

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

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 05/26/2026

Table of Contents

I.	Preamble	5
II.	Department Mission.....	5
III.	Definitions.....	6
	A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty	6
	1. Tenure-track Faculty	6
	2. Teaching Faculty	6
	3. Research Faculty	7
	4. Associated Faculty	7
	B. Conflict of Interest.....	8
	C. Minimum Composition	9
	D. Quorum.....	9
	E. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.....	9
	1. Appointment	10
	2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion	10
IV.	Appointments	10
	A. Criteria.....	10
	1. Tenure-track Faculty	10
	2. Teaching Faculty	12
	3. Research Faculty	13
	4. Associated Faculty	14
	5. Regional Campus Faculty	15
	6. Emeritus Faculty.....	15
	7. Joint Appointments.....	15
	8. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	16
	B. Procedures	16
	1. Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus	17
	2. Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus	18
	3. Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus	18
	4. Transfer from the Tenure-track	18
	5. TIU Transfer	18
	6. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	19
	7. Regional Campus Faculty	19

	8. Joint Appointments.....	19
	9. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	20
V.	Annual Performance and Merit Review	20
	A. Documentation	21
	B. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus	22
	1. Fourth-Year Review	23
	2. Extension of the Tenure Clock	24
	C. Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus	24
	D. Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus	25
	E. Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus	25
	F. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	26
	G. Regional Campus Faculty	26
	H. Salary Recommendations	26
	1. Criteria	27
	2. Procedures	27
VI.	Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	28
	A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion.....	28
	1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	28
	2. Promotion to Professor	33
	3. Teaching Faculty	35
	4. Research Faculty	37
	5. Associated Faculty	38
	6. Regional Campus Faculty	38
	B. Procedures	39
	1. Tenure-Track, Teaching, and Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus	39
	a. Candidate Responsibilities	39
	b. Responsibilities of the Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty	42
	c. Eligible Faculty Responsibilities	43
	d. Department Chair Responsibilities	44
	2. Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	45
	3. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty	45
	4. External Evaluations.....	46
VII.	Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals	48

VIII.	Seventh-Year Reviews.....	48
IX.	Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching	49
	A. Student Evaluation of Teaching	49
	B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching	49
X.	Appendix A: Mentorship Plan	51

I. Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty; the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook; and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the Department of Microbiology and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the Department of Microbiology 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 Arts and Sciences or their designee and the OAA before it may be implemented. It sets forth the Department of Microbiology'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 OAA accept the mission and criteria of the Department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to Departmental mission and criteria.

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

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

II. Department Mission

The mission of the Department is to provide a comprehensive education in microbiology and to extend, through investigative research, the body of knowledge that forms the discipline of microbiology. Student education is accomplished through formal lectures, laboratory exercises, tutorials and one-on-one discussions and demonstrations. Microbiology is an experimental science and an education in microbiology requires extensive exposure of undergraduate and graduate students to laboratory experiences. The Department's mission therefore includes maximizing student access to appropriate laboratory facilities, research equipment and financial support. The research interests and teaching activities of the faculty in the Department are varied. Faculty members disseminate knowledge and research expertise over a wide range of topics within the discipline of microbiology to students enrolled at OSU and, as a service, also to government, private organizations and to individuals. The multiple missions of the Department of Microbiology, expected by the University of all Departments, are formally designated as teaching, research, and service.

III. Definitions

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

The Department Chair, the Dean, the Divisional Dean, 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, promotion and tenure, or contract renewal.

1. Tenure-track Faculty

Appointment Reviews

- **Initial Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring) review of an Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the Department.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

- For the reappointment and promotion and tenure reviews of Assistant Professors and the tenure review of untenured Associate Professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured Associate Professors and Professors.
- For the promotion reviews of Associate Professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured Professors.

2. Teaching Faculty

Appointment Reviews

- **Initial Appointment Review: Assistant Teaching Professor.** For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an Assistant Teaching Professor, the Chair will form a search committee made up of a minimum of three members of the eligible faculty who have demonstrated success in pedagogical research or instructional performance. This committee will evaluate applicants and recommend a hiring decision to the Chair.

- **Initial Appointment Review: Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor.** For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review at senior rank (Associate Teaching Professors and Teaching Professors), the committee of the eligible faculty will evaluate applicants and recommend a hiring decision to the Chair. The committee of eligible faculty for a senior teaching faculty appointment consists of all tenure-track and all teaching faculty in the Department.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all 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, all nonprobationary Associate Teaching Professors, and all nonprobationary 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. Research Faculty

Appointment Reviews

- **Initial Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research Professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all research faculty in the Department.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and all nonprobationary research faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of Research Assistant Professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured Associate Professors and Professors and all non-probationary Research Associate Professors and Professors.
- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of Research Associate Professors and the reappointment reviews of Research Professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured Professors and all non-probationary Research Professors.

4. Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- For the initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty, all teaching faculty, and all research faculty in the department.
- Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by the eligible faculty (all non-probationary teaching faculty and tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college dean and the Office of Academic Affairs.
- For reappointments, the eligible faculty are all tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank than the candidate and all non-probationary teaching faculty of equal or higher rank than the candidate.

Promotion Reviews

- Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have adjunct titles, tenure-track titles with service at 40% FTE or below, or lecturer titles.
- For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track, teaching, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Sections III.A.1, 2 or 3 above.
- For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with tenure-track titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section III.A.1.
- For the promotion review of a lecturer to senior lecturer, the eligible faculty shall be all tenure-track and non-probationary teaching faculty at the rank of associate professor and professor.

B. Conflict of Interest

- Search Committee Conflict of Interest

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

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

- **Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest**

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

- a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor;
- a co-author on more than 50% of the candidate's publications since appointment or last promotion, including pending publications and submissions;
- a collaborator on more than 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.

C. 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 of the Division of Natural and Mathematical Sciences, will appoint a faculty member from another department within the college.

D. Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty, not including faculty who are on an approved leave of absence or Faculty Professional Leave (FPL). Faculty on approved leave or FPL 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 a 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 a quorum.

E. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters, only "yes" and "no" votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. CEF members are expected to participate fully in the review process and vote on personnel matters.

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

1. Appointment

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

In the case of a joint appointment, the Department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment TIU prior to appointment.

2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion

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

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

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; 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 if 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, research, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment.

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

1. Tenure-track Faculty

Instructor. Appointment at the rank of Instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of Assistant Professor, but requirements for the terminal degree have not been completed by

the candidate at the time of appointment. Procedures for appointment are identical to that of Assistant Professor. The Department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the Instructor level is limited to three years. Promotion to Assistant Professor occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. When an Instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor by the end of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to Assistant Professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an Instructor. This request must be approved by the Department's eligible faculty, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the OAA. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to exclude time from the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor. Minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor include an earned doctoral degree, strong prior research accomplishments, the potential for sustained research productivity at Ohio State, a high probability of securing outside funding to support their research, strong teaching capabilities and 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 7th 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 OAA, 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 exclude time from 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 Office of Academic Affairs.

Appointment at the rank of associate professor or professor requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the Department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to these ranks.

Additional criteria for appointment 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 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 OAA, 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

Except for those appointed at the rank of Instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all teaching faculty must be for a period of five years. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually by the eligible faculty. Second and subsequent contracts for Assistant and Associate Teaching Professors must be for a period of at least three and 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. There is no presumption that subsequent appointments will be offered, regardless of performance. The terms of a contract may be re-negotiated at the time of reappointment. These extended appointments are not probationary, and the individual may only be terminated for cause (see rule [3335-5-04](#) of the Administrative Code) or financial exigency (see rule [3335-5-02.1](#) of the Administrative Code). Tenure is not granted to teaching faculty.

Teaching appointments exist for faculty members who focus principally on the education needs of students in Microbiology. Teaching faculty members are expected to contribute to the Department's education mission as reflected in undergraduate and graduate program 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.

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 is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of Assistant Teaching Professor. Evidence of ability to teach is highly desirable.

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 and meet, at a minimum, the Department's criteria—in teaching, service, and scholarship—for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at the rank of teaching professor requires production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice.

3. Research Faculty

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

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

The appointment of research faculty must be based on a clear and sound plan for the programmatic future of the Department and college and on a realistic determination of the availability of resources to support the appointment.

It is expected that 100% of the individual's salary will come from extramural research grants for which typically either the research faculty member or a colleague, their sponsor, will be Principal Investigator. The Sponsor must certify that sufficient research grant funds exist to cover the salary over the period of the contract.

Research faculty will not be assigned research space but will work in the specifically designated space assigned to a Sponsor, a tenure-track faculty member in the Department of Microbiology. Space designation will be made in writing, in the form of a letter from the Sponsor to the Department Chair.

While continued collaboration with the Sponsor is likely, research faculty are expected to begin to publish a body of work independent of the Sponsor. Peer-reviewed publications independent of the Sponsor and independent grant support are expected within three years of appointment.

External appointees at the Research Associate Professor or Research Professor level will demonstrate the same accomplishments in research and service as persons promoted within the Department.

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

Research Associate Professor and Research Professor. Appointment at the rank of Research Associate Professor or Research Professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and meet, at a minimum, the Department's criteria for promotion to these ranks.

4. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a couple of 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 titles are used to confer faculty status on individuals who hold credentials comparable to those of tenure-track, teaching, or research faculty of equivalent rank. The adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track, teaching, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who provide academic service for the Department, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees or serving as a co-investigator on a research project for which a faculty title is appropriate. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure), and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track, teaching, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

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

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

Senior Lecturer. Appointment as Senior Lecturer requires that the individual has a doctorate in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction, or a master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience with

documentation of high quality. Senior Lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The initial appointment for a Senior Lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for Senior Lecturers cannot exceed three years.

