

**APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR
THE DEPARTMENT OF MOLECULAR GENETICS**

Approved by

**The Faculty of Molecular Genetics: 05/15/25
The Office of Academic Affairs: 10/7/2025**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	PREAMBLE.....	1
II.	DEPARTMENT MISSION	1
III.	DEFINITIONS.....	2
	A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty	2
	1. <i>Tenure-track Faculty</i>	2
	2. <i>Teaching Faculty</i>	2
	3. <i>Research Faculty</i>	3
	4. <i>Associated Faculty</i>	3
	5. <i>Conflict of Interest</i>	4
	6. <i>Minimum Composition</i>	5
	B. Quorum.....	5
	C. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty	5
	1. <i>Appointment</i>	5
	2. <i>Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion</i>	5
IV.	APPOINTMENTS	6
	A. Criteria.....	6
	1. <i>Tenure Track Faculty</i>	6
	2. <i>Teaching Faculty</i>	8
	3. <i>Research Faculty</i>	8
	4. <i>Associated Faculty</i>	9
	5. <i>Regional Campus Faculty</i>	10
	6. <i>Emeritus Faculty</i>	10
	7. <i>Joint Appointments</i>	10
	8. <i>Courtesy Appointments</i>	11
	B. Procedures	11
	1. <i>Tenure Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus</i>	11
	2. <i>Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus</i>	13
	3. <i>Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus</i>	13
	4. <i>Transfer from the Tenure Track</i>	13
	5. <i>TIU Transfer</i>	13
	6. <i>Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus</i>	14
	7. <i>Regional Campus Faculty</i>	14
	8. <i>Joint Appointments</i>	15
	9. <i>Courtesy Appointments for Faculty</i>	15
V.	ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEWS	15
	A. Documentation.....	16
	B. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	16
	1. <i>Fourth Year Review</i>	17
	2. <i>Extension of the Tenure Clock</i>	18
	C. Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	18
	D. Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	19

E.	Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus	19
F.	Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	19
G.	Regional Campus Faculty.....	20
H.	Salary Recommendations	20
VI.	PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS.....	21
A.	Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion.....	21
1.	<i>Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure</i>	21
2.	<i>Promotion to professor</i>	26
3.	<i>Teaching faculty</i>	27
4.	<i>Research faculty</i>	27
5.	<i>Associated faculty</i>	28
6.	<i>Regional Campus faculty</i>	28
B.	Procedures for Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews.....	28
1.	<i>Tenure-Track, Teaching, and Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus</i>	29
2.	<i>Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus</i>	34
3.	<i>Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty</i>	34
4.	<i>External Evaluations</i>	35
VII.	PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS	37
VIII.	SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS.....	37
IX.	PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING.....	38
A.	Student Evaluations of Teaching.....	38
B.	Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	38
X.	APPENDICES.....	41
A.	Appendix A: Directions for Peer Evaluations of Teaching	41
B.	Appendix B: Mentorship Plan	42
C.	Appendix C: Details of the Teaching Portfolio.....	45

I. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the [Rules of the University](#); the annually updated Office of Academic Affairs procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Chapter 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#); and other policies and procedures of the College of Arts and Sciences (ASC) and University to which the Department and its faculty are subject.

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

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

- Perform outstanding research in molecular, cellular, and developmental genetics and genomics using a diversity of established and emerging models and systems;
- Provide and develop evidence-based education and training for our undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral scholars and research staff that prepares them for future careers and as the next generation of critical thinkers and community members;
- Promote interdisciplinary collaborations via joint faculty and participation in Centers and Institutes that connect departments and colleges across the university;
- Perform service to the university and the scientific community, and the general public;
- Engage with the general public through outreach;
- Promote and sustain an environment that fosters belonging, creativity, and equity by respecting and welcoming all backgrounds, perspectives, and ideas.

All faculty participate in educating undergraduate and graduate students both in the classroom and through their research programs. The faculty members have strong records of funding from national agencies. We publish impactful papers in respected, peer reviewed journals and are invited to present research at national and international meetings; several faculty members are recipients of national research awards. The outstanding reputation of our research has translated into excellent undergraduate

and graduate programs that provide state-of-the-art preparation for careers in modern biology.

The Department has a constant goal of increasing the quality of our endeavors in all these areas. Our guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload (See POA section XI) are consistent with our mission and reflect the criteria for appointments, promotion, and tenure, and for merit salary increases and other rewards outlined in our governance documents.

III. DEFINITIONS

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

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

1. *Tenure-track Faculty*

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

2. *Teaching Faculty*

Appointment Reviews

- **Initial Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an assistant teaching professor, an associate teaching professor, or a teaching professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty 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 non-probationary associate teaching professors, and all non-probationary 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 of equal or higher rank.

