Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Document for The Ohio State University Department of History of Art

Approved by the Faculty: May 15, 2024

Revised by the Chair: Sept. 15, 2025

Revision Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: September 29, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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 other policies and procedures of the College and University to which the department and its faculty are subject.

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

This document must be approved by the dean of the College 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 promotion and for faculty 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 the departmental mission and criteria.

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

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

II DEPARTMENT MISSION

The Department of History of Art seeks to establish and maintain a strong and central presence for art history as a mode of humanistic inquiry within The Ohio State University. This entails:

1. contributing a broad range of introductory courses in archaeology and the history of art (including architecture and film) to the university's general education curriculum;
2. providing an undergraduate major that demands broad competence in global art history as well as the development of focused analytical, research, and writing skills;
3. providing a graduate program that aims at producing scholars capable of first-rate research and teaching at major research universities, as well as curators with the expertise to stage innovative exhibitions at important venues;

4. fostering a faculty that contributes actively and consequentially to the ongoing intellectual work within the history of art, not only by developing expertise in particular subfields but also by engaging productively in the broad and ever-shifting philosophical, scholarly, and institutional debates that determine the structure and content of the discipline;
5. creating a culture and practice of intersectionality in all aspects of teaching and research by exploring the relationship between the visual arts and issues such as race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, class, and religion, and by creating a culture of inclusion within the department;
6. enriching the overall intellectual and cultural life of the university community and the citizenry of Ohio through a sustained program of outreach and engagement aimed at producing and maintaining a lively dialogue around the visual arts.

The ultimate aim of the department, in pursuing these six goals, is to gain and sustain an international reputation for excellence in the production and dissemination of knowledge in the history of art. In doing so, the department seeks to contribute significantly to the stated goal of goals of Ohio State's Strategic Plan, which calls for a university that "enables, empowers, and inspires" its community.

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, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors.

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

2. Teaching/Professional Practice Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

• Appointment Review. The eligible faculty for an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an assistant teaching professor; a professional practice assistant professor; an associate teaching professor; a professional practice associate professor; a clinical professor; or a professional practice professor consists of all tenure-track faculty and all teaching and all professional practice faculty.

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

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

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

3. Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- The appointment of all compensated associated faculty must be based on a formal search process following the SHIFT Framework for faculty recruitment. In the Department of History of Art, there is no faculty vote on initial appointments of associated faculty. The appointment recommendation to the department chair is the responsibility of the search committee.

- 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 all

nonprobationary teaching and professional practice faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the dean or designee.

- The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair in consultation with the promotion and tenure committee.

Promotion Reviews

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

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

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

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

4. Conflict of Interest

Search Committee Conflict of Interest

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

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

Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest

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

- a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor;

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

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

5. Minimum Composition

In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the department chair, after consulting with the dean or designee, 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 promotion and tenure issues. The committee consists of three tenured members of the department faculty, one of whom serves as the Procedures Oversight Designee. The committee's chair and membership are appointed by the department chair. The term of service is one year, with reappointment possible. When the candidate under review is a teaching or professional practice faculty member, the committee chair may appoint another teaching or professional track faculty member (of higher rank) to the committee for the purposes of the review.

C. Quorum

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

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

D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters only "yes" and "no" votes are counted. 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. Abstentions are not allowed for votes on promotion and tenure.

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. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion

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

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

IV APPOINTMENTS

A. CRITERIA

The department is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or demonstrate the strong potential for enhancing the overall quality of the department. Important considerations include the individual's record to date in teaching, research, and service; his/her/their potential for professional growth in each of these areas; and his/her/their potential for interacting with colleagues and students both within and outside the unit in ways that will enhance the overall intellectual life of the department and serve to attract other outstanding faculty and students to the program, particularly on the graduate level. No offer will be extended when the search process fails to yield a pool of candidates who meet these criteria; rather, the search will either be cancelled or extended, as appropriate to the circumstances.

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

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

1. Tenure-Track Faculty

Instructor:

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

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the dean or designee, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate, since prior service credit cannot be revoked without a formal request for an extension of the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor:

An earned terminal degree is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the department and the profession is highly desirable. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the 7th year will be the final year of employment. Review for promotion and tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Promotion and Tenure Committee determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked without a formal request for an extension of the probationary period.