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for no more than three consecutive years.

5. Regional Campus Faculty

As the mission of the regional campuses emphasizes undergraduate instruction, regional campus criteria for appointment at the tenure-track ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor are similar to those for Columbus campus faculty but give relatively greater emphasis at each rank to teaching experience and quality.

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

6. Emeritus Faculty

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

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the 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 review the application and make a recommendation to the Department Chair, who will decide upon the request, and if appropriate, submit it to the dean or designee.

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

7. 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 personnel matters including appointments, promotion, and tenure cases only in their TIU.

8. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

B. Procedures

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

The SHIFT (Strategic Hiring Initiative for Faculty Talent) Framework was designed to identify and recruit broad, qualified applicant pools of extraordinary scholars who are leaders in their respective fields. Deans, department chairs, and search committee members work in partnership with the Office of Faculty Affairs and other key stakeholders in adherence to this framework to ensure a thorough, fair, and consistent faculty search process. The framework consists of four distinct phases—each of which includes a series of core requirements (must-do action steps) and optimal practices (aspirational action steps)—followed by a fifth phase focused on preboarding and onboarding.

This department adheres in every respect to the Framework requirements as detailed at [SHIFT](#).

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 [Faculty Appointments, Faculty Workload, Tenure, and Retrenchment policy](#) for information on the following topics:

- Recruitment of tenure-track, teaching, research, and associated faculty
- Appointments at senior rank or with prior service credit

- Hiring faculty from other institutions after April 30
- Appointment of foreign nationals
- Letters of offer

1. Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

The Divisional Dean for Natural and Mathematical Sciences provides approval for the Department to commence a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise.

The Department Chair will appoint a Search Committee of three or more faculty that will consist primarily of faculty members from the Department of Microbiology but may include faculty from other Departments.

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.

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

In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the Department Chair, after consultation with the eligible faculty, decides which candidate to approach first, subject to approval of the divisional dean. Before extending an offer to any candidate, the department chair must discuss the details of the offer, including compensation, with the divisional dean and receive approval.

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

2. Teaching 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 virtual or on-campus interview is on teaching practice and/or philosophy rather than scholarship.

3. Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

4. Transfer from the Tenure-track

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a teaching or research appointment if appropriate to the individual's and departmental and college needs, and if funding for the salary is available. Tenure 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 or research appointment to the tenure-track are not permitted. Teaching and research faculty members may apply for tenure-track positions and compete in regular national searches for such positions.

5. TIU Transfer

Faculty requests to move from one TIU to another must be approved by a simple majority of the 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 Office of Academic Affairs can provide guidance to non-tenure-track faculty about the process for transferring from one TIU to another.

6. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

The appointment of all compensated associated faculty members follows a formal search following the [SHIFT](#) Framework, which includes a job posting in Workday (see Section IV.B), a formal search, and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the Department Chair based on recommendation from the search committee and following a vote by the Department Committee of the Eligible Faculty. The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty is decided by the Department Chair following a vote by the Department Committee of the Eligible Faculty.

Compensated and uncompensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter or longer period of up to three years is appropriate to the circumstances. Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three consecutive years.

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer appointments are usually made on a semester-by-semester or annual basis. After the initial appointment of no more than one year and if the Department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple-year appointment of up to three years may be offered.

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

7. Regional Campus Faculty

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

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

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus Dean, Department Chair, and either the regional campus search committee or a broader representation of the regional and Columbus faculties. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. A hiring decision requires agreement by the Department Chair and regional campus Dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the Department Chair and the regional campus Dean.

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

8. Joint Appointments

The Department may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another Ohio State

TIU as described in Section IV.A.7. The potential for a joint appointment is typically evaluated during the recruitment process and, as such, is subject to all criteria outlined above for each faculty category.

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

9. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

V. Annual Performance and Merit Review

The Department follows the requirements for annual performance and merit reviews as set forth in the Policy on Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment, which stipulates that such reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting 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 annual performance and merit review of all faculty members is the responsibility of the Department Chair. The Department Chair may designate the responsibility for annual performance and merit reviews to appropriate unit administrators. The designee or a subcommittee of the eligible faculty may provide a written assessment to the Department Chair. However, unless the Office of Academic Affairs has granted an exception to a large unit, the 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 Department Chair or the Chair's designee must be provided to all tenured and non-probationary faculty.

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

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

The Department Chair is required (per Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#)) to include a reminder in the annual 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 reviews are not merely descriptive summaries of activities but evaluate performance in relation to the unit's criteria 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 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 reviews also 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 first Monday of February:

- Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#) (*required for probationary faculty*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (*non-probationary faculty*)
- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in the Microbiology P&T folder on Teams (*all faculty*)

Other documentation for the annual performance and merit review will be the same as that for consideration for promotion and/or tenure, including:

- A list of all scholarly papers submitted, published, or accepted for publication since the previous year's report.
- Survey of Student Learning Experience reports for every class taught since the previous Annual Performance and Merit Review, and other relevant documentation of teaching, such as student narrative evaluations, as appropriate.