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 non-probationary research faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of research assistant professors, the eligible faculty 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 members, 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.
- 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 49% FTE or below, or lecturer titles.
- For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track, 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 nonprobationary teaching faculty at the rank of associate professor and professor.

5. *Conflict of Interest*

- Search Committee Conflict of Interest

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

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

- Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest

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

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

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

6. *Minimum Composition*

In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the department chair, after consulting with the dean, will appoint one or more faculty members from another tenure-initiating unit within the college so that the minimum of three faculty members is reached.

B. *Quorum*

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty members not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. Faculty can be “present” if they participate in the entire meeting through Microsoft Teams, Zoom, or other video link or through a conference call. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purpose of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

C. *Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty*

In all votes taken on personnel matters with the department, votes must be cast prior to meeting adjournment. Only “yes” and “no” votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes and may result in a loss of quorum. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to consider whether they are participating fully in the review process when abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter. Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted but participating fully in discussions and voting via remote two-way electronic connection are allowed.

1. *Appointment*

- A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when at least two-thirds of the votes cast by eligible faculty members are positive.
- In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate’s joint-appointment TIU prior to his/her/their appointment.

2. *Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion*

- A positive recommendation for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion is secured when at least more than half of the votes cast by eligible faculty members are positive.
- In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate’s joint-appointment TIU prior to his/her/their reappointment, promotion and/or tenure.

IV. APPOINTMENTS

A. Criteria

The department is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance its quality. 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 in the event that the search process does not yield one or more candidates who would enhance the quality of the department. The search is either cancelled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

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

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.

At the time of appointment, probationary faculty members shall be provided with all pertinent documents detailing departmental, college, and university promotion and tenure policies and criteria. If these documents are revised during the probationary period, probationary faculty members shall be provided with copies of the revised documents. The department chair will consult each newly appointed faculty member as to the appropriate composition of their faculty development and mentoring committee (see Appendix B for expectations for such a committee) with the goal of having the committee in place before the end of the first semester of the appointment.

1. Tenure Track Faculty

Although there will be variations in the specific criteria established for any given faculty search, the following criteria apply to all searches for tenure track faculty:

- Earned Ph.D. or M.D. or equivalent in a field relevant to the mission of the Department and the specified research area(s) of the position;
- Postdoctoral research experience;
- Demonstrated ability to carry out modern research through to completion, as evidenced by publications in refereed journals of original research;
- Strong potential to support research program by successfully competing for external funding;
- Demonstrated potential to develop into an accomplished teacher, as evidenced by evaluations of prior teaching or other relevant experiences;
- Commitment to excellence in undergraduate and graduate education in a major research university setting;
- 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;
- Potential to contribute to a positive departmental culture and to departmental goals for community engagement

Appointment decisions for tenure-track faculty positions, as defined in rule [3335-5-19](#) of the Administrative Code, are based on criteria that reflect strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the faculty ranks.

Instructor. Faculty in the Department of Molecular Genetics will normally be hired at the rank of assistant professor or higher. Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but requirements for the terminal degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. Procedures for appointment are identical to those for an assistant professor. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment to the rank of instructor is limited to three years. Promotion to assistant professor occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year. When an instructor is promoted to the rank of assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor in writing at the time of the promotion. This written request must be approved by the eligible faculty, the department chair, the dean, and Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor. An earned doctoral degree is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Appointments at the rank of assistant professor will be made to individuals who have strong prior research accomplishments, the potential for sustained research productivity at the university, the potential to develop into an internationally recognized scholar, a high probability of securing outside funding to support their research, strong teaching capabilities and potential for effective teaching at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, a willingness to provide high-quality service to the department, institution, and the profession, and strong potential to contribute to a positive departmental culture and to departmental goals for community engagement. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the seventh year will be the final year of employment. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Committee of the Eligible Faculty determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period.

Associate Professor and Professor. All appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor with or without tenure, Professor with tenure, and offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the dean and the Office of Academic Affairs. Rank and tenure eligibility must be approved by the departmental eligible faculty using the criteria specified in this APT document.

An appointment at the rank of associate professor will be based on compelling evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher to undergraduate and graduate students, as a nationally-recognized scholar, and as one who provides excellence in service to their profession and field as well as locally to their institution; and can be expected to continue a program of high-quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the Department of Molecular Genetics. An appointment at the rank of professor will be based on compelling evidence that the faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in teaching at the graduate and undergraduate levels; has produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated leadership in service to their field and institution.

