

# **Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures for The Ohio State University Department of Mathematics**

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: June 13, 2025

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">I Preamble</a>	4
<a href="#">II Department Mission</a>	4
<a href="#">III Definitions</a>	4
<a href="#">A Committee of the Eligible Faculty</a>	4
<a href="#">1 Tenure-track Faculty</a>	5
<a href="#">2 Teaching Faculty</a>	5
3 Associated Faculty	5
4 <a href="#">Conflict of Interest</a>	6
5 <a href="#">Minimum Composition</a>	7
<a href="#">B Promotion and Tenure Committee</a>	7
1 Committee for the evaluation of non-Tenured Faculty	7
2 Committee for Promotion to Professor	7
<a href="#">C Quorum</a>	8
<a href="#">D Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty</a>	8
<a href="#">IV Appointments</a>	8
<a href="#">A Criteria</a>	8
<a href="#">1 Tenure-track Faculty</a>	9
2 <a href="#">Teaching Faculty</a>	10
3 <a href="#">Associated Faculty</a>	10
4 Regional Campus Faculty	12
5 Emeritus Faculty	12
6 Joint Appointments	12
7 <a href="#">Courtesy Appointments for Faculty</a>	11
<a href="#">B Procedures</a>	13
<a href="#">1 Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus</a>	13
2 <a href="#">Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus</a>	15
3 <a href="#">Transfer from the Tenure Track</a>	15
4 TIU Transfer	15
5 <a href="#">Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus</a>	16
6 <a href="#">Regional Campus Faculty</a>	16
7 Joint Appointments	17
8 <a href="#">Courtesy Appointments for Faculty</a>	17

<u>V Annual Performance and Merit Review</u> .....	17
A Documentation.....	19
B <u>Probationary Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus</u> .....	19
1 <u>Fourth-Year Review</u> .....	19
2 <u>Extension of the Tenure Clock</u> .....	20
C <u>Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus</u> .....	20
D <u>Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus</u> .....	21
E <u>Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus</u> .....	21
F <u>Regional Campus Faculty</u> .....	22
G Salary Recommendations .....	22
<u>VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews</u> .....	23
A <u>Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion</u> .....	23
1 <u>Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure</u> .....	24
2 <u>Promotion to Professor</u> .....	26
3 <u>Teaching Faculty</u> .....	27
4 <u>Associated Faculty</u> .....	27
5 <u>Regional Campus Faculty</u> .....	27
B <u>Procedures</u> .....	27
1 <u>Tenure-track and Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus</u> .....	28
a <u>Candidate Responsibilities</u> .....	28
b <u>Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities</u> .....	31
c <u>Eligible Faculty Responsibilities</u> .....	32
d <u>Department Chair Responsibilities</u> .....	33
2 <u>Procedures for Associated Faculty</u> .....	34
3 <u>Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty</u> .....	34
4 <u>External Evaluations</u> .....	34
<u>VII Promtion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals</u> .....	36
<u>VIII Seventh-Year Reviews</u> .....	37
<u>IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching</u> .....	37
A <u>Student Evaluation of Teaching</u> .....	37
B <u>Peer Evaluation of Teaching</u> .....	37
Appendix A: Mentorship Plan .....	40

## 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 Chapter 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#); and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the department and its faculty are subject.

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

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

## II. DEPARTMENT MISSION

The mission of the Department of Mathematics is to produce research in mathematics at the level of the best universities worldwide, to provide a comprehensive and challenging program for undergraduate majors and graduate students planning careers in mathematics or related fields, and to offer high quality mathematics courses to serve the rest of the university community.

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

## III. DEFINITIONS

### A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

The eligible faculty for all appointment (hiring), reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure reviews must have their tenure home or primary appointment in the Department of Mathematics. This includes faculty from the Columbus campus as well as the regional campuses.

The department chair, the dean and the divisional, 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.** The initial appointment of an assistant professor, associate professor, or professor is based on a vote by the eligible faculty (all tenure-track faculty in the department) and recommendations of the recruitment committee to the department chair.
- **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 Faculty**

### **Initial Appointment Review**

- **Appointment Review.** The initial appointment of an assistant teaching professor, associate teaching professor, or teaching professor is the decision of the chair and based on recommendations of the Recruitment Committee to the department chair.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all non-probationary teaching faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

### **Reappointment and Promotion Reviews**

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

## **3. Associated Faculty**

### **Initial Appointment and Reappointment**

The initial appointment of all compensated associated faculty is based on recommendations of the Recruitment Committee to the department chair.

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

The reappointment of associated faculty members is decided by the department chair.

### **Promotion Reviews**

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

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

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

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

## **4. Conflict of Interest**

### **Search Committee Conflict of Interest**

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

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

### **Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest**

A member of the eligible faculty has a conflict of interest when 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 50% 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, will appoint a faculty member from another tenure-initiating unit within the college.

## **B. Promotion and Tenure Committees**

The department has two Promotion and Tenure Committees that assist the eligible faculty in managing the personnel and promotion and tenure issues.

