br>• Evidence of service contributions to the scholarly community/profession and quality indicators of the outcomes of those contributions.<br>• Recognition (awards and prizes) for service to the Department of History, College, University, and/or the scholarly community/profession. |
| The department also recognizes the value of professionally related service to the community and gives weight to such service. | • Activities/quality indicators of professionally related service to the community. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Unique professionally related service to disadvantaged communities. |

## 2) PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 establishes the following general criteria for promotion to the rank of professor:

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

| **TEACHING** | |
|---|---|
| **Criteria** | **Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met** |
| 1. Candidate must have demonstrated continued excellence as a teacher of history at all levels of the department's curriculum on his or her campus.<br><br>2. Candidate must have developed and applied effective instructional techniques and materials appropriate for the objectives and level of the courses taught. | • Peer reviews of candidate's instruction report effective classroom teaching and a positive trajectory during review period.<br>• Peer reviews of course materials demonstrate course materials (syllabus, assignments, examinations, additional assigned activities) are up-to-date and appropriate for the topic and the audience.<br>• Overall SEI scores regularly meet or exceed average for Department of History.<br>• If submitted, discursive student evaluations demonstrate qualitative instructional excellence.<br>• Instructional report demonstrates effective instruction at various levels across the curriculum.<br>• Developing new curricula and courses.<br>• Mentoring undergraduate students through independent studies, supervising honors theses, the Drake Institute, STEP, or other, similar programs.<br>• Earning awards or other positive recognition for undergraduate instruction and mentoring.<br>• Graduate student advisees earn awards.<br>• Graduate student advisees complete program and earn placement in appropriate professional position.<br>• Completed Foundations, Impact Teaching through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning.<br>• Completed Teaching at Ohio State through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning.<br>• Awarding of "Endorsement" from Drake Institute of Teaching and Learning. |

| **SCHOLARSHIP/RESEARCH** | |
|---|---|
| **Criteria** | **Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met** |

| | |
|---|---|
| To be eligible for promotion to professor, a faculty member must have made significant scholarly contributions that have secured him/her a national or international reputation for superior intellectual attainment in his/her field. While the total body of a scholar's work will be considered, it is expected that the faculty member will have produced a second body of original and significant research since promotion to the associate professor rank.<br><br>In the discipline of history, a second body of research can mean a second scholarly monograph published or under final board-approved contract and in production, as well as other evidence of scholarly productivity, which can include refereed journal articles and/or book chapters; conference papers; book reviews; digital scholarship; documentary films and other research-based work intended for non-academic audiences; grants, exhibitions, and exhibition catalogues.<br><br>A set of six peer-reviewed journal articles and/or peer-reviewed book chapters based on original research that make a substantial contribution to the field may be considered commensurate with a second monograph. The minimum expectation for regional campus faculty is four rather than six such publications.<br><br>So too an interpretive or theoretical book that reshapes thinking about a subject of concern to a wide range of scholars and/or the public; a pioneering textbook in a new field of inquiry; and/or a digital or public-history project that makes a substantial contribution to the field may also be considered commensurate with a second monograph.<br>In all cases, the scholarly accomplishments must demonstrate that the faculty member has been effectively engaged in original research and creative activity of high quality and significance. All scholarship must be subject to rigorous professional review regardless of the stage the project is at when the evaluation takes place. | • A second scholarly book manuscript that is either published or in production with a letter from the press affirming that the book is under contract and has been accepted for publication with no further revisions required.<br>• A set of six peer-reviewed journal articles and/or peer-reviewed book chapters based on original research that make a substantial contribution to the field. That expectation is four rather than six for faculty on the regional campuses.<br>• An interpretive or theoretical book that reshapes thinking about a subject of concern to a wide range of scholars and/or the public, or a pioneering textbook in a new field of inquiry.<br>• Qualitative evaluations of the candidate's scholarship completed by at least five external reviewers.<br>• Additional work including peer-reviewed journal articles and book chapters consistent with the standards of the discipline of history and the candidate's specific field.<br>• Published reviews of the candidate's work indicating that the candidate has made substantial contributions to the discipline or their field of history.<br>• Complete publication record including edited and co-edited volumes, editor-reviewed and other journal articles, conference papers, monographs, books, book chapters, textbooks based on scholarship, magazine articles and on-line publications.<br>• Success at securing competitive national or international grants, fellowships, and other support for research.<br>• Research awards and other positive recognition for research achievements (internal and external).<br>• Keynote presentations at international conferences.<br>• Invited talks at symposia, conferences, other field specific venues that demonstrate the recognition of the intellectual leadership of the candidate.<br>• Forthcoming publications, essays submitted for publication, and conference presentations delivered demonstrate progress on new research projects of high quality and significance. |