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

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

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

2. *Teaching Faculty*

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

MOLGEN appoints Teaching Faculty. These appointments exist for faculty members who focus principally on the educational needs of students in the department or college. Teaching Faculty members are expected to contribute to the department's research and 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 and evidence of teaching ability are the minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of assistant teaching professor.

Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor. Appointment at the rank of associate teaching 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.

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 the department. Appointments at the rank of research assistant professor require approval by the College of Arts and Sciences. Appointment at the rank of research associate professor or research professor requires approval of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs.

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 indicate the ability to sustain an independent, externally funded research program that will support and enhance the research mission of the department.

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 a strong record of independent scholarship consistent with what is expected for promotion of a tenure-track faculty member to these ranks.

4. *Associated Faculty*

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a few weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. Associated faculty may be reappointed. 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 have credentials comparable to tenure-track, teaching, or research faculty of equivalent rank. The term of appointment is for one year with renewal contingent on continued significant contributions. Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give academic service to the department, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees, for which a faculty title is appropriate. The adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track, teaching, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track, teaching, or 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 faculty with tenure-track titles at 49% FTE or below. Appointment at tenure-track titles is possible for individuals at 1-49% FTE or uncompensated (0% FTE). The rank of associated faculty with tenure-track titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

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

Senior Lecturer. Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a doctorate in 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 instruction. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The initial appointment for a senior lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for senior lecturers cannot exceed three years.

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor.

Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for only 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, and professor are similar to those for Columbus campus faculty but give relatively greater emphasis at each rank to teaching experience and quality.

Regional campus criteria for the appointment of teaching 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](#).

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.

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 promotion and tenure cases only in their TIU.

8. *Courtesy Appointments*

The Department of Molecular Genetics may occasionally appoint as courtesy faculty (0% FTE) members of other academic units at the university who are actively involved in the department. The criteria are similar to those used for the appointment of tenure track, teaching, or research faculty in the department, but include an emphasis on identifying faculty who can fulfill a unique role in the department.

Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, membership on department committees, teaching all or some of a course from time to time, or a combination of these. Courtesy appointments are made with the intent of strengthening the departmental graduate and undergraduate degree programs, the teaching program, and the service activities of the Department of Molecular Genetics. Except in extreme circumstances, the number of courtesy faculty should not exceed 30% of the number of tenure track faculty FTE. 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 [Policy on Faculty Appointments](#) for information on the following topics:

- Recruitment of Tenure Track, Clinical, Research, and Associated Faculty
- Appointments at Senior Rank or with Prior Service Credit
- Hiring Faculty from Other Institutions after April 30
- Appointment of Foreign Nationals
- Letters of Offer

1. *Tenure Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus*

A national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure track positions. This includes all external candidates for all faculty positions. The only exception is for dual career partners, as described in Chapter 5, section 4.1 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). Exceptions to

this policy must be approved by the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the [OAA Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

The search for and appointment of a tenure track faculty member will follow these guidelines:

- The Divisional Dean of the Division of Natural and Mathematical Sciences (NMS) and Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (ASC) provide approval for the Department to commence a search process. This approval may be accompanied by constraints on salary, rank, startup funds, research space, and area of expertise.
- Discussions concerning the requests for tenure-track faculty positions in the Department will include tenure-track faculty and associated and courtesy faculty with tenure-track appointments. However, only members of the Department's tenure track faculty will vote on decisions regarding requests for faculty positions.
- The Chair of the Department will appoint an ad hoc Search Committee consisting of no fewer than three tenure track Department faculty to coordinate the logistical arrangements of the search. A Search Committee member may be appointed from outside the tenure track faculty after discussion between the Chair of the Department and the search committee chair. The Chair of the Search Committee will be chosen by the Department Chair.
- Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo the trainings identified in the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment. In addition, all employees/faculty involved in the hiring and selection process must review and acknowledge the EEO Recruitment and Selection Guidelines in the BuckeyeLearn system.

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote also 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.

If two or more candidates achieve equivalent levels of support to extend an offer, the Department Chair decides, in consultation with the divisional dean, which candidate to approach first, after consultation with the faculty. At that time, the department chair must discuss the details of the offer, including compensation, with the divisional dean and receive approval before extending an offer.

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

In the event that one or more of the candidates should decline the position, or if an agreement cannot be reached with any of the acceptable candidates that were interviewed, the Search Committee will determine whether candidates of equivalent caliber to those originally interviewed are among the remaining applicant pool. If so, the Search Committee Chair will seek approval from the Divisional Dean to interview additional candidates. If there are no additional viable candidates, or if approval is denied, the search process will be repeated the following academic year (pending College approval).