**1. The committee for the evaluation of non-tenured faculty (CENT;** this committee oversees the promotion of tenure-track assistant professors to tenured associate professor, as well as the promotion of all teaching faculty)

- This committee consists of eight (8) members of the eligible faculty, of whom three are elected each year by the eligible faculty for two year terms with the remaining two (2) appointed by the Chair of the Department for one year terms. Terms begin in Spring Semester.
- The Election Committee arranges for the nomination and election of this committee. (The Election Committee is fully described in the department's [Pattern of Administration](#), Section VII.D.)
- After considering the results of the election process, the Chair will appoint two (2) faculty members to the committee. In making appointments to this committee the Chair will try to balance the committee in terms of the mathematical specialties represented, as well as in terms of the diversity of the committee.
- Members of the committee elect their own Chair.

**2. The committee for promotion to professor (PROCOMP;** this committee oversees the promotion of tenured associate professors to tenured professor)

- This committee will consist of five (5) members of the eligible faculty. Members of PROCOMP normally serve for a period of one year beginning in the Spring Semester. In the Spring Semester of each year, the eligible faculty elects four (4) members and the Chair of the Department will appoint one (1).
- The Election Committee arranges for the nomination and election of this committee.
- After considering the results of the election process the Chair will appoint one (1) faculty member to the committee. In making appointments to the committee the Chair will try to balance the committee in terms of the mathematical specialties represented, as well as in terms of the diversity of the committee.

- Members of the committee elect their own Chair.

### **C. Quorum**

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is 50% of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty participating remotely are counted towards the quorum. Faculty on approved leaves of absence 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 Eligible Faculty**

In all votes taken on personnel matters, votes must be cast prior to meeting adjournment. Only “yes” and “no” votes are counted. Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted.

#### **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 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 reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure.

## **IV. APPOINTMENTS**

### **A. Criteria**

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



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

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

## 1. Tenure-track Faculty

**Assistant Professor.** Minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of assistant professor include a PhD degree in Mathematics (or closely related field), evidence of potential for scholarly productivity and the potential to develop into an internationally recognized scholar, demonstrated potential for effective teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, a willingness to provide high-quality service to the department, the institution, and the profession, and a strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the ranks in a timely fashion. Appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the seventh year will be the final year of employment.

Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Committee of Eligible Faculty determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period.

**Associate Professor and Professor.** Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor, with or without tenure, Professor with tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs.

Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to these ranks (see Section VI.A). The College of Arts and Sciences has the following additional criteria.

Criteria for appointment offers at the rank of associate professor with tenure include:

- National recognition for a high-quality body of scholarship
- Demonstrated excellence in teaching undergraduate and graduate students
- Demonstrated excellence in service/outreach to their profession and field as well as locally to the university.
- Strong potential to advance to the rank of professor in a timely fashion.

Criteria for appointment offers at the rank of professor with tenure include:

- An established national or international reputation as a leading scholar in their field with an outstanding body of scholarship
- Demonstrated excellence in teaching at graduate and undergraduate levels
- Demonstrated record of high-quality service to their field and institution.

Appointment at the rank of associate professor normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at the rank of associate professor is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate

has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

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

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

## **2. Teaching Faculty**

The Department of Mathematics supports Teaching Faculty. These appointments exist for faculty members who focus principally on the education needs of students in the department or college. Teaching Faculty members are expected to contribute to the department's education mission as reflected in undergraduate and graduate program (Master's level) development and teaching. Teaching Faculty appointments are made in accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-7](#). Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the department.

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 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 must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for teaching professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. Tenure is not granted to teaching faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance.

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

**Assistant Teaching Professor.** An earned doctorate in mathematics (or appropriate related field) is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of Assistant Teaching Professor. Evidence of ability to produce high quality instruction is also required.

**Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor.** Appointment at the rank of Associate Teaching Professor or Teaching Professor requires that the individual have an earned doctorate in mathematics (or appropriate related field) and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria—in teaching, professional practice and other service, and teaching scholarship—for promotion to these ranks.

## **3. Associated Faculty**

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

**Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor.** Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give academic service to the department, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees, for which a faculty title is appropriate. The term of appointment is for one year with renewal contingent on continued significant contributions. The adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track or teaching 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 or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

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

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

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

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

**Zassenhaus and Ross Visiting Assistant Professors.** Zassenhaus and Ross Visiting Assistant Professors are compensated associated faculty with Visiting Assistant Professor appointments (see previous paragraph). Zassenhaus and Ross Visiting Assistant Professors are appointed annually for up to three years, subject to normal review. Appointments to these positions are made to very promising mathematicians who have recently completed their Ph.D. degrees. Candidates for either position are expected to have demonstrated potential for excellence in research and teaching, though the emphasis will be on research excellence for appointment to Zassenhaus Visiting Assistant Professorships, and on teaching excellence for appointment to Ross Visiting Assistant Professorships. As with other Visiting Assistant Professor appointments, these positions may not be reappointed for more than three consecutive years. Zassenhaus and Ross Visiting Assistant Professors are not eligible for tenure or promotion.