| **SERVICE** | |
|---|---|
| **Criteria** | **Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met** |
| The faculty member must have an excellent record of service to the department, university, and scholarly communities. | • Evidence of service contributions to the Department of History and quality indicators of the outcomes of the contributions.<br>• Annual evaluations document excellent service to Department of History. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Evidence of service contributions to the College and University and quality indicators of the outcomes of those contributions.<br>• Advising student clubs, College Honors Committee, or other organizations.<br>• Serving as an outside representative on graduate student examination committees.<br>• Evidence of service contributions to the scholarly community/profession and quality indicators of the outcomes of those contributions.<br>• Recognition (awards and prizes) for service to the Department of History, College, University, and/or the scholarly community/profession. |
| The department also recognizes the value of professionally related service to the community and gives weight to such service. | • Activities/quality indicators of professionally related service to the community.<br>• Unique professionally related service to disadvantaged communities. |

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

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

## 3) 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 faculty above. These criteria shall be evaluated in a way that aligns with individual adjunct faculty members' contractually assigned duties and responsibilities in the areas of teaching, research, and/or service.

**Promotion to Senior Lecturer**. Lecturers may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank as described in Section IV.A.2.

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

### 4) REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY

Expectations for regional campus faculty differ somewhat from those for faculty on the Columbus campus. The primary function of the regional campuses is to provide high quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities. The relative emphasis on teaching and service expected of regional campus faculty will therefore ordinarily be greater. The department expects regional campus tenure-track faculty to establish a program of high-quality research and publication, similar to that of faculty on the Columbus campus. The department recognizes that the greater teaching and service commitment of regional campus faculty requires a different set of expectations. The judgment whether a particular body of work meets departmental standards for tenure and/or promotion will take into consideration the regional campuses' different mission, higher teaching expectation, and lesser access to research resources.

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

## B. PROCEDURES

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook.

### 1) TENURE-TRACK FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS

#### 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 department's current document. Candidates are also responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators compiled for their case according to departmental guidelines. Each of these elements is described in detail below.

a) **Dossier**. Candidates are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline including, but

not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist.

While the 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 the candidate.

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

Any published materials presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or other final form that documents actual publication. An author's manuscript does not document publication unless accompanied by a letter from its publisher stating that the manuscript is under final, board approved contract and in production.

Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

Documentation of every tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion case will, where appropriate, include evidence of the following:

## 1) TEACHING

Excellence as a teacher. An effective teacher of history is one who

- meets the formal instructional obligations of a teacher in the Department of History of The Ohio State University;
- demonstrates an interest in students;
- stimulates students' interest in his/her subject;
- succeeds in conveying knowledge of history and historical method to his/her students;
- demands standards of intellectual performance suitable for a history department in a major American university, including clear and effective writing;
- reflects up-to-date scholarship in his/her teaching.

Evaluation of a candidate's performance as a teacher will be based on the widest possible range of evidence. It will include (1) evidence gathered by the chair or by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and (2) evidence offered by the candidate.

The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured 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.

Evidence submitted to the Promotion and Tenure Committee regarding teaching will normally include the following:

i) Student evaluations for all courses for all the probationary years or, in the case of promotion from associate professor to professor, student evaluations for courses taught since the last promotion or in the last five years, whichever is more recent. The standard SEI forms must be used, and may be supplemented by other forms. Consistent with university guidelines, someone other than the instructor being reviewed must administer any instrument of evaluation.

ii) Summaries of SEIs prepared by the Undergraduate Teaching Committee or another appropriate university authority.

iii) Copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final formwith no further revisions needed.

iv) Syllabi, exams, and assignments for all courses for all the probationary years or, in the case of promotion from associate professor to professor, for all courses taught since the last promotion or the last five years, whichever is more recent.

v) A brief written statement by the candidate of his/her teaching objectives, methods, and accomplishments. This document must include a statement of the candidate's approach to and goals for teaching, a self- assessment, and a description of specific strategies for improvement of teaching.

vi) Detailed written evaluations of teaching based on classroom visitations by colleagues. These evaluations should follow the guidelines laid out in the department's "Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching," below.

vii) Other data that the department chair, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, or the candidate may judge pertinent to an evaluation of

the candidate's performance in the area of teaching. This additional data might include:

--Explanations or demonstrations of especially successful or innovative teaching techniques;

--Explanations of special teaching accomplishments, awards, and the like;

--Information regarding the candidate's publication of teaching materials and articles on teaching techniques.