At the time of appointment, new faculty will receive copies of the Department of Molecular Genetics and College of Arts and Sciences Pattern of Administration and Appointments, Promotion and Tenure documents as well as all revised copies of these documents.

In some cases, a faculty member may be hired in collaboration with another unit on campus such as another department, the Cancer Center, or the Center for RNA Biology. Molecular Genetics will serve as the tenure initiating unit for those faculty recruits who have a 50% or greater appointment in the Department of Molecular Genetics. The same criteria will apply in these situations although the search committee will consist of faculty from both units. A Memorandum of Understanding between both units will be developed prior to initiating the search.

All probationary tenure-track faculty are assigned a faculty development and mentoring team of at least two tenured faculty members. The department's mentorship plan is described in greater detail in Appendix B.

2. *Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus*

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

3. *Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus*

Searches for research faculty may proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty with the exception that during the interview, it is primarily the candidate's research credentials that are evaluated.

4. *Transfer from the Tenure Track*

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

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

Transfers from a teaching appointment and from a research appointment to the tenure track are not permitted. Teaching faculty members 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 deans, 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. Approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements for the change have been made. Since normally the transferring

faculty member will fill an existing vacancy in the receiving unit, the MOU will describe the resources supporting the position, including salary, provided by the receiving unit.

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

6. *Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus*

The appointment of compensated associated faculty members follows a formal search following the [SHIFT](#) Framework, which includes a job posting in [Workday](#) (see Section IV.B above) and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the department chair following a vote by the eligible faculty.

The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair following a vote by the eligible faculty.

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

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

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

Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are made on an annual basis and rarely semester by semester. After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment 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 regional campus dean 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, the divisional dean in the College of Arts and Sciences or their designee, 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 decision to make an offer 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 and research faculty are the same as those described above for tenure-track faculty.

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

8. *Joint Appointments*

The department may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another OSU 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 tenured or tenure eligible faculty member from another Ohio State tenure-initiating unit. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this department or ability to fulfill a unique role in the department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. Initial appointment as a courtesy faculty member requires a positive vote from at least 2/3 of the eligible faculty. Courtesy faculty appointments will be renewed every five years. Renewal of a courtesy appointment requires a positive vote from at least 1/2 of the eligible faculty.

V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEWS

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 members, 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.

Depending on their appointment type, the annual performance and merit review of faculty members is based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments and goals

specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.

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

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

A. Documentation

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

- Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#) (required for probationary faculty) or Faculty Activity Report (non-probationary faculty)
- Reports (including student comments) from the official student evaluation instrument for all courses taught during the calendar year (currently SEI reports)
- An updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (all faculty)
- Teaching faculty may include documentation from the review year that they plan to include in their teaching portfolio at the next mandatory review (teaching faculty)

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

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

B. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

During a probationary period, every probationary faculty member shall be reviewed annually by the

department chair 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. The department will use the review process to be supportive and helpful to untenured faculty as well as to candidly and clearly communicate aspects of performance that need improvement if the candidate is to make acceptable progress. The department chair provides a written evaluation with sufficient detail for meaningful feedback that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

The department chair shall inform probationary faculty members when the annual review will take place and provide a copy of the dossier outline to be completed by the faculty member in reporting accomplishments to date. The department chair conducts an independent assessment, meets face to face with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals, and prepares a written evaluation on these topics.

The departmental eligible faculty will first perform an annual review of all probationary faculty. The faculty development committee (see Appendix B) or their designee will provide a written overview of the probationary faculty's annual activities at a meeting of the eligible faculty. The eligible faculty will vote (in writing) on continuation of the appointment of each probationary faculty member. A formal report summarizing the results of the evaluation and the outcome of the vote will be prepared by the eligible faculty and provided to the department chair. The chair's decision on reappointment of a probationary faculty member may be contrary to that of the eligible faculty, although the reasons for the contrary decision must be communicated to the eligible faculty.

At the completion of the review, the department chair shall provide the faculty member and the dean of the college with a written assessment of the faculty member's performance and professional development. The assessment will include both strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate. Annual review letters will be constructive and candid. When probationary faculty receive their annual review and the report from the eligible faculty, the department chair shall inform them of their right to review their primary personnel file maintained by their department and to place in that file a response to any evaluation, comment or other material contained in the file. The faculty member shall also be given an opportunity to discuss the results of the annual review with the department chair and with other members of the eligible faculty, as appropriate, and to provide written comments on the review. All annual review letters and reports from the eligible faculty (along with any comments provided) shall become a part of a faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure.