#### **4. Regional Campus Faculty**

As the mission of the regional campuses emphasizes undergraduate instruction, regional campus criteria for appointment at the tenure-track ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor are similar to those for Columbus campus faculty but give relatively greater emphasis at each rank to teaching experience and quality. However, considering the higher teaching and service load, candidates for this position must still be involved in scholarly activity in mathematics.

Regional campus criteria for the appointment of teaching faculty 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 faculty, or associated faculty may request emeritus status upon retirement or resignation at the age of sixty or older with ten or more years of service, or at any age with twenty-five or more years of service.

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the department chair (regional campus dean for associated faculty on regional campuses) outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-4) will hold a meeting to review and discuss the application. This will be followed by a vote of the Eligible faculty present at the meeting. If a simple majority (50%) is in favor of granting emeritus status, the committee will recommend that the department chair support the emeritus faculty status. The department chair will decide upon the request and if appropriate submit it to the dean, who will forward the recommendation to the provost.

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.

Emeritus faculty may not vote at any level of governance, may not serve on any department committees, may not attend faculty meetings, and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters.

## **6. Joint Appointments**

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

## **7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty**

Courtesy appointments are no-salary (0% FTE) appointments for tenure-track or teaching Ohio State faculty from other tenure-initiating units. A courtesy appointment shall be based on an expectation of the appointee's substantial involvement in the department; continuation of the appointment should reflect

ongoing contributions. 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. Unlike associated appointments, courtesy appointments do not require formal annual review.

## **B. Procedures**

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

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

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

### **1. Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

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

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows.

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

National searches to fill all tenure track positions in the Department of Mathematics will be managed by the department Advisory Committee (AC), through its Recruitment Committee, which makes recommendations on appointments to the department chair.

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 and diverse 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, diverse talent pools to ensure alignment with the university’s commitment to EEO principles and advance the eminence of the institution.
- “Phase 2 | Preliminary Review of Applicants” focuses on best practices for the application review and candidate screening processes. The guidelines and resources in this section support consistency, fairness, and equity 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.

After the interview the AC will discuss the candidate at a meeting of the eligible faculty. The faculty meeting serves to gauge the level of faculty support for each candidate. The eligible faculty will then vote by secret ballot on each candidate to decide whether they meet the criteria for the position. When two thirds or more of the votes are position, this shall constitute a positive recommendation. If more than one candidate receives a positive recommendation, the committee of eligible faculty will vote by secret ballot to rank order the qualified candidates.

If an offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If an offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor, with or without tenure, or professor, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the department chair decides, in consultation with the divisional dean, which candidate to approach first. At

that time, the department chair must discuss the details of the offer, including compensation, with the divisional dean and receive approval before extending an offer.

The department will discuss potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status with the Office of Academic 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.

The College of Arts and Sciences requires that all departments establish a program for the mentorship of probationary tenure-track faculty. The department's mentorship program is described in Appendix A.

## **2. Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

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

For individuals who already hold a Senior Lecturer position, and who have exhibited high quality teaching in our department, a switch to a teaching faculty position might be appropriate. Upon recommendation of the director of undergraduate instruction and the vice-chair for undergraduate studies, the chair may recommend to the dean that such individuals be moved from an associated faculty position to a teaching faculty position without requesting a search waiver. The change of title requires approval by the dean, the department chair, and the Office of Academic Affairs. The request from the director of undergraduate instruction and the vice-chair for undergraduate studies must be initiated by the end of March, to allow enough time for the advisory committee to discuss the files in a regular meeting, open to the faculty. Such appointments are still considered new teaching faculty appointments, so are not allowed if these hires would result in the total number of teaching faculty exceeding the Teaching Faculty cap (see the department's Pattern of Administration Section IV.A).

## **3. Transfer from the Tenure Track**

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

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

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

## **4. TIU Transfer**

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

Approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements for the change have been made and requires the establishment of mutually agreed-upon arrangements among the affected TIU heads, college dean(s), and the faculty member. An MOU signed by all parties, including the Office of



Academic Affairs, must describe in detail the arrangements of the transfer. Since normally the transferring faculty member will fill an existing vacancy in the receiving unit, the MOU will describe the resources supporting the position, including salary, provided by the receiving unit.

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

## **5. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

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

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

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

Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are made on an annual basis and rarely semester by semester. Appointments at the senior lecturer level require a vote by the eligible faculty (all tenured associate professors and professors and all non-probationary associate teaching professors and professors) and approval of the dean. After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment of up to three years may be offered.

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

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

**Zassenhaus and Ross Visiting Assistant Professorships.** The availability of Zassenhaus and Ross Visiting Assistant Professorships will be advertised nationally each Fall. The chair will recommend the top candidates from this list to the divisional dean for appointment.

**Visiting Assistant Professorships.** These positions are ones which are linked to specific faculty members in the department. This includes hires that are partially or fully supported from grants, as well as any visiting positions specifically linked to any hiring or retention offers, or to dual career hires. The chair will recommend the selected candidate to the divisional dean for appointment.