**2) SCHOLARSHIP**

Excellence as a scholar. Scholarly excellence entails significant and original contributions to published scholarship in the candidate's field of specialization. Such contributions include the following: new knowledge; information that aids colleagues in the field in carrying forward their own research; empirical evaluations of new or traditional hypotheses to determine their validity; application of historical concepts to other disciplines; and the application of concepts from other disciplines to history in ways that generally advance knowledge.

The usual media for scholarly contributions are: evaluated or published book manuscripts, articles in recognized, refereed journals, and presentations at scholarly meetings.

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

The candidate's achievements and the likelihood of further long-term scholarly accomplishments will be evaluated on the basis of the widest possible range of evidence, including evidence offered by the candidate and that gathered by the chair and by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Such evidence will normally include:

i) Letters from external evaluators. External evaluations are intended to aid the independent professional judgment of faculty involved in tenure and promotion decisions, and are not to substitute for that judgment.

ii) Publications. In evaluating publications and manuscripts, considerations of quality will take precedence over those of quantity, although the pace of publication will be given serious consideration. Work accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work is under final, board approved contract and in production, that is, the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed. The eligible faculty will consider the nature of each publication. Although intrinsic quality is the primary criterion, the type of refereeing and reputation of a publisher or journal can be important considerations. Ordinarily, the committee will consider monographic or interpretive publications based upon original research as providing primary evidence of scholarly development rather than textbooks or source books conceived primarily for undergraduate instruction. The department also values collaborative research and will evaluate publications based on that research equitably. While the Promotion and Tenure Committee may also seek out--and the candidate may present--published reviews from scholars in the field, the Committee of the Eligible Faculty will make its own assessment of the candidate's publications.

iii) Scholarly activity at professional meetings. The quality of the contributions will be the primary consideration in evaluating this activity. Papers, formal commentaries on the papers of others, and participation in colloquia will be evaluated. Again, the Promotion and Tenure Committee may seek and the candidate may present evaluations from scholars in the field.

iv) Reviews of scholarly works for journals. The scholarship of the reviews and the nature of the journals in which they appear will be appraised.

v) Scholarly recognition in the form of requests to serve on editorial boards of scholarly journals, to chair sessions at professional meetings and conventions, or to serve on program committees for such meetings.

vi) Recognition in the form of prizes, awards, grants, or fellowships based on scholarly esteem and reputation.

vii) Other evidence to consider, that the chair or the Promotion and Tenure Committee determine pertinent to his/her development as a scholar. This evidence may include contributions made as a member of a team engaged in a scientific or scholarly project. In such cases, the Committee of the Eligible Faculty will assess the

importance and extent of the candidate's contribution to the overall project and its success. The candidate may include in his/her dossier any manuscripts of articles or papers, whether they have been published or not.

## 3) SERVICE

Excellence in Service. A member of the Department of History at The Ohio State University has an obligation to use his/her talents to collaborate effectively with colleagues for the betterment of the department, the university, and the larger community. A faculty member's profile of service may vary over time.

The time period for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured 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.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee may gather any information that the candidate, the chair, or the committee considers pertinent to a full evaluation of the candidate's ability to render effective service to these communities, including evidence relating to the quality and the quantity of such service. The information may include the number of committee meetings attended, specific projects undertaken, administrative responsibilities assumed, and individual, community or professional contributions. The department chair, the Promotion and Tenure Committee or the candidate may solicit written assessments of a candidate's service from those who are in a position to provide them. Other information may include:

i) Service on department, college, and university committees.

ii) Service as an adviser to graduate and undergraduate students.

iii) Presentations made in the classes of others, contributions to university publications, lectures to the departmental faculty, and similar activities.

iv) Activities in the university community and in the community outside the university based on and related to one's professional training and professional concerns.

v) Activity in the national/international scholarly community and its institutions.

vi) Service rendered to public or private agencies, foundations, and boards appropriate for an academician and promoting history and its public impact.

b) **Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Document**. Candidates must indicate the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. Candidates may be reviewed using the department's current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion, whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, 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. This must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the department.