If the Chair's recommendation, as communicated in the annual review letter, is to reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year of service, that recommendation shall be final. A recommendation from the chair not to reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year requires a review that follows fourth year review procedures per Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#). Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

1. Fourth Year Review

During the fourth year review of the probationary period, the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, except that external letters are not solicited and the dean, not the department chair, makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty

votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

The eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department chair, 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 departmental 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 the department's recommendations to approve the renewal of the appointment, review by the 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 reappointment recommendations. The dean, in consultation with the divisional dean, will make the final decision on non-reappointment.

2. *Extension of the Tenure Clock*

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

C. Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Associate Professors are reviewed annually by the Department Chair. The department chair conducts an independent assessment, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member, if requested, to discuss his/her/their performance and future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review, and the department chair may respond in writing.

Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair, who may meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their performance and future plans and goals. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the 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, in civil and collegial 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 in relation to these expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review, and the department chair may reply in writing.

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

D. Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

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 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 at the same rank. This review generally proceeds in the same manner as the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty, with the addition of a supplemental teaching portfolio (See Appendix C) to the materials required for review. 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 performance and merit 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 at the same rank. This review generally proceeds in the same manner as the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

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 his/her/their performance, future plans, and goals.

The department chair's decision on renewal of the appointment is final. In making a decision on renewal of the appointment the chair will be guided by a vote of the eligible faculty. If the decision is to renew, the department chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

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

G. Regional Campus Faculty

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

H. Salary Recommendations

The College of Arts and Sciences requires that the department:

- 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.

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

Except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increases, all funds for annual salary increases are directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and the active promotion of an enriching working and learning environment through collegiality, civility, and openness to diverse ideas and opinions. The department chair should proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in it. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

Meritorious performance in scholarship, teaching, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. The time frame for assessing performance is 36 months. 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 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 available merit increase pool.

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

VI. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

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

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

A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

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

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

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

1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

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

The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a

scholar, and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high-quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the university.

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

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

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

The contributions of tenure-track assistant professors in the areas of teaching, research, and service will be considered during the promotion and tenure review process. In particular, the eligible faculty will scrutinize the candidate's dossier for evidence of a pattern of consistent and sustained performance during the probationary period that suggests that the candidate has developed and will continue to develop professionally. During their deliberations the members of the eligible faculty will recognize that each faculty member can contribute to each of the Department's missions in different ways.

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

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

TEACHING AND MENTORING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Provides up-to-date content at an appropriate level for each instructional situation, while demonstrating continuing growth in subject matter knowledge	• Peer evaluators indicate that syllabi and class materials are up-to-date and appropriate for topic and audience • Discussion in teaching narrative includes efforts to update class content as appropriate • Peer evaluators indicate that mode(s) of instruction are appropriate and effective, and treatment of and feedback to students is timely and appropriate • Attended continuing education on topic or focus area and adopted new materials in class
Demonstrates the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm	• Discussion in teaching narrative includes description of multimodal techniques or approaches to stimulate class participation and learning • Student feedback scores are appropriate for type of class or

Demonstrates creativity in the use of appropriate modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment	- show an upward trend - Peer evaluations demonstrate positive trajectory during review period - Positive qualitative student comments as independently summarized reflect student engagement, courteous treatment of students, and provision of timely and appropriate feedback
Engages students actively in the learning process and encourages independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process, while treating them with respect and courtesy.	
Developed or improved curricular elements in the department	- Dossier teaching narrative and/or peer evaluation and/or annual review letters describe revising existing courses and academic programs - Developing new courses and academic programs, as described in dossier and/or peer evaluation and/or annual review letters - Dossier and/or peer evaluation and/or annual review letters describes updating or developing syllabi, assessments, laboratory exercises, and problem sets, to demonstrate up-to-date thought on subject content - Publication of pedagogical innovation - Presentation of pedagogical innovations or research at conferences
Mentored graduate students and/or postdocs and/or research staff and/or undergraduate students	- Serving as advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the available graduate candidate pool and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise - Serving on thesis, dissertation, and graduate examination committees in the departmental program and in IGPs as appropriate - Timely completion of degree by graduate mentees - Publishing with students/postdocs/trainees - Students/postdocs/trainees participate in research conferences - Support of student/postdoc applications for research funding and mentoring them throughout the process - Students and/or postdocs receive awards and fellowships for their research efforts - Mentoring of undergraduate research students in their laboratory - Promoting student participation in research presentations, both at OSU and at outside meetings - Serving as mentor or committee member for undergraduate honors research theses - Students and/or trainees receive funding or awards for their research efforts
Engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching	- Engagement in professional development focused on evidence-based teaching practices, such as participation in programs offered by the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning and similar institutional resources, including opportunities leading to formal recognition (e.g., Teaching Endorsement) - Discussion in teaching narrative demonstrating teaching outcomes after efforts to improve - Annual evaluations set goals and documented activities in which faculty member participated, changes made to teaching, and outcomes of the change