## **6. Regional Campus Faculty**

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

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



Searches for regional campus faculty in mathematics will be performed by a search committee appointed by the dean of the regional campus after consultation with the department chair. The committee shall contain at least one member from the Columbus campus Department of Mathematics.

Candidates will be interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, department chair, and either the regional campus search committee or a broader representation of the regional and Columbus faculties. The dean or an associate dean of the College of Arts and Sciences will also interview the candidates. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. A hiring decision requires agreement by the department chair and regional campus dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin. The letter of offer must be signed by both the department chair and the regional campus dean.

Searches for regional campus teaching faculty are the same as those described above for tenure-track faculty. Due to the 15% cap on the total number of teaching faculty in the department (see the Pattern of Administration Section IV.A), a hire on one campus impacts the capacity of other campuses to hire teaching faculty. As such, searches for regional campus teaching faculty in mathematics will only be initiated with approval from the department chair. Prior to approval, the department chair will consult with the faculty at the regional campuses, as well as the Advisory Committee.

The appointment of associated faculty on the regional campus is described in the regional campus APT document.

## **7. Joint Appointments**

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

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

## **8. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty**

A courtesy (no-salary; 0% FTE) appointment can be proposed by any individual faculty member in the Department of Mathematics for a tenure-track or teaching faculty member from another Ohio State tenure-initiating unit. This requires a complete curriculum vitae and nomination letter to the department chair indicating why the appointment is appropriate. The letter should include a statement indicating the expected uncompensated academic service contributions of the nominee to the Department of Mathematics. If the proposal is approved by the eligible faculty, the department chair extends an offer of appointment. Once appointed, a courtesy appointee shall be reviewed by the Chair every three years to determine if it continues to be justified and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular department faculty meeting.

# **V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEWS**

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

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

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

In all cases, accountability for the annual performance and merit review of faculty members in the Department of Mathematics resides with the department chair.

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

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

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

faculty [workload guideline](#).

## **A. Documentation**

For their annual performance and merit review, compensated faculty members must submit the following documents to the department chair no later than the due date established by the department chair:

- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (all faculty);
- completed annual activity report (all faculty);
- for probationary faculty, an updated Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#).

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.

The promotion and tenure committee (CENT) will also provide an annual report on each probationary tenure-track faculty member and all teaching faculty who are being reviewed for contract renewal or promotion. This document is included in the file for the annual performance and merit review.

## **B. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

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

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

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

### **1. Fourth-Year Review**

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, 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 solicited only when either the department chair or the promotion and tenure committee determine that they are necessary to conduct the Fourth-Year Review. This may occur when the candidate's scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input. In this event, letters are solicited no later than the end of the Autumn semester.

The eligible faculty meets to conduct a review of the candidate and to vote by a secret ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

The promotion and tenure committee (CENT) forwards to the department chair a record of the vote and a written performance review which includes a summation of the views expressed by the eligible faculty in the review meeting. The department chair conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

## **2 Extension of the Tenure Clock**

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**

In the Department of Mathematics, annual reviews of tenured faculty will be carried out by the department chair with assistance from the salary committee, in the process of establishing merit salary increases (see below).

The annual review of tenured faculty examines whether faculty members are achieving sustained excellence and adequate balance in three overlapping aspects of academic life. One aspect is the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the department, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship. A second aspect is the instructional aspect. This includes teaching classes (peer evaluation of instructional efforts), as well as working with our graduate and undergraduate programs, broadly understood to include activities of advising and mentoring. Excellence in teaching also requires maintaining a social environment which welcomes all students to the learning of mathematics. Finally, the third aspect consists of public service. This can include service within the department, the college, the university, the broader community, and the profession.

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the professors in the department who comment on the faculty member's performance in relation to department and individual goals and on progress toward promotion. The department chair conducts an independent assessment; meets with the faculty member to discuss 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 and the department chair may respond in writing.

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. The department chair prepares a written evaluation of performance against these expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review and the department chair may respond in writing.

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

#### **D. Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

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

In the penultimate contract year of a teaching faculty member's appointment, the department chair, in consultation with the undergraduate vice-chair and the Advisory Committee, must determine whether the position held by the teaching faculty member will continue. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed. If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review generally proceeds in the same manner as the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure track faculty. All reappointment decisions are at the discretion of the college dean. There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

#### **E. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. For visiting assistant professors (including Zassenhaus and Ross Assistant Professors), the department chair will request a written evaluation of teaching by the Instructional Improvement and Evaluation Committee. For all compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment, the department chair prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance, future plans, and goals. The department chair's recommendation on renewal of the appointment is final.

Lecturers or senior lecturers 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 or her 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. The department chair will defer to the regional dean on assessment of teaching and service. The regional dean will defer to the department chair on assessment of research. For probationary tenure-track faculty, in the event that the regional campus dean recommends renewal and the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the case shall be reviewed by the college dean or their designee, with the college dean's or their designee's judgment prevailing.

The annual performance and merit review of regional campus teaching faculty is conducted according to the process established on the regional campus. The dean/director will provide the department chair a copy of a teaching faculty member's annual performance and merit review letter.