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

c) **External Evaluations**. The candidate is responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names. The department chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

## 2) PROMOTION FROM ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO PROFESSOR: REVIEW GROUP RESPONSIBILITIES

A review group will consider annually, in spring semester, requests from associate professors seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. The review group will consist of the professors on the Promotion and Tenure Committee, a professor elected to the Advisory Committee, another professor selected by the chair (preferably drawn from the candidate's field of expertise), and a professor selected by the candidate. The chair shall consult with these professors in meeting to determine if the associate professor will be considered during the following year for promotion to professor. Members of the review group will conduct a preliminary review of the associate professor's research, teaching, and service**.** A positive two-thirds vote by this group on a motion to consider an associate professor for promotion will constitute an affirmative recommendation to the chair. In the event of a negative vote by the review group, the chair should consult all professors in meeting on the case. A

positive vote of two thirds by the larger group will overturn the negative vote of the smaller group and constitute a positive recommendation to the chair.

- The review group 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 only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 only once. 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 review group to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.

## 3) 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.

- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.

  - **Late spring:** Select from among its members a procedures oversight designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The procedures oversight designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The procedures oversight designee's responsibilities are described here.

  - **Late spring**: Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair or his/her designee. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section 8 below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.

  - **Early autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness,

accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.

- If deemed necessary, meet with each candidate for clarification and provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.

- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.

- Record in writing the deliberations of the committee of the eligible faculty, including the numerical vote on the candidate and the faculty's assessment of the quantity, quality, effectiveness, and significance of the candidate's record in research, teaching, and service; to read aloud the notes on the discussion (after the vote); to offer a chance to amend the notes; and to seek a voice vote approving the notes.

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

- Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.

- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure-initiating unit is another department. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

## 4) ELIGIBLE FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES

The eligible faculty will consider annually, in spring semester, requests from assistant professors seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. The eligible faculty will conduct a preliminary review of the assistant professors' research, teaching, and service**.** A positive two-thirds vote by the eligible faculty on a motion to consider an assistant professor for promotion with tenure will constitute an affirmative recommendation to the chair.

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 decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.

Additional responsibilities of the members of the eligible faculty are as follows:

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

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

## 5) DEPARTMENT CHAIR RESPONSIBILITIES

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

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

- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. (The department must ensure that such questions are asked of all applicants in a non-discriminatory manner.) For tenure-track assistant professors, the chair will confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an MOU at the time of promotion with tenure..

- In cases where the faculty appointment has been funded with the support of a Discovery Theme, the department chair will request a comprehensive performance review from the director of said Discovery Theme for inclusion in the dossier.

- **Late spring semester**: To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the vice chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.) This task may be delegated to the vice chair.

- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this department. The department chair will seek a letter of evaluation from the TIU head of the joint appointment unit. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.

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

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

- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.

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

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

- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:

    - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair

    - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair

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

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

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

- 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 the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the department chair of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

## 6) PROCEDURES FOR ASSOCIATED FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS

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

## 7) PROCEDURES FOR REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY

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

Regional campus faculty are first reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. The regional campus review focuses on teaching and service.

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

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

## 8) EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS

This department will seek external evaluations predominately from evaluators in the following programs:

Peer programs include the following Big Ten Academic Alliance departments of history: the University of Illinois, Indiana University, the University of Maryland, the University of Michigan, the University of Minnesota, Penn State University, and the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Other peer history departments include Emory University, Vanderbilt University, New York University, the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, the University of Washington, and the University of Virginia.

Aspirational peer programs include the departments of history at: the University of

California-Berkeley, the University of California-Los Angeles, Northwestern University, Duke University, Princeton University, Yale University, Harvard University, Columbia University, the University of Chicago, Cornell University, the University of Texas-Austin, and the University of Pennsylvania.

Justification will be provided in each case when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.

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 adjunct faculty promotion reviews.