Associate Professor and Professor:

Appointment at a senior rank requires minimally that the individual meet the department's criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to these ranks. In addition, appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor and offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

Appointment at the rank of Associate Professor normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at that rank is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, e.g., when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office

of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional, i.e. terminal, year of employment is offered.

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

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

2. Teaching/Professional Practice Faculty

Teaching Faculty:

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

Assistant Teaching Professor

The minimum criterion for appointment at the rank of Assistant Teaching Professor is a PhD in art history or a related field and substantial classroom experience. Evidence for high quality teaching is required, as well as the potential for strong service to the Department.

Associate Teaching Professor

The minimum criterion for appointment at the rank of Associate Teaching Professor is a PhD in art history or a related field. Awarding the rank of Associate Teaching Professor to a faculty member must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member in question has achieved excellence as a teacher; possesses a thorough knowledge of current research within the relevant field of study; and incorporates that knowledge as appropriate within his/her/their teaching. The candidate must also have demonstrated high-quality service to the Department.

Teaching Professor

The minimum criterion for appointment at the rank of Teaching Professor is a PhD in art history or a related field. Awarding the rank of Teaching Professor to a faculty member must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member in question has achieved sustained excellence as a teacher; possesses a thorough knowledge of current research

within the relevant field of study; and incorporates that knowledge as appropriate within his/her/their teaching. Appointment at the rank of Teaching Professor of Teaching is also based on an expected contribution to scholarship in the faculty member's field, typically in the form of articles, book chapters, or work presented at major conferences. The candidate must also have demonstrated high-quality and impactful service to the Department, the University and/or the profession.

Professional Practice Faculty

Professional Practice Assistant Professor

The minimum criterion for appointment at the rank of Professional Practice Assistant Professor is a PhD in art history or a related field and substantial professional experience, as well as some experience in the classroom. The potential for strong service to the Department is also expected.

Professional Practice Associate Professor

The minimum criterion for appointment at the rank of Professional Practice Associate Professor is a PhD in art history or a related field. Awarding the rank of Professional Practice Associate Professor to a faculty member must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member in question has achieved excellence as a teacher; remains professionally active in the field and possesses current credentials as well as an up-to-date, thorough knowledge of relevant research; and incorporates that knowledge as appropriate within his/her/their teaching. The candidate must also have demonstrated high-quality service to the Department.

Professional Practice Professor

The minimum criterion for appointment at the rank of Professional Practice Professor is a PhD in art history or a related field. Awarding the rank of Professional Practice Professor to a faculty member must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member in question has achieved sustained excellence as a teacher; possesses current professional credentials and evidence of sustained engagement in the field (e.g., through exhibitions, publications and/or conference presentations) as well as an up-to-date, thorough knowledge of research within the relevant field; and incorporates that knowledge as appropriate within his/her/their teaching. The candidate must also have demonstrated high-quality and impactful service to the Department, the University and/or the profession.

3. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty can be appointed to terms of up to three years in length. Associated faculty may be reappointed.

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct appointments are never compensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who volunteer considerable uncompensated academic service to the

department, such as teaching a course, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure track, teaching, or professional practice faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure track, teaching, or professional practice faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

Lecturer. Appointment as lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a Master's degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is desirable. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer should generally not exceed one year.

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

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

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from a regular academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for only three consecutive years.

4. 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, and professor are similar to those for Columbus campus faculty, but give relatively greater emphasis at each rank to teaching experience and quality.

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

5. Emeritus Faculty

Emeritus faculty status is an honor given in recognition of sustained academic contributions to the university as described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-36. Full-time tenure track, teaching, professional practice, 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 outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-3) will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair. The department chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean or 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 3335-5-04, 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.

6. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

B. PROCEDURES:

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

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

Recruitment of Tenure Track, Clinical/Teaching/Professional Practice and Research

Faculty
Appointments at Senior Rank or with Prior Service Credit
Hiring Faculty From Other Institutions After April 30
Appointment of Foreign Nationals
Letters of Offer

1. Tenure-Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus 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 Volume 1, Chapter 4, section 5.1 of the *Policies and Procedures Handbook*. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the College and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection.