The annual performance and merit review of regional campus associated faculty is conducted according to the process established on the regional 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.

In formulating recommendations, the department chair consults with the Salary Committee and follows the College of Arts and Sciences requirements that units:

- adopt procedures for the distribution of merit salary and other rewards that recognize the importance of qualitative rather than merely quantitative contributions in each area of faculty activity.
- guard against rigid formulas or weightings of research/creative work, teaching, and service that might limit recognition of extraordinary one-time commitments in one or more areas of variations in workload, or of shifts in responsibilities at different stages of professional development.
- make recommendations for merit salary increases and other rewards that are consistent with that TIU's APT document and other relevant policies, procedures, practices, and standards established by: (1) the college, (2) the Faculty Rules, (3) the Office of Academic Affairs, and (4) the Office of Human Resources.

Except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increases, all funds for annual salary increases are directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and the active promotion of an enriching working and learning environment through collegiality, civility, and openness to diverse ideas and opinions.

As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations for tenure-track faculty, the department chair will consider a weighted score, based on the Salary Committee evaluation of teaching, research, and service (see the POA document). The default weighting is 50% research, 30% teaching, and 20% service. However, faculty members whose work balance has shifted may ask the department chair, at the start of

the academic year, to be evaluated using a different weighting.

In addition, the department chair should proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in it. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

Faculty members who wish to discuss dissatisfaction with their salary increase with the department chair should be prepared to explain how their salary (rather than the increase) is inappropriately low, since increases are solely a means to the end of an optimal distribution of salaries. Faculty members who are not satisfied with the outcome of the discussion with the Chair may file a salary appeal. See the department's Pattern of Administration, Section XV.A.

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

## **VI. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews**

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.*

### **A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion**

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

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

This department is committed to assessing the practice of these values and principles as part of all performance evaluations.



## 1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

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

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

Consistent with these guidelines, promotion to associate professor with tenure in the College of Arts and Sciences requires excellence in both research/creative work and teaching. Evidence of service to the unit and the promise of excellence in service beyond the unit are desirable. The substantial probability that a high rate of quality research/creative work and excellence in teaching and service will continue needs to be established. The claim that awarding tenure to the candidate will improve the overall quality and standing of the unit needs to be supported.

Every candidate is expected to meet the criteria for promotion in all aspects of performance (teaching, scholarship, and service). Excellence in teaching and scholarship and effective service are moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the [American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

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

The 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.

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

Research Criteria: Promotion to associate professor with tenure requires that candidates meet the following criteria in research:

RESEARCH	
Criteria Candidates must have:	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met Candidates may have:
Making significant advances in our knowledge in some branch of mathematics and disseminating that knowledge through publications in high-quality journals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Complete publication record including peer-reviewed journal papers, conference papers and posters (both refereed and otherwise) includes an appropriate amount of publication in highly regarded peer-reviewed journals</li><li>• External letters that comment on the quality of research and significance of research outcomes</li><li>• External grants are not required but may be used as an indicator of high-quality research</li></ul>



Maintaining and enhancing the flow of information between mathematicians and those in the scientific community who are consumers of new mathematical discoveries or who stimulate new avenues of mathematical research.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete record of presentations at colloquia or seminars at well-regarded institutions</li> <li>• Complete record of invited talks at well-regarded conferences.</li> <li>• Citation metrics indicating impact of research contributions on the field</li> </ul>
Attainment of measurable national or international recognition.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• External letters that comment on national or international reputation</li> <li>• Research awards indicating national or international recognition</li> <li>• Serving in editorial board for quality journals</li> <li>• Serving in organizing committee of quality conferences</li> </ul>

Teaching Criteria: Promotion to associate professor with tenure requires that candidates meet the following criteria in teaching:

TEACHING	
Criteria Candidates must have:	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met Candidates may have:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication of mathematics in a thoughtful, stimulating, and effective manner.</li> <li>• Effective and engaging presentation of mathematical content in the classroom.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student evaluations of instruction in all or most courses indicate an appropriate level of student satisfaction</li> <li>• Peer evaluations of instruction which include evaluations of instructional materials developed by the candidate indicate effective, thoughtful, and stimulating pedagogy and/or attention to innovation in instructional methods and approaches.</li> <li>• Awards for teaching excellence</li> </ul>
In graduate student instruction: presenting new developments in the field, offering a solid basis in the fundamentals of mathematics, and supervising graduate student research.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student evaluations of instruction in graduate courses indicate an appropriate level of student satisfaction</li> <li>• Peer evaluations of graduate courses which include evaluations of instructional materials developed by the candidate indicate achievement of this criterion</li> <li>• Well not required, development of new graduate courses focusing on new mathematical content</li> <li>• Complete list of graduate students supervised for thesis study</li> </ul>

Service Criteria: Promotion to associate professor with tenure requires that candidates meet the following criteria in service:

SERVICE	
Criteria Candidates must have:	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met Candidates may have:

Serving responsibly on department committees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of responsible service by colleagues and department administrators documented in annual review letters</li> <li>• Election or appointment to department leadership roles</li> </ul>
Refereeing for journals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete list of service record of refereeing service to quality journals</li> </ul>
Providing service outside the department	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service on professional committee related to mathematical organizations</li> <li>• Service on committees in the college level and/or university level</li> <li>• Service on regional, national or international committees outside Ohio State University</li> <li>• Service to national or international funding agencies</li> </ul>

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.