- A list of current grants and contracts, including project title, role of the faculty member (e.g., PI or Co-PI), funding agency, grant identifier used by the funding agency, funded period, dollar amount, and OSP project number.
- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate, e.g., grants and contract proposals that have been submitted, telescope time awarded, etc.
- A list of service contributions, including committees at the international, national, state, university, college, and department levels, membership on scientific organizing committees, participation in reviews (as a referee of research papers or TAC member, for example), etc.

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

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

B. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

During the probationary period, each faculty member will be reviewed and considered for reappointment annually in accordance with the policies of the Department, College, and University. The annual review will encompass the faculty member's performance in teaching, research, and service as well as evidence of continuing development.

Annual reviews are conducted during Spring semester. The Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty shall inform probationary faculty in writing at least forty-five days in advance of the time that their activities and accomplishments are to be reviewed.

The Committee of the Eligible Faculty is provided access to the faculty member's dossier for evaluation at least seven days in advance of the meeting. The meeting is convened and led by the Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. At the completion of the review, the Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty will provide to the Department Chair a candid and constructive written report that documents the Committee's evaluation of the faculty member's performance and professional development. The report will assess both strengths and weaknesses and will include recommendations as appropriate to help the faculty member meet the Department's requirements for promotion and tenure.

The Department Chair then conducts an evaluation of the faculty member, informed by the CEF report. The Chair's review letter, which includes feedback from the CEF, will be addressed to the candidate. The letter will indicate whether the candidate exceeds expectations, meets

expectations, or fails to meet expectations in each of the three categories of teaching, research, and service. The candidate will have an opportunity to provide formal comments on the annual review to be included in the candidate's promotion case file.

If the Department Chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final.

If the Department Chair concludes that the faculty appointment should not be renewed, 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

In the Spring of the fourth year of the probationary period, the mandatory Fourth-Year Review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exceptions that external evaluations are optional and the Dean makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

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

The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate. The meeting is convened and led by the Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the Fourth-Year Review, evidence of significant progress in establishing an independent research program must be documented. The results of research conducted at The Ohio State University should be proceeding through the publication process. Success in obtaining a competitive extramural research grant is expected by the end of the third year. If grant support is lacking, the candidate must submit a written statement to the Department Chair that identifies the reasons for the lack of extramural research grant support, efforts made by the candidate to obtain research grant support and an estimate of additional resources that could be provided by the Department to help ensure the success of the candidate's research program.

The eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the Department Chair, who conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the 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.

Renewal of the appointment of a probationary faculty member for the fifth year requires the approval of the divisional dean. In cases where the divisional dean concurs with a department's recommendations to approve the renewal of the appointment, review by the College of Arts and Sciences Divisional Promotion and Tenure Review Panel is optional and at the divisional dean's

discretion. The divisional review panel, however, must review negative department reappointment recommendations. If either the department chair or the divisional dean recommends nonrenewal of a faculty member's probationary contract, the case will be referred to the college's Promotion and Tenure Committee, which will review the case, vote and make a recommendation to the dean. The dean, in consultation with the divisional dean, makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

2. Extension of the Tenure Clock

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

C. Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Associate Professors are reviewed annually by the Committee of Eligible Faculty. The meeting is convened and led by the Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, who writes a detailed performance review that includes advice on the faculty member's progress toward promotion. This letter is addressed to the Department Chair. The Department Chair then conducts an independent assessment that is informed by the CEF report as appropriate. The Chair's review letter, which includes feedback from the CEF, is addressed to the faculty member. The Department Chair provides the faculty member an opportunity to meet and discuss the review, future plans, and goals.

Professors are reviewed annually by the Department Chair. The Department Chair meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance, future plans, and goals. The annual review of Professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the Department, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the Department, the College, the University, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of Assistant and Associate Professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, 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.

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.

A post-tenure review, in accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-5-04.5](#), will be initiated if a tenured faculty member receives a “does not meet performance expectation” rating in the same evaluative category in at least two of the past three consecutive annual reviews. A faculty member who retains tenure following a post-tenure review will be subject to an additional post-tenure review if they receive a “does not meet performance expectations” rating in any area of their annual review in the two years subsequent to a post-tenure review. The department chair, dean, or provost may require an immediate and for cause post-tenure review at any time for a faculty member who has a documented and sustained record of significant underperformance outside of the faculty member's annual performance evaluation. For this purpose, for cause may not be based on a faculty member's allowable expression of academic freedom as defined by the university or Ohio law.

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 must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed.

If the position is to continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate year to determine whether the position will continue. This review generally proceeds in the same manner as the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty.

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

E. Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

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

If the position 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 proceeds in the same manner as the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

F. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

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

G. Regional Campus Faculty

The annual performance and merit review of a regional campus probationary tenure-track or tenured faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus 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. 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 on the regional campus with the review focusing on teaching and service. 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 entirely on the regional campus, with the review focusing on teaching and service, as applicable.