Position requests for permanent, tenure-track faculty hires may arise from long-range planning by the departmental faculty or from special opportunities. Requests are reviewed by the chair, who, after consultation with the entire faculty, makes a proposal or proposals to the dean or designee.

When a search for a tenure-track faculty position has been authorized by the dean of the college, the department chair appoints an *ad hoc* search committee for that position, consisting of no fewer than three members of the voting faculty of History of Art, and appoints one of these to chair the committee. The department chair may also appoint faculty from other appropriate units, but ensures that the voting faculty of History of Art constitute a majority of the committee members. The department chair may serve as a non-voting member of the search committee.

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

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 Equal Employment Opportunity requirements 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 must vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer involves prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. All offers at the rank of associate professor, with or without tenure, all offers at the rank of professor, and all offers of prior service credit require the 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 details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the department 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. Teaching/Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Searches for teaching and professional practice faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the interview will address issues in teaching or professional practice rather than scholarship.

Initial appointments for teaching and professional practice faculty must be made for five years and require a formal vote by the eligible faculty, with two-thirds voting positively.

3. Transfer from the Tenure Track

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a teaching or professional practice appointment if appropriate circumstances exist. Tenure or tenure eligibility is lost upon transfer, and transfers must be approved by the department chair, the dean, and the executive vice president and provost.

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

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

4. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

A. Searches and Appointments

Searches for compensated associated faculty may be initiated at the request of individual faculty members or groups of faculty members, or at the recommendation of the chair. 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 promotion and tenure committee.

Non-salaried associated faculty are appointed by the chair after consultation with the faculty.

Associated appointments can be made for a period of up to three years. Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are made on an annual basis and rarely semester by semester. After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment may be offered. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Adjunct appointments may be renewed only when the uncompensated academic service for which the appointment was made continues.

5. 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 or Director has primary responsibility for determining the position description for a tenure-track faculty search, but should consult with and seek agreement from the department chair before the search begins. The chair of the department and the regional campus Dean or Director will agree on a single search committee consisting of members from both units. Candidates should—at a minimum—be interviewed by the regional campus Dean/Director, the chair of the department, the search committee, and representatives of both faculties. Candidates will be evaluated on both campuses, with the faculty on the Columbus campus taking primary responsibility for assessing the candidates' scholarly record. At the end of the evaluation process, the search committee makes a recommendation to both faculties, which in turn make a recommendation to the department chair and dean of the regional campus. A decision to hire requires agreement on the part of the chair of the department and the regional campus Dean/Director. Negotiations with a candidate should not begin until such agreement has been reached, and a letter of offer must be signed by the chair of the department and the Dean or Director of the regional campus.

Procedures for searches for regional campus teaching and professional practice faculty are the same as those described above for tenure-track faculty.

Following a formal search according to the SHIFT Framework, compensated associated faculty are appointed by the regional campus associate dean, in consultation with the dean/director, department chair, program coordinators, and other relevant faculty members.

6. Courtesy Appointments

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

V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEWS

PROCEDURES

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the Policy on Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment, which stipulates that such reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting 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, research, and/or service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. The review of faculty with budgeted joint appointments must include input from the joint appointment TIU head for every annual evaluation cycle. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on goals specific to the individual in the joint unit. Annual performance and merit reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting as well as a written assessment. 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 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 chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee by February 1:

- Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, *Policies and Procedures Handbook*, Volume 3 (*required for probationary faculty*) 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

Probationary tenure-track faculty will be reviewed annually by the department chair. The purpose of this review is to assess the performance of the faculty member in the three areas of research, teaching, and service, and to form the basis for a decision on renewal of the appointment and possible merit salary increments for the upcoming year. The performance of each probationary faculty member is evaluated relative to the department's published criteria for appointment, promotion and tenure. The chair will provide for classroom observation and peer evaluation of the faculty member's teaching, including a review of teaching materials and student evaluations.

The chair will then prepare an annual review letter. This letter, which includes an indication as to whether the faculty member will be reappointed, is provided to the faculty member under review and to the Dean of the College; it also becomes a part of the faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure. If the chair recommends non-renewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-03) is invoked: the case is referred to the full eligible faculty, which considers the case, votes on whether the appointment should be renewed, and prepares a report for the department chair. Following the completion of the comments process, the case is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

Fourth-Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exceptions that external evaluations are optional and the 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 research is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the research without outside input.