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

The dossier materials sent to external evaluators shall include a statement of research that conveys the theme, nature, and envisioned results of their work. The statement should indicate the current state of ongoing project(s) and anticipated date(s) of completion.

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. In cases where digital or public-history projects constitute a large portion of the promotion portfolio, efforts should be made to ensure that at least one external reviewer has expertise in those fields under review. The department will only solicit evaluations from professors with institutional affiliations in the programs listed above. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate

professors.

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

Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, at least twice as many letters are sought as 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 Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department vice chair, 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 the department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

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

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

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

## VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS

It is the policy of The Ohio State University to make decisions regarding the renewal of probationary appointments and promotion and tenure in accordance with the standards, criteria, policies, and procedures stated in the Faculty Rules, supplemented by additional

written standards, criteria, policies, and procedures established by tenure initiating units and colleges.

If a candidate believes that a non-renewal decision, negative promotion and tenure decision**,** or denial of a request to be considered for promotion has been made in violation of Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 and therefore alleges that it was made improperly, the candidate may appeal that decision. 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.

Procedures for appealing a decision based on an allegation of improper evaluation are described in rule 3335-05-05.

## VIII. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS

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

## IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

### A. STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

- The Department expects its instructors to adhere to all university guidelines regarding student evaluation of instruction, especially the rule that students in every course must have an opportunity to evaluate their instructor. Instructors in the department are expected to administer the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) form consistent with university protocols. SEI data must be included in promotion dossiers. SEI reports must also be appended by faculty members to Annual Activity Reports.

- Instructors are encouraged to consider using supplementary (i.e., discursive) student evaluations of their instruction. A faculty member may or may not include such data in his or her promotion dossier. However, if any such data is included the promotion dossier, all data collected by such means of supplemental evaluation must be included. Summaries of such data for the dossier will be composed by members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

### B. PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

- The department chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process, in consultation with the Undergraduate Teaching Committee (which fulfills college expectations for a Peer Review of Teaching Committee). The Undergraduate Teaching Committee (UTC) will proactively arrange for reviews of assistant professors. Other members of the faculty bear responsibility for

requesting peer reviews of teaching and for ensuring that an adequate number of peer reviews is conducted for promotion review and other purposes. Each faculty member seeking promotion should view peer reviews as instruments useful in demonstrating that he or shehas met the department's standards for of excellence in teaching.

- The UTC bears primary responsibility for assigning and conducting peer reviews of teaching, including periodic reviews of all faculty at all ranks. The UTC chair solicits requests for reviews during the first week of each semester and arranges reviews in response to those requests. The UTC Chair should assign reviews to members of the UTC and, if necessary to meet demand, to other members of the faculty.

- Peer reviews of teaching may be conducted on an informal or a formal basis. Each request for a peer review should specify whether an informal or formal review is desired. Informal reviews may be requested in any course. Reports resulting from informal reviews are not filed as part of the promotion dossier or personnel file. Formal reviews result in reports that become part of a faculty member's promotion dossier and permanent personnel file.

- Formal peer reviews should take the form of letters addressed to the chair and should include data about the course (instructor, course name and number, semester, date and time of class visitation, number of students enrolled and attending). Such reviews should be based upon class visitation and upon examination of the syllabus and other course material (including reading and writing assignments, handouts, examinations, class web site, and other technology- based teaching material). Such reviews should assess the instructor's style of pedagogy, quality of organization, command of material, clarity of presentation, and other relevant topics. The faculty member and the reviewer will arrange the time.

- Any lecturer, adjunct professor, visiting faculty and graduate student offering an online course for the first time must have the first offering evaluated by the UTC.

- Senior lecturers, adjunct professors and visiting faculty can request teaching reviews at any time. The chair or his or her designee also has the right to organize a teaching review of senior lecturers, adjunct professors and visiting faculty.

- Tenure-eligible assistant professors are expected to have at least five peer reviews conducted during semesters that they are on duty and teaching during the probationary period. It is the responsibility of the UTC chair to arrange these reviews, in consultation with the faculty member. Generally, such reviews should be distributed across a wide range of undergraduate courses, and must include General Education courses. College guidelines require tenure-eligible

faculty to secure a minimum of five peer reviews during the probationary period;

- Tenured associate professors are expected to arrange a minimum of three formal peer reviews for their promotion dossiers. At least two of these reviews should be undertaken in the three years preceding a promotion review.