H. Salary Recommendations

The College of Arts and Sciences requires 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 department'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.

1. Criteria

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

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

Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity. Faculty with high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation 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.

2. Procedures

The Department Chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the Dean, who may modify these recommendations. Salary increases are formulated in dollar amounts rather than percentage increases, with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the Department Chair divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) and considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate. The Department Chair should proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the Department and across the field or fields represented in it.

Faculty members who wish to discuss 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.

VI. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

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

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

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

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

1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

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

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

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

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

Every candidate is expected to meet the criteria for promotion in all aspects of performance. Accepting weakness in any aspect of performance in making a tenure decision is tantamount to deliberately handicapping the Department's ability to perform and to progress academically.

The criteria listed in the charts below in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service are expected of all faculty for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. 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.

The tables below list the criteria required of all faculty for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure and examples of the types of evidence that may be used to demonstrate that the criteria have been met.

TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge	• Peer evaluators determine that syllabi and class materials are up-to-date and appropriate for topic and audience • Positive peer evaluation on mode of instruction • Positive peer evaluation on treatment of and interactions with students • Peer evaluation demonstrates positive trajectory during review period • Positive evaluations from Continuing Education Programs, both internal and external to the university • Attended continuing education on topic or focus area and adopted new materials in class
Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm	
Demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment	
Engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process	

Treated students with respect and courtesy	• Use of multimodal techniques or approaches to stimulate class participation and learning – discuss in teaching narrative • Overall positive scores on the SSLE single-selection response questions • Overall positive SSLE open-ended comments • Incorporating new technologies to courses (e. g. on-line manuals, electronic notebooks) • Receiving teaching awards
Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process	• Positive student comments on SSLE on feedback to students throughout the instructional process
Improved and/or developed curriculum	• Revising existing courses and academic programs • Developing new courses and academic programs • Changing or developing syllabi, examinations, laboratory exercises, and problem sets, to demonstrate up-to-date thought on subject content
Mentored graduate students and/or postdocs	• Serving as advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the Department's graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise • Serving on thesis, dissertation, and graduate examination committees • Timely completion of degree by graduate mentees • Publishing with graduate students and postdocs • Promoting student/postdoc participation in research conferences • Promoting student/postdoc applications for research funding and mentoring them throughout the process • Students and/or postdocs receive awards and fellowships for their research activities

Mentored undergraduate students	• Mentoring of undergraduate research students in their laboratory • Promoting student participation in research presentations (e.g., Denman) • Serving as mentor or committee member for honors research theses • Students receive awards for their research efforts
Engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching	• Attending continuing education on topic or focus area and adopting new materials in class • Completing Foundations, Impact Teaching through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning • Completing Teaching at Ohio State through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning • Awarding of “Endorsement” from Drake Institute of Teaching and Learning
Provided to all students the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning and, to the most capable and motivated students, an enhanced learning experience.	• Peer evaluations of instruction • Student evaluation of instruction • Student accomplishments

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Published a body of work in high-quality peer-reviewed venues that is thematically focused, contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and is beginning to be favorably cited or otherwise show evidence of influence on the work of others.	• A body of work in peer reviewed journals of high quality that clearly demonstrates creation of an independent research program and contributes substantively to knowledge/outcomes in the area of focus • Complete publication record including journal articles, reviews, conference papers and posters (both refereed and otherwise), books, book chapters, textbooks based on scholarship, magazine articles and on-line publications, patents and invention disclosures. • Quality and quantity of publications, with an emphasis on documented research accomplishments that have made a significant, internationally recognized,

	impact on the candidate's field(s) of expertise • Unique contribution to a line of inquiry or repackaging of earlier work. While collaborative work is encouraged, and indeed is essential to some types of inquiry, the candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described to permit accurate assessment. Letters from research collaborators describing the candidate's contribution can be included but must be solicited by the Department Chair • Rigor of the peer-review process and degree of dissemination of publication venues. Archival journal publications and monographs are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published scholarship more than unpublished scholarship, and original works more than edited works • Beginning to demonstrate a positive trend of citations in other researchers' publications • Creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus including media appearances and websites • Empirical work, demonstrating the candidate's ability to conduct such work and to mentor future scholars, is preferred to synthetic work at this stage of career
A demonstrated ability to obtain and potential to sustain research program funding	• Obtaining grants and awards to support their research program. Competitive peer-reviewed funding is weighted more favorably than other types, since it serves as a quality indicator of research programs, and grants requiring the exercise of intellectual creativity are weighted more heavily than those that largely dictate the work to be done. Research funding is a means to an end; funding that has not led to research productivity is disregarded in the review