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

The eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department chair. 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.

Extension of the Tenure Clock

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

C. Tenured faculty on the Columbus Campus

On **February 1** of each year, annual activity reports or updated dossiers will be required from all tenured faculty. This information will be used for the purposes of an annual performance and merit review of tenured faculty. The chair will schedule meetings with each faculty member to discuss the year's activities and plans for future development.

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the department chair. The department chair conducts an independent assessment; meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their performance and future plans and goals. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the 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.

D. Teaching/Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

No later than the beginning of the penultimate year of a probationary teaching or professional practice faculty member's initial appointment term, the individual must undergo a review so that the unit may determine whether it is appropriate to renew that individual's appointment for a new appointment term. The review will follow the same procedures as a review for tenure-track faculty as set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 and Faculty Rule 3335-6-04. For faculty in their second and subsequent appointment term, individuals must be informed as to whether a new appointment will be extended by the end of the penultimate year of each appointment period.

If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 must be observed. There is no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance.

E. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The chair will conduct an annual review of all compensated associated faculty to determine whether reappointment is appropriate at the end of the appointment term. The review may consider the scholarly qualifications of the candidate, his/her/their teaching effectiveness, and the future needs of the department. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their performance, future plans, and goals.

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

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

F. Regional Campus Faculty

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

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

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

G. Salary Recommendations

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

As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the department chair divides faculty into three groups based on continuing productivity (those exceeding departmental expectations, those meeting departmental expectations, and those failing to meet departmental expectations) and considers market and internal equity issues. The department chair will 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 the department. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations. Faculty with high-quality performance in the three areas of teaching, research, and service and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

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

On occasion, one-time cash payments or other rewards, such as extra travel funds, are made to recognize non-continuing contributions that justify reward but do not justify permanent salary increases or when larger permanent salary increases are not possible. Such payments/rewards are considered at the time of annual salary recommendations.

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 AND 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 to Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 provides the following general criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure:

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

Tenure is not awarded below the rank of Associate Professor at The Ohio State University.

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

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

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

The criteria listed below in the areas of teaching, research, and service are expected of faculty for promotion to associate professor with tenure; they are accompanied by examples of evidence that might demonstrate achievement of those criteria.. In the evaluation of untenured associate professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

TEACHING	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates must have made contributions in the following areas: CURRICULUM AND COURSE DEVELOPMENT -provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge -improved curriculum through revision or development of courses and/or academic programs	CURRICULUM AND COUSE DEVELOPMENT • Changes to existing syllabi or development of new syllabi demonstrating up-to-date research and thinking on course content • Peer review of teaching reports and/or annual review letters indicating that syllabi, assignments, class materials, and topics are up-to-date, appropriate for theme and audience, and meet contemporary expectations for the field
TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS -engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge-creation process -demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm -development of syllabi that demonstrate creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment. -engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching	TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS • Peer and student reviews of teaching and/or annual review letters document the use of active learning techniques, the encouragement of independent thought, and the appreciation of the knowledge-creation process • Peer and student reviews of teaching and/or annual review letters document effective course organization and presentation of material • Syllabi and peer and student reviews of teaching and/or annual review letters demonstrate creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment • Documented participation in workshops or other initiatives aimed at improving teaching

	• Awards and/or other formal commendations for teaching
ADVISING AND MENTORSHIP -provided mentorship to graduate and undergraduate students -served as advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the department's graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise	ADVISING AND MENTORSHIP • Service as Chair of the Graduate and/or Undergraduate Studies Committee • Service as a Member of the Graduate and/or Undergraduate Studies Committee • Service as Advisor of a Graduate or Undergraduate Student • Service on a Graduate Thesis, Examination and/or Dissertation Committee • Service on an Undergraduate Thesis Committee • Service as an advisor to a Graduate or Undergraduate Student Group • Service as a mentor to a STEP cohort or Drake Institute Cohort • Noteworthy accomplishments of graduate and/or undergraduate mentees • Mentoring of Post-Doctoral Fellows • Awards and other forms of recognition of excellence in mentorship