## 2. Promotion to Professor

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

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

The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure (see Section VI.A.1), with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, evidence of established national distinction as a scholar and an emerging international reputation in the field, and excellence in service to one or more publics, including the university, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, the nation, and/or professional organizations.

It is also expected that a candidate for promotion to professor will have demonstrated significant involvement with our graduate or undergraduate programs. Evidence of such involvement may be demonstrated by any or all of the following: (1) Advising PhD dissertations, (2) Advising Master's theses and undergraduate theses, (3) Overseeing independent study courses or undergraduate research, (4) Curriculum development or revision, (5) Teaching the more difficult graduate courses.

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

In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#), assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another. Normally, the primary criterion for promotion to the rank of professor in the Mathematics Department is a distinguished record of scholarly activity and promise that such activity shall continue. However, the Department also recognizes that a career may have various stages and may shift in focus from scholarly

activity to teaching or administrative service, while still combining to form a very productive and distinguished career. 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. A faculty member who has made truly extraordinary contributions in the areas of teaching or service may warrant promotion with a less extensive, though still high quality, record of continued productivity in research.

### **3. Teaching Faculty**

**Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor.** For promotion to associate teaching professor, a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service; must have a documented high level of competence in professional practice; and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of this department. Specific criteria and evidence in teaching and service for promotion to associate teaching professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure (see Section VI.A.1.) Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

**Promotion to Teaching Professor.** For promotion to teaching professor, a faculty member must have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching; leadership in service to this department and to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

### **4. Associated Faculty**

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

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

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

### **5. Regional Campus Faculty**

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

In evaluating regional campus teaching faculty for promotion, the department will use the same criteria as described above for the promotion of faculty in each of these categories.

## B. Procedures

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

### 1. Tenure-Track and Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus

#### a. Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion are responsible for (1) submitting a complete, accurate dossier and (2) providing a copy of the APT under which they wish to be reviewed, if other than the department's current document. If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for (3) reviewing the list of potential external evaluators compiled for their case according to department 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. The types of documentation the department typically expects to be submitted include the following.

#### Teaching

The time period for teaching documentation (including all courses' SEIs) to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty, it is the date of last promotion or reappointment to present or the last five years prior to the promotion decision, whichever time period is shorter. 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. Documentation for an evaluation of a candidate's teaching performance includes student ratings and written comments, peer review, indicators of the magnitude of service to the Department's undergraduate and graduate teaching missions. Examples of documentation include:

- a. Student evaluations of an instructor will be obtained using the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) instrument. Evaluations must be conducted for every lecture course and seminar course taught in the Department. Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) must be presented. Individual SEI student evaluations will be compared to the College and University mean evaluations. Overall mean scores as well as the response patterns to individual SEI items will be examined during Departmental reviews. Faculty members will also be asked to collect discursive comments using the SEI tool; a summary of these comments will be provided to the Chair and to the eligible faculty for use in the tenure/promotion review.
- b. Teaching will also be evaluated on a periodic basis through peer visits to the classes with reports to the Chair concerning the peer-evaluation of teaching conducted. See Section IX-B-1 for required numbers of peer evaluations. It is the responsibility of the chair to ensure that these peer evaluations have been completed and properly documented.
- c. Dossier narratives are opportunities for the candidate to describe the contributions they have made to the teaching mission, including creation of new courses/curricula, modifications to

existing courses/curricula, use of innovative teaching approaches, and the ways they have modified their teaching in response to peer and student feedback.

#### Scholarship

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

- a. In addition to the list of publications, descriptions of the candidate's contribution to the work and the quality of the journal must be clarified.
- b. Citation counts for published works, including those prior to the appointment start date and/or date of last promotion.
- c. A list of grants and contracts, both intra- and extra-mural in support of research or scholarly endeavors. Information should include direct and indirect costs awarded, the term of the award, and the role of the candidate on the grant/contract.
- d. A list of scholarly presentations, including whether they were invited or peer-reviewed, and whether they were poster or podium presentations. Presentations should be organized by the venue in which they delivered (local, state, national, international).
- e. Listing of awards granted for scholarship.

#### Service

The time period for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty, it is the date of last promotion or reappointment to present or the last five years, whichever time period is shorter. 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.

- a. List of service activities across levels. This includes service to the Department, the College, University, Community, State, nation, and profession. Service outside the university includes the professional expertise of the faculty member to scholarly associations and groups as well as to the community. Internal to the University it includes service to students and formal and ad-hoc committees as defined in the Department and College Pattern of Administration, the University Senate, and other university offices.
- b. Dossier narratives provide an opportunity for the candidate to document the nature of service provided and to provide context on the effort and prestige of the service activities (e.g. leadership in a professional society, service on a University Senate committee), since the significance of service contributions vary considerably and are often difficult to ascertain from only the listing of the activity.
- c. List of any service awards or honors won.