A developing national/international reputation in the candidate's field	• Positive external evaluations indicating candidate is developing reputation at the national/international level because of their research contributions to their field (reputation based on the quality of the research contribution is distinguished from one based mainly on familiarity through the faculty member's frequent attendance at national and international conferences) • Invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums • Invitations to review research papers and grant proposals • Beginning to demonstrate a positive trend of citations in other researchers' publications
---	---

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Made substantive contributions to the governance of the Department in a manner that facilitates positive contributions by others	• Serving as contributing member of departmental committees • Organizing the departmental annual symposium • Annual evaluations document excellence in service to the department
Demonstrated the potential for useful contributions to the profession	• Serving as ad-hoc reviewer for journals • Serving on grant reviewing panels • Serving on committees and panels of professional societies • Contributing to the organization of conferences

2. Promotion to Professor

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

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

The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to Professor are similar to those for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, 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 professional organizations.

A faculty member must be recognized internationally as an established research scholar before promotion to Professor. A record of sustained and substantial extramural support from peer-reviewed, competitive grant sources is required, normally including renewals of grants initiated earlier. Professional recognition should include membership on editorial boards, invited research presentations at peer institutions, national and international symposia, invited reviews in professional publications, and membership on panels for state and federal granting agencies and advisory committees. Other important supporting activities might include obtaining patents, consulting for both profit and nonprofit organizations, the convening of research meetings and symposia, professional development as a result of research leave, research success of postdoctoral research advisees, and successful collaborative research with visiting scientists and sabbatical-leave colleagues.

A sustained record of excellence in teaching must be documented for promotion to Professor. The criteria listed for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure must be met and additional teaching competence must be documented.

A substantial record of active participation on appointed committees at the Department, College, University and extramural professional level is expected. However, outstanding service alone, even in a senior administrative role, will not be sufficient for promotion to Professor.

Promotion to professor in the College of Arts and Sciences takes the pursuit of research and creative excellence as our core value. The college also recognizes that a career may consist of various phases in which a concentration on research/creative work, teaching, or service creates a composite professional life. Promotion to professor typically requires excellence in scholarship/creative work. Where a candidate has made truly extraordinary contributions in the areas of teaching or service, that record may warrant promotion in combination with a less extensive, though excellent, record of continued productivity in research/creative work.

The Department will be receptive to cases with a heavier weighting on teaching performance and a correspondingly reduced weighting on research and scholarship. In order for a faculty member to be promoted under these conditions, it must be clear that the contributions to teaching are extraordinary and of high quality. Development and implementation of innovative and more effective approaches to instruction would be helpful in making such a case. In assessment of a candidate's national and international reputation in the field, a national and international reputation for the scholarship of teaching may be counted as either teaching or scholarship.

In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#), assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in

another. Promotion should reflect the reality that (a) not all faculty members have the same distribution of assignments (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence equally in all evaluation dimensions; and (c) there is a multi-faceted institutional responsibility that must be achieved by the skills of the faculty collectively. Promotion to Professor should be awarded not only to those faculty who have demonstrated impact in their scholarship of research and creative inquiry, teaching and learning, and service, but also to those who have exhibited excellence in leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the department, college, and university.

3. Teaching Faculty

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

Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor. For promotion to Associate Teaching Professor, a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and as a provider of effective service and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of this Department. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor are similar to those for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. Criteria and examples of evidence for teaching faculty are listed in the tables below. Promotion will entail the 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/or to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. Evidence of scholarship would for example include: (1) publications articles, books, book chapters, and conferences papers on teaching and pedagogy in peer-reviewed journals, (2) performing research for publications or grants, and (3) developing, writing, or editing textbooks or course materials. Promotion will entail the generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

In addition to the criteria listed above, the criteria in the charts below in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service are expected of all faculty for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor

TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge	Peer evaluators determine that syllabi and class materials are up-to-date and appropriate for topic and audience

Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm	• Positive peer evaluation on mode of instruction • Positive peer evaluation on treatment of and interactions with students • Peer evaluation demonstrate positive trajectory during review period • Positive evaluations from Continuing Education Programs, both internal and external to the university • Attended continuing education on topic or focus area and adopted new materials in class • Use of multimodal techniques or approaches to stimulate class participation and learning – discuss in teaching narrative • Overall positive scores on the SSLE single-selection response questions • Overall positive SSLE open-ended s • Incorporating new technologies to courses (e. g. on-line manuals, electronic notebooks) • Receiving teaching awards
Demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment	
Engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process	
Treated students with respect and courtesy	
Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process	• Positive student reports and/or comments on SSLE on feedback to students throughout the instructional process
Improved and or developed curriculum	• Revising existing courses • Developing new courses • Changing or developing of syllabi, examinations, laboratory exercises, and problem sets, to demonstrate up-to-date thought on subject content • Coordinating activities with regional campus faculty
Engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching	• Attending continuing education on topic or focus area and adopting new materials in class • Completing Foundations, Impact Teaching through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning • Completing Teaching at Ohio State through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning • Awarding of “Endorsement” from Drake Institute of Teaching and Learning