RESEARCH	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates must have: -Published a body of work in high-quality peer-reviewed venues that is thematically focused, contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and is beginning to be favorably cited or otherwise show evidence of influence on the work of others. The following attributes of the body of	• A scholarly book/monograph published or under final board-approved contract with a scholarly press • For Associate Professors standing for promotion to Professor: a second scholarly book/monograph published or under final board-approved contract *or* a collection of

work are considered: -The inherent quality of the scholarship or research as well as its demonstrated or potential impact on the field -Its unique contribution to a line of inquiry or revision of earlier approaches within the field -Rigor of the peer-review process and degree of dissemination of the research. Peer-reviewed journals and monographs are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published research more than unpublished research, and original works more than edited works. -Originality of the research. When standing for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, the ability to conduct original research and to mentor future researchers is valued over synthetic work Interdisciplinarity/collaborative/community-engaged work. While collaborative work is encouraged, and indeed is essential to some types of inquiry, the candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described so as to permit accurate assessment. -A demonstrated ability to obtain and potential to sustain research program funding. Competitive peer-reviewed funding is weighted more favorably than other types, since it serves as a quality indicator of research programs, and grants requiring the exercise of intellectual creativity are weighted more heavily than those that largely dictate the work to be done. Research funding is a means to an end; funding that has not led to research productivity is disregarded in the review. -A developing national/international reputation in the candidate's field as evidenced by external evaluations, invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals, and a beginning trend of positive citations in	peer-reviewed articles demonstrating scholarly achievement in a specific area of research that could be considered equivalent to a second book • Articles published or in production in peer-reviewed journals, or other journals consistent with the standards of the discipline, that are thematically focused and contribute substantively to knowledge in the field • Articles published in edited volumes • Book and/or exhibition reviews published in scholarly journals • Editorship or co-editorship of edited volume(s) or special issue(s) of a scholarly journal • The curation of exhibitions at museums or galleries with national or international reputations • Essays and/or entries in catalogues for exhibitions organized at museums or galleries with national or international reputations • Grants or Fellowships that support the candidate’s research • External awards or prizes for research from national/international agencies, associations, and/or private foundations • External reviews that demonstrate the originality, significance, and real or potential impact of the candidate’s scholarship • List of citations that demonstrate the impact of the candidate’s research • Invited lectures at major national and international universities or museums and/or keynote addresses at scholarly symposia, conferences, and/or other field-specific venues

other researchers' publications. A reputation based on the quality of the research contribution is distinguished from one based mainly on familiarity through the faculty member's frequent attendance at national and international conferences.	• Presentations at national and international academic conferences and symposia

SERVICE	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates must have: Made substantive contributions to the governance of the department/TIU Demonstrated potential for service to the university and/or community Demonstrated potential for useful contributions and service to the profession	• Service on standing departmental committees • Service on special departmental committees (e.g., faculty search committees) • Service on College and/or University committees or advisory boards • Offices held or service on committees and/or boards of professional organizations • Service as peer reviewer for a scholarly journal, academic press, or fellowship-granting institution • Service as external evaluator for tenure or promotion reviews (For candidates standing for promotion to rank of Professor) • Service as external evaluator for departmental program reviews (For candidates standing for promotion to rank of Professor) • Contributions furthering the recruitment, retention, and mentoring of colleagues and students • Service that fosters environments in which all students, faculty, and staff are encouraged to feel a sense of belonging at work • Contributions to student life through such activities as working with student clubs and organizations and mentoring students, for example, by guiding first generation students and helping them adapt to college • Service as a Graduate Faculty Representative

	• Participation in community-engaged teaching, including service-learning, community-based education, experiential or active learning, practicum, etc. • Direction of significant and impactful outreach and engagement activities • Description of significant outreach and engagement activities in which the faculty member played a major role, with qualitative indicators to evaluate the excellence of each activity

2. Promotion to Rank of Professor

In accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C)

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

The specific criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national or international reputation in the field.

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

Promotion to professor typically requires excellence in scholarship. Evidence of excellence can be demonstrated either by a second scholarly monograph or by an equivalent body of peer-reviewed articles, curated exhibitions, or other publications that reveal a focused and impactful research contribution (see chart above). Where a candidate has made truly extraordinary contributions in the areas of teaching or service, that record may warrant promotion in combination with a less extensive, though still strong record of continued productivity in scholarship.