While the Promotion and Tenure Committee (CENT or PROCOMP) makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by him 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 or non-probationary faculty, it is the date of last promotion,

reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

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

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

The completed dossier needs to be made available to the faculty before the meeting (and vote) of the eligible faculty. In the event that changes are made to the dossier after the faculty vote, the eligible faculty will be informed of such changes. At that point, any eligible faculty member may ask the chair of the promotion and tenure committee for a revote. If no such request is received within 24 hours of the notification of changes in the dossier, the change will be considered minimal, and the original vote will be considered valid.

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

As noted above, if external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed according to department guidelines. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names. The department chair decides whether removal is justified.

### **b. Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities (CENT or PROCOMP)**

The responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee (CENT or PROCOMP) 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 facilitate a meeting with the eligible faculty 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.
  - The committee will organize a meeting of the eligible faculty to discuss the merits of the case (see III.C). At the meeting, each non-mandatory case will be discussed. The meeting will be followed by a vote, handled by the Election Committee. Only participants at the meeting will be allowed to vote. At least two-thirds of the votes must be positive in order for the review to proceed (see III.D).
  - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
  - A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) only once. Faculty Rule [3335-7-08](#) makes the same provision for nonprobationary teaching 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 eligible faculty 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 one or more Procedures Oversight Designees who will serve in this role for the following year. The chair of the committee cannot serve as Procedures Oversight Designee. Each candidate for promotion is assigned to one of the Procedures Oversight Designees. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described [here](#).
  - **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (See Section VI.B,4 below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.
  - **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to ensure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins. This is usually carried out by the Procedures Oversight Designee responsible for the candidate.

- Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.
- Consider the interdisciplinary work of a candidate across multiple units as part of the whole work, especially if the candidate has a joint appointment in another unit.
- Revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of the full eligible faculty, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; The revised document will specify the department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service, summarize the faculty perspectives on whether the candidate has met every criterion in each aspect of performance, and reference the sources of evidence in the dossier on which those perspectives are based. The completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair. This becomes the official report of the eligible faculty.
- 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 our own 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 discuss in detail the evidence in the dossier on whether the candidate has met each of the department's criteria in research, teaching, and service.
- 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.

Voting is carried out through the Election Committee (see the department's [Pattern of Administration](#) Section VII.D for information on the committee's composition and functions), following the procedures outlined in III.C, III.D.

### **d. Department Chair's Responsibilities**

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. The TIU



must ensure that such questions are asked of all candidates 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 the list of names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, and the candidate (see External Evaluations below).
  - To solicit an evaluation from a head of any units in which the candidate has a joint appointment. These may be tenure-initiating units in the case of a joint appointment, or can be a university institute or administrative unit. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit. These letters are part of the candidate dossier, so need to be obtained prior to the meeting of the eligible faculty.
- To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
  - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair
  - of the availability for review of the written evaluations of 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 department chair of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

## **2. Procedures for Associated Faculty**

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

## **3. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty**

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

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

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

Regional campus teaching faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. Following the review, the dean/director consults with the faculty member's 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**

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews and all teaching faculty promotion reviews to the rank of Teaching Professor. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor or for associated faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations for a teaching faculty member will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the appropriate Promotion and Tenure Committee (CENT or PROCOMP).

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

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

- Is written by a person at an appropriate peer or aspirational institution. In keeping with college guidelines, the department will generally obtain evaluations from faculty at R01 institutions that are members of the Association of American Universities (AAU) and the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA). Justification will be provided in each case in which a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.
- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. The department will generally solicit evaluations from professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.
- 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 or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters are sought than are required, and they are solicited no later than the end of the spring semester prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee (CENT or PROCOMP), the department chair, and the candidate. All potential evaluators must be approved by the College of Arts and Sciences through the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. No written justification is required for tenured professors at peer or near-peer institutions as defined above. If the potential evaluator is from an academic institution that is not clearly a peer or aspirational peer for Ohio State, or if the potential evaluator is from a nonacademic institution (e.g., a public policy think tank, a private art academy or music conservatory, a museum, a biomedical company, or a governmental agency), a brief written justification is required. The department's justification will be based on the prestige of the institution, the credentials and experience of the evaluator, and/or the specific relevance of the evaluator's expertise to the candidate's activities. International evaluators from strong institutions are allowed. The research credentials of the evaluators will generally mirror those of a professor at the professor rank at Ohio State. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors. The department will

provide justification if more than a minority of the evaluations are from associate professors (e.g., candidate's work is in a small or new field for which more senior people are not available, evaluators have gained prominence as national or international experts in the field). For reviews of associate professors, all evaluators must be professors (or equivalent). Emeritus professors are acceptable as long as they are active researchers.