SCHOLARSHIP/ 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 contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and is beginning to be favorably cited or otherwise show evidence of influence on the work of others. The published body of work demonstrates one or more areas of focus and expertise. Pedagogical research may be an area of focus.	• 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. Review will consider both the quality and quantity of publications, with an emphasis on documented research accomplishments that have made a significant, nationally recognized, impact on the candidate's field(s) of expertise • 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, preprints, patents and invention disclosures. • Evidence of work in progress including preprints and presentations in new areas or in extensions of existing areas of focus. • The publication record should demonstrate the candidate's unique contribution(s) to a line of inquiry. Collaborative work is encouraged, however, 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. Peer reviewed journal publications and monographs are weighted more heavily than unreviewed preprints and published scholarship more than unpublished scholarship. Conference proceedings can be used to demonstrate progress in a line of inquiry that has not yet reached the publication stage. • Quality indicators including early demonstration of a positive trend of citations in other researchers' publications • Research narrative describing scholarly research goals, efforts to achieve those goals, and contributions to collaborative efforts Creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus including media appearances and websites

A demonstrated ability to obtain and potential to sustain research program funding (external and/or internal) sufficient to support a vibrant research program in the area(s) of focus.	• Obtaining grants and awards to support their research program. Competitive peer-reviewed funding is weighted more favorably as a quality indicator of the research program. • Grants developed by the candidate as a lead or engaged collaborator are weighted more heavily than those that largely dictate the work to be done by the candidate. The candidate's role in the development of collaborative grants should be clearly described. • Research funding is a means to support the program, therefore funding that has not influenced research productivity is weighted less in the review (but may be used as an indicator of future productivity)
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 author or contribute to scholarly review papers • Invitations to organize or serve on panels at local, national, or international research meetings or as session chairs at such meetings • Invitations to review research papers and grant proposals • Beginning to demonstrate a positive trend of citations in other researchers' publications • List of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, outreach, or creative work
Demonstrated a high degree of ethics in the conduct of research including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators	• High degree of ethical conduct of research including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of undergraduate, graduate and professional students, residents, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators Concerns in this area and efforts to address prior concerns will be addressed in annual review letters.

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Made substantive contributions to the governance of the Department and/or university in a manner that facilitates positive contributions by others	• Serving as contributing member of departmental committees • Serving on relevant collaborative/interdepartmental committees (i.e. IGP graduate studies committees, seminar committees, engagement in activities of relevant university centers) • Ad hoc service to the university outside the department (i.e. judge at student research colloquia,

	service on internal fellowship and grant panels etc.) • Annual evaluations document appropriate service to the department
Demonstrated commitment to and contributions to the profession	• Serving as ad-hoc reviewer for journals • Serving on external grant reviewing panels • Serving on committees, panels and/or boards of professional societies • Contributing to the organization of conferences
Demonstrated department and community engagement	• Regular involvement in department events including seminars, colloquia, student presentations including rotation talks and defenses, faculty meetings, candidate chalk talks, etc. Involvement such as hosting seminar speakers, moderating colloquia etc. can be documented in the dossier. Annual review letters may highlight concerns and will note when prior issues have been addressed. • Participation in outreach activities (departmental or university) as documented in the dossier • Efforts to broaden scientific communication as documented in the dossier

In the evaluation of untenured associate professors for tenure, the same criteria will apply, along with any others established in writing at the time an associate professor appointment without tenure was offered.

In the evaluation of jointly appointed assistant professors whose TIU is this department, the same criteria will apply but service contributions to the joint appointment unit will also be considered in evaluating whether the candidate has met criteria in service required for promotion.

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 (see charts in Section VI.A.), with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, evidence of established national or international distinction 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.

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

Promotion to the rank of Professor shall be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in teaching; has produced a high impact of work that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated leadership in administrative/professional service. In

addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#), assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another. 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, especially when changes to workload expectations have been documented via the annual review process.