- Professors should be evaluated once every four years.

- Senior lecturers and assistant professors must be peer reviewed by faculty at higher ranks. Associate professors may be reviewed by associate professors or professors, although at least 50 percent of formal reviews must be written by professors. Professors should be evaluated by other professors.

- Peer review of regional campus faculty should follow the expectations set at the regional campus.

- If peer reviews reveal problems or under-performance, the chair should meet with the instructor and suggest steps to improve teaching performance. The chair may require additional peer reviews in excess of the minimum numbers provided for in this policy. The chair may also require peer reviews of professors whose teaching records reveal problems or under-performance. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning.

# X. APPENDIX

## A. PROSPECTIVE SPOUSAL/PARTNER HIRES

### 1) PROCEDURES

For all cases of prospective spousal/partner hires, the Department will follow the OAA Office of Faculty Affairs program, Dual Partners and Faculty Relocation. For cases beginning within the Department of History, the department chair will issue a request to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences for approval to pursue a partner hire. Should the dean approve, the chair will then submit a request to the OAA Office of Faculty Affairs for a waiver to search and a request for funds.

The Department of History recognizes that partner appointments fall into one of three hiring categories:

**Internal**: when the individual being considered is the partner of an individual whom the history department is actively trying to recruit.
**Retention**: when the individual being considered is the partner of a current colleague whom the department is actively trying to retain.

**External**: when the individual being considered is the partner of an individual whom a different unit is actively trying to recruit.

All requests for partner appointments begin with the chair. Upon receiving a request to consider a partner appointment from another university unit (an **External** case), the chair shall distribute the candidate's CV to faculty in the relevant field(s) and elicit feedback. If the chair finds that the case clearly lacks merit, then the chair should decline to move forward with the request for a partner appointment.

For all **Internal** and **Retention** cases, and for **External** cases where the chair finds that the individual in question may merit further scrutiny, the chair shall convene a screening committee consisting of three faculty members (ideally two representatives of the relevant field(s) and one of the tenured elected members of the chair's Advisory Committee) and one non-voting graduate student representative of the graduate students. This screening committee shall analyze the full dossier of the candidate, consult carefully with representatives of the relevant field(s), and take into consideration a range of criteria detailed below). If faculty members from within the relevant fields are away from campus, the screening committee shall make a concerted effort to elicit feedback from them using electronic means.

The screening committee shall report its conclusions to the Advisory Committee. The case will then be treated in one of three ways. In each of these, the seven elected members of the Advisory Committee will determine a recommended course of action by a simple majority vote. Given that time is of the essence in such matters, the Advisory Committee action may be completed by electronic means.

a) If the Advisory Committee finds that the case clearly has sufficient merit to move forward, then the screening committee shall take the case before the department with a recommendation to vote in favor of bringing the candidate to campus for a full interview and job talk.

b) If the Advisory Committee finds that the case clearly lacks sufficient merit to justify moving forward, then the case shall be dropped with no further action.

c) If the screening committee's recommendation lacks clarity or the Advisory Committee is in need of additional information before issuing a decision, the chair will assign the case to the further consideration of the seven elected members of the Advisory Committee.

After the candidate completes the interview, the screening committee will elicit feedback from the department regarding the candidate's suitability for a

position in History. The chair shall then convene a meeting of the department at which the screening committee will present its summary report and the faculty will hold a full and open discussion to assess the candidate's qualifications, with reference to the criteria outlined below. At this meeting the department will determine by vote whether to offer appointment. This vote will require two-thirds majority for an affirmative outcome.

**2) CRITERIA**

In considering partner appointments in all of the above categories, the department shall carefully consider the following interrelated criteria (listed alphabetically).

a) **Departmental Need**: in the context of both field(s) and constellations.

b) **Dossier**: referring to all issues that pertain to scholarly merit in training, experience, publication record and the quality of publications, national or international reputation, teaching experience, and evidence of effectiveness in the classroom.

c) **Potential**: referring to evidence that suggests that the individual will contribute to the department's scholarly profile and department life in terms of research, teaching (at both the undergraduate and graduate levels) and service.

For a partner hire to be deemed sufficiently advantageous to justify offering an appointment in either a tenured or tenure-track position, an open analysis must show compelling affirmative evidence of a combination of these factors.