If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that 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 faculty can be found [here](#). Evaluators will be provided with copies of the vita, publications list, all preprints of manuscripts submitted by the candidate, up to five (5) reprints selected by the candidate, and any other material the Promotion and Tenure Committee deems appropriate.

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

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

## **VII. Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals**

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

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

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

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

## **VIII. Seventh-Year Reviews**

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

## **IX. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

The College of Arts and Sciences values excellence in teaching across disciplines and at all levels of instruction. Student and peer evaluations of teaching provide tools for assessing faculty teaching effectiveness and for providing faculty with regular opportunities for improvement. Evaluation of teaching should be holistic, considering a variety of evidence of accomplishment in the classroom: for example, student evaluations (quantitative and narrative), peer evaluations, examples of curricular or pedagogic innovation, and efforts to improve teaching by taking advantage of college or university resources.

In no case should the evaluation of teaching rely exclusively on quantitative instruments (such as the SEI), which have been shown to be unreliable indicators of overall performance in the classroom and to work systematically to the disadvantage of women, non-native English speakers, and faculty of color.

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

### **A. Student Evaluation of Teaching**

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEIs, or electronic SEIs) is required in every regular course offered in this department. Faculty members should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if they are going to provide in-class time for students to complete the evaluation using a mobile application. The faculty member must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation. The faculty member should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and to provide feedback that can be taken into account in future teaching. SEI scores are primarily an indicator of student satisfaction and may not be used as the sole evidence of teaching effectiveness.

### **B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

Peer evaluation of teaching is required for all faculty members in the College of Arts and Sciences. Peer evaluation should fulfill two basic goals: 1) provide constructive feedback to faculty on both the content and the quality of their instruction, and 2) help faculty to continually improve the overall effectiveness of their teaching at all levels.

Annually the department chair appoints an Instructional Improvement and Evaluation Committee (IIEC) of a size judged sufficient to meet the volume of peer review activity expected that year, without overburdening any of the members. The term of service is one year, with reappointment possible. The IIEC committee serves to oversee the department's peer evaluation of teaching process, with duties and procedures described in our POA.

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

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi, instruction materials, assignments, and exams. Faculty under review

will be asked to provide peer reviewers with the course syllabus and other materials well in advance of the classroom visit or visits. They should also provide reviewers with a list of preferred visitation dates. In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should focus on such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. The college encourages the reviewer to first meet with the faculty member under review to discuss the instructor's teaching philosophy, goals and expected outcomes for the course, and any challenges related to instruction (including previous feedback from previous evaluations of teaching). In addition to preparing a written report for the faculty member's dossier, the reviewer should meet with the faculty member following the classroom visitation for a more informal consultation about their teaching effectiveness.

Written reports of peer evaluation of teaching should focus not only on classroom performance but also on curricular choices, implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and engagement with current disciplinary knowledge. Written reports should be completed by the end of the semester of review and submitted to the department chair, copied to the faculty member. The faculty member may provide written comments on this report and the peer reviewer may respond in writing to those comments if he or she wishes. All such comments are appended to the report for inclusion in the faculty member's promotion and tenure dossier, unless the faculty member requests the comments be excluded.

Peer Evaluations of Probationary Faculty: The department chair is responsible for coordinating peer review of teaching in conjunction with the IIEC of probationary tenure-track and probationary teaching faculty at least once per year during the probationary period, with the goal of adequately assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. When assistant professors are reviewed for tenure and promotion, they are required to have a minimum of five peer evaluations of teaching from the probationary period. When probationary teaching faculty are reviewed for reappointment or promotion, they are required to have a minimum of four peer evaluations of instruction from the probationary period. No more than two evaluations should be prepared by the same colleague.

Peer Evaluations of Tenured and Non-Probationary Faculty: The department chair is responsible for coordinating the peer review of teaching in conjunction with the IIEC, of tenured associate professors and nonprobationary assistant teaching professors, and nonprobationary associate teaching professors at least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned and of having at least two peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion or reappointment review.

The teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary teaching professors should be reviewed at least once every four years, with the goal of assessing teaching at all levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. When non-probationary teaching professors are reviewed for reappointment, they are required to have a minimum of two peer-evaluations of instruction since the last promotion or reappointment.

Formative Peer Reviews of Teaching: The department chair may request peer reviews of the teaching of any faculty member who, in the head's judgment, would benefit from review. Typically, such reviews are in response to low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance to improve teaching.

Any faculty member may request additional peer review of teaching. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking

formative reviews may also seek the services of the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning.

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

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Mentorship Plan**

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

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

Mentees who would like additional mentorship support or otherwise believe that their current mentoring relationship is not meeting their needs should discuss the issue with the department chair or designee (e.g., P&T committee chair). The department chair or designee will seek a resolution, which may include assigning a new mentor or adding an additional mentor to the mentorship team. If the probationary faculty member's concerns are not resolved through this process, they should schedule a meeting with the Divisional Dean or the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs in the College of Arts and Sciences. Faculty mentors may also be changed if the probationary faculty member, in consultation with the department chair, identifies a mentor who is more closely aligned with the goals of the faculty member.