In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another. Promotion should reflect the reality that (a) not all faculty members have the same distribution of assignments (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence equally in all evaluation dimensions; and (c) there

is a multi-faceted institutional responsibility that must be achieved by the skills of the faculty collectively. Promotion to professor should be awarded not only to those faculty who have demonstrated impact in their scholarship, teaching and learning, and service, but also to those who have exhibited excellence in leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the department, college and university.

3. Teaching/Professional Practice Faculty

Teaching Faculty

Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor

Promotion to the rank of Associate Teaching Professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member in question has achieved excellence as a teacher; possesses a thorough knowledge of current research within the relevant field of study; and incorporates that knowledge as appropriate within his/her/their teaching. The candidate must also have demonstrated high-quality service to the Department. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to associate teaching professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Teaching Professor

Promotion to the rank of Teaching Professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member in question has achieved sustained excellence as a teacher; possesses a thorough knowledge of current research within the relevant field of study; and incorporates that knowledge as appropriate within his/her/their teaching. The candidate must also have a demonstrated record of scholarship in his/her/their field, which may be demonstrated by published articles, reviews, chapters in edited volumes, and/or scholarly presentations. The candidate must also have demonstrated high-quality and impactful service to the Department, the University and/or the profession. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Professional Practice Faculty

Promotion to Professional Practice Associate Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professional Practice Associate Professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member in question has achieved excellence as a teacher; remains professionally active in the field and possesses current credentials as well as an up-to-date, thorough knowledge of relevant research; and incorporates that knowledge as appropriate within his/her/their teaching. The candidate must also have demonstrated high-quality service to the Department. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to associate teaching professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Professional Practice Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professional Practice Professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member in question has achieved sustained excellence as a teacher; possesses current professional credentials and evidence of sustained engagement in the field (e.g., through exhibitions, publications and/or conference presentations) as well as an up-to-date, thorough knowledge of research within the relevant field; and incorporates that knowledge as appropriate within his/her/their teaching. The candidate's engagement in research in their field should be impactful and international. The candidate must also have demonstrated high-quality and impactful service to the Department, the University and/or the profession. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

4. Associated Faculty

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

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

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

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

5. Regional Campus Faculty

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

In evaluating regional campus teaching, professional practice, and associated faculty for promotion, the department will use the same criteria as described above for the promotion of faculty in this category.

B. Procedures:

Departmental procedures for promotion and tenure reviews are guided by the provisions of Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 and by the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook.

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

During the spring semester, the chair of the department will notify each faculty member who will be undergoing mandatory review the following autumn semester and inform him or her of the nature of the review; the chair will also offer to assist the candidate in the preparation of his/her/their dossier. At the same time, the Promotion and Tenure Committee is appointed and the major deadlines of the review process are established.

a Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier and providing a copy of the APT under which they wish to be reviewed, if other than the department's current document. If external evaluations are required, candidates are 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.

- **Dossier**

Every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist.

While the department chair and members of the P&T committee assist in making reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by him or her.

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

For scholarship documentation, a full history of publications and creative work

should be included, as this information provides context to the more recent and relevant research record and/or demonstrates scholarly independence. Information about scholarship produced prior to the start date (for probationary faculty) or date of last promotion or reappointment may be provided. Any such material should be clearly indicated. However, it is the scholarship performance since the start date or date of last promotion that is to be the focus of the evaluating parties. There should also be an increasing trajectory of significant scholarly outcomes 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 or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

Teaching:

Evidence of distinction in teaching will emphasize success in developing student interest in the history of art, success in conveying to students the essentials of the subject taught, and a willingness to demand of students clear evidence of intellectual growth. The assessment of teaching excellence will be based on (but need not be limited to) student and peer evaluations, including SEI and departmental evaluations for all courses taught during the time period indicated above; peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in section IX of this document); and representative syllabi and other course materials.

Other documentation should include copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication; material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.

Candidates should include evidence of their development of programs and courses; their involvement in graduate exams, theses, qualifying papers and dissertations, and undergraduate writing and research; and any participation in interdepartmental teaching.

Awards and formal recognition for teaching should be listed.