	• Participating in professional development conferences (e. g. ASMCUE)
--	--

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Contributed to service at the Department or College/University level	• Serving as contributing member of departmental (Curriculum, Awards), college, and university committees • Participating in departmental recruiting/welcoming events • Developing and managing formal training of graduate and undergraduate laboratory TAs • Managing graduate and undergraduate TAs • Supervising laboratory prep staff • Performing informal student advising and support (e.g. writing recommendation letters, answering enrollment questions, grad school or career advice, tutoring matches) • Organizing and facilitating workshops on campus related to teaching and curriculum • Serving as advisors to departmental or OSU student organizations and clubs • Leading activities with the undergraduate Microbiology Club (e. g. agar art) • Writing letters of recommendation for students • Evaluating classes for transfer credit • Receiving awards for service
Contributed to service to the profession	• Serving as ad-hoc reviewer for journals and textbooks • Serving on committees and panels of professional societies

4. Research Faculty

Promotion to Research Associate Professor. For promotion to Research Associate Professor, a faculty member must demonstrate excellence in scholarship with a substantial record of high-quality focused research consistent with an appointment devoted solely to research. Publications

must appear in high-quality peer-reviewed venues and be judged by external evaluators as having substantial positive impact on the field. A record of significant and continuous peer reviewed external funding for research is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation. The claim that retention of the candidate will improve the overall scholarly quality and standing of the department needs to be supported. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Research Professor. For promotion to Research Professor, a faculty member must have a record of excellence in scholarship including a national or international reputation built on an extensive body of high-quality publications and with demonstrated impact on the field. A record of significant and continuous peer-reviewed external funding for research is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding. The claim that retention of the candidate will improve the overall scholarly quality and standing of the department must be supported. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

5. Associated Faculty

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

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

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

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

6. Regional Campus Faculty

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

In evaluating regional campus teaching faculty and research faculty for promotion, the Department will use the same criteria as described above for the promotion of faculty in each of these categories. Regional campus associated faculty are reviewed by the regional campus

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

B. Procedures

The Department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) for tenure-track faculty, [3335-7-05](#) for clinical/teaching/professional practice faculty, [3335-7-32](#) for research faculty, and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Chapter 3 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

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

a. Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier and providing a copy of the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed, if other than the department's current document. If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators compiled for their case according to departmental guidelines. Each of these elements is described in detail below.

- **Dossier**

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

While the Committee of Eligible Faculty makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by the candidate.

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

Teaching documentation includes:

- cumulative SSLE reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction, computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class

- peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in Section IX to this document)
- copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed beyond review of publisher-supplied proofs.
- teaching activities as listed in the core dossier including
 - involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research
 - mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers
 - extension and continuing education instruction
 - involvement in curriculum development
 - awards and formal recognition of teaching
 - presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences
 - adoption of teaching materials at other colleges or universities
- other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate

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 (for tenured or nonprobationary faculty) may be provided. Any such material should be clearly indicated. However, it is the scholarship performance since the start date or date of last promotion that is to be the focus of the evaluating parties.

Scholarship documentation includes:

- a list of all books, articles, and scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Copies of all publications must be provided upon request. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed beyond review of publisher-supplied proofs.
- documentation of grants and contracts submitted and received
- other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted)
- research activities as listed in the core dossier including
 - documentation of creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus including but not restricted to, for example, artwork, multimedia, radio, recordings, television, and websites
 - documentation of invention disclosures, submitted and awarded patents, options and commercial licenses.
 - list of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work

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

Service documentation includes:

- service activities as listed in the core dossier including
 - involvement with professional journals and professional societies
 - consultation activity with industry, education, or government
 - administrative service to department
 - administrative service to college
 - administrative service to university and Student Life
 - advising to student groups and organizations
 - awards and prizes for service to profession, university, or department
- any available documentation (e.g. letters from committee chairs if solicited by the Department Chair) of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier

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

- Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document

Candidates must submit a copy of the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed, if electing to be reviewed under an APT other than the current document available [here](#). Candidates may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion, whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, 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. The APT document must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the Department.

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

- External Evaluations

If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the Department Chair and the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. The candidate may add no more than three additional names but is not required to do so.

The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The Department Chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

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

b. Responsibilities of the Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty

The responsibilities of the Committee Chair, on behalf of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, are as follows:

- To review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with OAA requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
- Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on their dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the 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 eligible faculty meeting, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair. The revised document must specify each of the unit's criteria in teaching, scholarship and service, summarize the faculty perspectives on whether the candidate has met each criterion, and include the sources of evidence in the dossier on which these perspectives are based. The completed written evaluation and recommendation is forwarded to the Department Chair.
- Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure-initiating unit is another Department. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the Department's recommendation must be

provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this Department's cases.

c. Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

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

- To consider annually, in Spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only Professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of Professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
 - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (including student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
 - A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) for one year. Faculty Rules [3335-7-08](#) and [3335-7-36](#) make the same provision for nonprobationary teaching faculty and research faculty, respectively. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
 - A decision to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the Department Chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
 - **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described [here](#).
 - **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the Department Chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from faculty at institutions that are members of the Association of American Universities (AAU) (see Section VI.B.4 below). Justification is provided in cases when the suggested reviewers are at institutions other than those of the [Association of American Universities](#).

- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.
- To participate in peer review of teaching of faculty in the Department of Microbiology.

d. Department Chair 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 department 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.
- **Summer Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Committee of Eligible Faculty, the Department Chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this Department. The Department Chair will seek a letter of evaluation from the TIU head of the joint appointment unit. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit. This evaluation should be shared at the TIU level of the review and incorporated with the Chair review.
- To make each candidate's dossier available for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To charge each member of the Committee of Eligible 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. 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
 - Availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and Department Chair
 - Opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the Department Chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the Department Chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the College office by that office's deadline.
- To receive the Committee of 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 on the Columbus Campus

Adjunct faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed in Section VI.B above, with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the Department Chair's recommendation is negative, 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 Department Chair. A request to promote follows the same procedures as tenure-track faculty except that external letters are not needed unless scholarship is a component of the assigned role.

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

Associated faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/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 are mandatory for all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews and all research faculty promotion reviews. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for promotion or reappointment of teaching faculty or for associated faculty unless the department requires scholarship for promotion and the candidate has been involved in a significant amount of such scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations for a teaching faculty member or an associated faculty member will be made by the Department Chair after consulting with the candidate and Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty. External evaluations are not required for promotion reviews for teaching faculty.

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 \(AAU\)](#). Justification will be provided in each case in which a suggested evaluator is from a program that is not a member of the AAU.
- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who can give an “arms’ length” evaluation of the research record and is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. In the case of an Assistant Professor seeking promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from Associate Professors.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will “usefulness” be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the Department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters are sought than are required, and they are solicited at the beginning of summer 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.

A list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Committee of Eligible Faculty, 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 a member of the AAU 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 will be provided, 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 may be included. 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. Up to two emeritus professors are acceptable if they are active researchers. The department will structure invitations

to external reviewers to ensure that the final group of letters received does not include any scholars from the same institution.

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 and research faculty can be found [here](#). A sample letter for teaching faculty can be found [here](#).

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

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

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

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

VIII. Seventh-Year Reviews

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

IX. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

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

In no case should the evaluation of teaching rely exclusively on quantitative instruments such as the SSLE. Evaluation of teaching should also be contextual, taking into account specific challenges of teaching different kinds of material to diverse 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 Survey of Student Learning Experience (SSLE) is required for all classroom and laboratory courses. Faculty members should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if s/he is 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.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

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

The Department Chair, in consultation with the Vice Chair for Teaching and Undergraduate Affairs and the Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty, oversees the Department's peer evaluation of teaching process. Responsibilities include:

- to review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and probationary teaching faculty at least once per year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. When assistant professors are reviewed for tenure and promotion, 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.

- to review the teaching of tenured associate professors, 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 typically assigned and of having at least three peer reviews of teaching since the last promotion or reappointment review, whichever is more recent, before the commencement of a promotion or reappointment review.
- to review the teaching of tenured professors and nonprobationary teaching professors at least once every four years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is typically assigned. When nonprobationary 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 review, whichever is more recent.
- to review the teaching of associated faculty on multiple year appointments at least once every other with the goal of assessing teaching at all levels of instruction to which the faculty member is typically assigned. The teaching contributions of other associated faculty, including those with courtesy appointments, may be reviewed at the request of the Department Chair. These evaluations may focus on any aspects of instruction and be considered during reappointment review of the associated faculty member.
- to review, upon the Department Chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.
- to review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The Department Chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the [Michael V. 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 Chair or faculty member and may or may not include class visitations.

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and exams. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, the class visitation or equivalent is conducted by one or more senior peers whom the Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty has identified. The peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to establish a time for the visit and to understand the goals of the course and the candidate's teaching philosophy.

Written reports of peer evaluations of teaching should focus not only on classroom instruction but also on such issues as curricular choices, implicit and explicit goals of instruction, the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge.

At the conclusion of the class visits and before the end of the semester of review, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give feedback and submits a written report to the Department Chair, copied to the candidate. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

The teaching contributions of associated faculty, including those with courtesy appointments, may be reviewed at the request of the Department Chair. These evaluations may focus on any aspects of instruction and be considered during reappointment review of the associated faculty member.

X. Appendix A: Mentorship Plan

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

Mentors should 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 should ask the Department Chair to assign another tenure-track faculty member to the mentee until they return.

Mentees who would like additional mentorship support or otherwise believe that their current mentoring relationship is not meeting their needs should discuss the issue with the TIU head or designee (e.g., chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty). The Department Chair head 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.