3. *Teaching faculty*

a) Promotion to Assistant Teaching Professor. Faculty hired at the teaching instructor rank will be promoted to assistant teaching professor upon completion of their doctoral degree, assuming they are performing satisfactorily in teaching, professional practice, and service. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

b) Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor. For promotion to associate teaching professor, a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service; must have a documented high level of competence in professional practice; and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of this department. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to associate teaching professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Active scholarship, as documented in peer-reviewed publications, is viewed positively, but not required unless changes in workload expectations are documented in the annual review process. This scholarship may be pedagogical research, scholarly contributions to teaching, publication of scientific research, or securing funding for teaching research or innovations. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

c) 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 and professional practice; leadership in service to this department and to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy such as publication of pedagogical research, teaching innovations, or scientific research. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

4. *Research faculty*

a) Promotion to Research Associate Professor. For promotion to research associate professor, a faculty member must have a record of excellence in scholarship, including 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. There is an expectation of a record of significant external support for research and a substantial probability that external support for research will continue along with evidence of a growing national reputation. The claim that the 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.

b) 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 peer-reviewed extramural and/or commercial funding is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding and a substantial probability that external research support will continue. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

5. *Associated faculty*

a) 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.

b) 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, with expectations pro-rated depending on level of appointment and workload expectations as outlined in the annual review process.

c) 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.

d) 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 and other needs of their communities. With this consideration in mind, in evaluating regional campus tenure-track faculty for promotion and tenure or promotion, the Department will give greater emphasis to the quality of teaching and service relative to scholarship. Recognizing that the character and quantity of scholarship by regional campus faculty may differ from that of Columbus campus faculty, due to the weight of other responsibilities and lack of access to comparable resources, the Department has an expectation that regional campus tenure-track faculty establish a research program of high-quality scholarly activity.

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 for Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

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

1. Tenure-Track, 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. If a teaching portfolio is required (*promotion of teaching faculty*) candidates are responsible for assembly of the portfolio. Each of these elements is described in detail below.

• Dossier

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

While the Committee of the 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 them.

Research/Scholarship:

- Faculty should keep records of all activities demonstrating research productivity and excellence. For example, records of publications, grants submitted, grants received, presentations at scientific meetings, and seminar presentations should be included in the dossier. Any other activities that demonstrate that the faculty member is developing a productive, high quality research program, such as awards from professional societies, should also be included.
- The formal dossier should contain a full history of publications to provide context to the more recent and relevant research record and to demonstrate scholarly independence and collaboration. Publications prior to the start date at Ohio State (for probationary faculty) or publications produced at Ohio State prior to the most recent promotion review should be clearly indicated. Research activities since the start date or date of last promotion will be the focus of evaluation.
- Publications in the area of pedagogical research may be included as evidence of excellence in research or teaching/mentoring. It is anticipated that faculty being reviewed for promotion to Teaching Professor will include pedagogical papers in the research and scholarship section of their dossier.

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

- A full record of all mentoring activities in the review period should be included. Direct mentoring of graduate students and undergraduate students, service on thesis and dissertation committees, and achievements of mentees should be clearly outlined in the final dossier.
- Faculty are expected to include materials from the OSU-approved student feedback tool for all didactic classes where they were an instructor of record. Currently this includes cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries of any discursive comments prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class. See section IX-A of this document for procedures for collecting and reporting SEI results.
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports are required (details provided in section IX-B and the Appendix to this document).
- Materials related to the scholarship of teaching, including published pedagogical papers and teaching innovations can be included as support of excellence in teaching and mentoring. Candidates for promotion to Teaching Professor may instead include these materials in support of research excellence.
- For promotion of teaching faculty, a teaching portfolio outlining teaching goals, assessment, professional development, and examples of course materials must be submitted (details provided in the Appendix C to this document). Submission of a teaching portfolio is optional for promotions of faculty on the tenure track.

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 nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or reappointment or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.
- Service on Department, College and University committees, or election to any of the University's governing boards (e.g., University Senate) should be documented, as well as any leadership role on these committees (e.g., Chair, etc.).
- Any activities associated with professional societies should also be documented. Such activities might include service on society committees, organizing workshops, symposia, or serving as a session Chair at meetings.
- Other service and outreach activities performed outside of the University, but requiring an expertise in biology, should be documented. Such activities would include presentations at local schools, judging at science fairs, answering letters of inquiry, representing the Department at various activities. Service in civic and religious organizations should not be included in this section.
- In some instances, it may be difficult to evaluate the quality and quantity of service, especially in those activities outside of the University. Thus, candidates for promotion and/or tenure should, if necessary, explain the nature of the service activity. For example,

faculty should indicate whether they were asked (or elected) to perform the service activity or if they volunteered. They should also indicate if the service activity involved a leadership role, and the nature of that role.

The complete dossier is forwarded when the review moves beyond the department. The documentation of teaching through student and peer evaluation is forwarded along with the dossier. Any documentation of scholarship and service outside the core dossier and the contents of the teaching dossier (if required) 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 also indicate the APT under which they wish to be reviewed. Candidates may elect to be reviewed under (a) the department's current APT document; (b) the APT document that was in effect on their start date; or (c) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion (or last reappointment in the case of teaching and research faculty), whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, for tenure-track faculty the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year.