Research:

While the department sets no minimum requirements in terms of research for the granting of tenure or promotion, it does insist on a significant record of publication, with the determining factor being the extent of the candidate’s contribution to the discipline as a whole. In addition to copies of scholarly papers published or accepted for publication (papers accepted for publication

but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed), documentation of excellence in research includes evaluations of the quality of the candidate's publication outlets and both internal and external evaluations of the scholarship itself, as well as awards, grants and prizes for research, and contracts received.

Service:

Every member of the faculty is expected to assume a share of responsibility for the governance and functioning of the department, college and university. An appropriate amount of professional service is also expected. Evidence of distinction in service includes student advising; administrative support; committee work; participation in professional organizations; organizing colloquia, conferences and exhibitions; lecturing to local audiences; and providing advice to local arts organizations. In evaluating service, quality and competence are more important than the number of activities. In order to more clearly assess a candidate's service, the chair and/or Promotion and Tenure Committee may solicit written evaluations from persons who are in a position to assess specific contributions.

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

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

Candidates must also indicate the APT 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 (or last reappointment in the case of teaching and professional practice faculty), whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, for tenure-track faculty the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year.

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

- **External Evaluations** (see also External evaluations below)

If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing

the list of potential external evaluators developed according to departmental guidelines. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The department chair decides whether removal is justified.

b Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

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

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

- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.

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

  - A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 for one year. Faculty Rule 3335-7-08 makes the same provision for nonprobationary teaching and professional practice faculty. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.

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

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

  - **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.

- **Late Spring**: Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section VI.B.4 below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.

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

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

- After the meeting of the full eligible faculty, to draft an analysis of the case for promotion, evaluating the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship, and service, including the results of the faculty vote and a summary of faculty perspectives expressed in the meeting, and to forward the completed written evaluation to the department chair.

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

- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit. The 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.

c Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities

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

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

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

d Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on the established 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 department chair will confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an MOU at the time of promotion with tenure.

- **Late Spring Semester**: To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

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

- 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 departmental review process:

    - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair

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

  - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten calendar days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. 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 eligible faculty's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the TIU head of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

2. Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

3. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

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

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

Associated faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process

established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. The decision of the regional campus dean/director is final.

4. External Evaluations

In keeping with the national standing of The Ohio State University, the Department of History of Art will ask for evaluations from faculty in programs that are nationally recognized in their field or subfields. Because of the multidisciplinary nature of the department and the small overall size of the field, a specific list of institutions or even programs cannot be easily assembled. This department will seek external evaluations predominantly from evaluators from the Big Ten Academic Alliance and the Association of American Universities. If the field of research requires additional expertise outside of AAU, a request for review and approval will be made to the College.

The following principles will be applied in identifying external reviewers: the external reviewer will be 1) a distinguished expert in their field, as demonstrated by their scholarly credentials: number and quality of publications and/or creative work, national and international awards, prominence in professional organizations or presence on editorial boards of major journals; and/or 2) nationally or internationally known in the field related to a candidate's interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary projects.

Justification will be provided in each case when a suggested evaluator departs from these expectations.

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. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for teaching, professional practice, or associated faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations for a teaching, professional practice, or associated faculty member will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

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

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

a. Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's research who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or postdoctoral 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 the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.

b. 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 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 this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

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

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

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

VII PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS

Only the candidate may appeal a negative tenure, promotion, or reappointment decision.

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

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

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

VIII SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS

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

IX PROCEDURES FOR STUDENTAND PEER-EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The Department of the History of Art requires each faculty member to contribute to all aspects of a curriculum that runs the gamut from undergraduate general education course designed to complement an undergraduate education in the liberal arts, to specialized courses for art history majors, to graduate courses aimed at preparing students to assume professional positions within the discipline of Art History or in a range of related fields. The Department also recognizes as teaching a variety of additional activities, including curriculum development, advising, and instruction in continuing education and extension programs.

Departmental Teaching Mission

An education in the History of Art should lead at every level to an increased intellectual understanding of a wide body of objects, practices, and methods that constitute the discipline. The Department conceives of teaching as both an individual and a collective activity and values the methodological and pedagogical differences represented by its faculty as an important dimension of each student's experience and education. It places a premium on classroom clarity, accessibility to students, the establishment of standards that are both demanding and realistic, and the creation and fostering of an inclusive and respectful classroom culture. It expects its students to develop a sound knowledge of the methods, materials, and monuments of the History of Art, strong writing skills, and a capacity to reflect cogently on the terms of the discipline and humanistic inquiry more generally.

Evaluation of Teaching

Evaluation of teaching in the Department of History of Art attempts both to assess the degree to which particular teaching activities contribute to the educational mission of the department as a whole and to balance this with the specific instructional goals of individual faculty members as articulated in syllabi and other contractual agreements with students. Effective evaluation should distinguish between the evaluation of a course as such and a more specifically focused assessment of individual instructors and methods; we therefore expect that the most serious and useful evaluative instruments will be tailored to the specific shapes and goals of particular courses.

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the online Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) form is mandatory for every course offered in this department. Faculty members may also use departmental student evaluation forms or forms of their own design that provide students the opportunity to make narrative comments. Any hard-copy evaluation forms must be distributed and collected by a responsible person (student, faculty, or staff member) other than the instructor of the course. This person will obtain the forms from the instructor or the departmental staff member charged with managing course evaluations and return the filled-out forms to the main office, where a record will be kept of who obtains and returns the forms. The instructor for the course may at no time come into physical contact with the evaluation forms or be in the room while they are being filled out by the students.

Copies of the narrative evaluations will be provided to the faculty member on request by the department after the grades for that particular course have been posted; the original forms will be kept on file. Both SEI and narrative evaluations become part of each faculty member's annual activity report; reports that do not include these evaluations will not be considered.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

1. Review Process

The administration of the peer evaluation of teaching is the responsibility of the Chair. The Chair will appoint a peer evaluator from the faculty for each person undergoing review. Evaluators must not be of lower rank than the person being reviewed. As far as possible, these duties will rotate equitably through the faculty, so that the widest range of faculty suggestions and comments may be obtained.

Peer evaluations of teaching are comprehensive and include, in addition to classroom visitation, review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and exams. Probationary faculty should also include the relevant portions of their core dossier related to teaching, as specified by the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty under review should provide peer reviewers with these materials well in advance of the classroom visit or visits. They should also provide reviewers with a list of preferred visitation dates. In addition to preparing a written report for the faculty member's file, the reviewer should

meet with the faculty member following the classroom visitation for a more informal consultation about his/her/their teaching.

The peer reviewer includes in his/her/their report an assessment of these materials, including their appropriateness, usefulness, currency, and consistency with the objectives stated in the core dossier as well as the department's mission. Peer review focuses particularly on aspects of teaching that students are less qualified than faculty to evaluate, such as appropriateness of curricular choices given the goals of the course (survey as opposed to required major course), implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and appropriateness of approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. As part of its evaluation the reviewer examines copies of the faculty member's SEI summaries from recent years, and where student opinion is mixed to negative, may attempt to ascertain the reasons. In so doing, peer evaluators are to bear in mind that they have observed only one or a few classes out of the semester, and moreover have a very different level of knowledge compared to students. Consequently their assessment may differ considerably from that of the majority of students.

The peer reviewer will prepare a written report with findings and recommendations, including a separate assessment of student evaluations. The report is submitted to the Department Chair, who drafts a plan to respond to the recommendations, if needed. The faculty member under review may also provide written comments on the report and the Chair or reviewer may respond in writing to those comments if it wishes. All such comments are appended to the report for inclusion in the faculty member's promotion and tenure dossier and/or personnel file, unless the faculty member requests that the comments be excluded.

2. Timing of Review

Probationary tenure-track and all teaching/professional practice faculty members are reviewed annually. Lecturers and other associated faculty will be reviewed annually by either the department chair or the undergraduate studies chair (though formal letters for these reviews will not be produced). Professors and Associate Professors with tenure are reviewed every two years. In addition, faculty members not scheduled for review may be reviewed at the request of the chair. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need to provide assistance in the improvement of teaching. Individual faculty members may also request a review of teaching from the chair in any year for an anticipated promotion review, for teaching development, or for other purposes. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning. These voluntary reviews are considered formative only, with the report being given only to the faculty member who requested the review.

All faculty scheduled for review will be informed of this fact during the semester preceding the review. Required documentation should be made available to the reviewer at the beginning of the semester in which the review is scheduled to take place. The review itself will be scheduled in such a way as to allow adequate

opportunity for classroom observation.

Evaluation of teaching for Regional Campus faculty is performed by peer faculty at that campus.