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

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

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

External evaluation letters are not required for promotion of teaching faculty to the Associate Professor of Teaching rank.

b. Committee of the Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

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

- To review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members (tenure track, teaching, and research) seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
 - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a

- non-mandatory review.
 - A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 only once. Faculty Rules 3335-7-08 and 3335-7-36 make the same provision for non-probationary teaching and research faculty, respectively. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
 - A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the 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 the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section VI.B.4 below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.
 - **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
 - Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his/her/their dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
 - Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.
 - Consider the interdisciplinary work of a candidate across multiple units as part of the whole work, especially if the candidate has a joint appointment in another unit.
 - Revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of the full eligible faculty, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting. The revised document must specify each criterion 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 were 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 from another tenure-initiating unit. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.
- 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.

c. *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. For tenure-track assistant professors, the department chair will confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an MOU at the time of promotion with tenure.
- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Committee of the 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.
- To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on the criteria established in this document
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.

- To explain to the eligible faculty any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the departmental review process:
 - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair;
 - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair; and
 - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten calendar days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he/she/they will submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline.
- To receive the eligible faculty's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the head of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

2. Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

3. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

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

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

Regional campus teaching faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. Following the review, the dean/director consults with the 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 include all tenure-track faculty promotion and tenure or promotion reviews, all research faculty promotion reviews, and all teaching faculty promotion reviews to the level of Teaching Professor. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor or for associated faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations in these cases will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Committee of Eligible 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 R1 institutions that are members of the [Association of American Universities \(AAU\)](#) and the [Big Ten Academic Alliance \(BTAA\)](#). The department further defines peer or near-peer institutions to include: Clemson University, Iowa State University, University of Connecticut, University of Delaware, University of Georgia, University of Rhode Island, University of Tennessee. Justification will be provided in each case in which a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists. Peer reviewers from other institutions, including universities outside of North America, liberal arts colleges, and non-academic research institutes (e.g., the NIH) may be suggested in cases where the external reviewer is 1) a distinguished expert in the field, as indicated by publications; national and international awards; prominence in professional organizations; and presence on editorial boards of major journals; 2) is nationally or internationally known in a field outside of Molecular Genetics but related to a candidate's interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary projects; and/or 3) meets the standards for a peer reviewer in a TIU in which the candidate is joint-appointed.
- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship who is not a close personal friend, former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate, or someone who has collaborated extensively with the candidate or is currently collaborating

with the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will solicit evaluations from professors with institutional affiliations predominately in the programs listed above. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.

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

Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters are sought than are required, and they are solicited no later than the end of the spring semester prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Committee of the 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 Faculty Affairs. No written justification is required for tenured professors at peer or near peer institutions as defined above. If the potential evaluator is from an academic institution that is not clearly a peer or aspirational peer for Ohio State, or if the potential evaluator is from a nonacademic institution (e.g., a public policy think tank, a museum, a biomedical company, or a governmental agency), a brief written justification is required. The department's justification should be based on the prestige of the institution, the credentials and experience of the evaluator, and/or the specific relevance of the evaluator's expertise to the candidate's activities. International evaluators from strong institutions are allowed. The research credentials of the evaluators should 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 should provide justification if more than a minority of the evaluations are from associate professors (e.g., candidate's work is in a small or new field for which more senior people are not available, evaluators have gained prominence as national or international experts in the field). For reviews of associate professors, all evaluators must be professors (or equivalent). Emeritus professors are acceptable as long as they are active researchers.

If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that none of the person(s) suggested by the candidate 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 clinical/teaching/professional practice faculty can be found [here](#).

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

lapse, or the appearance of such a lapse, in the course of the review process.

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

VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS

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

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

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) (A) 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.

Every effort should be made to consider new information about a candidate's performance before a final decision is made if the new information becomes available before a decision is rendered. In rare instances, the department may petition the dean to conduct a seventh year review for an assistant professor who has been denied promotion and tenure. Both the eligible faculty of the department and the chair must approve proceeding with a petition for a seventh year review. The petition must provide documentation of substantial new information regarding the candidate's performance that is germane to the reasons for the original negative decision. Petitions for seventh year reviews must be initiated before the beginning of the last year of employment because the seventh year review, if approved, would take place during the regular university review cycle of the assistant professor's seventh and last year of employment.

If the dean concurs with the Department's position, the dean shall in turn petition the executive vice president and provost for permission to conduct a seventh year review. If the provost approves the request, a new review will be conducted equivalent to the one that resulted in the nonrenewal of the appointment. Conducting a seventh year review does not presume a positive outcome. In addition, should the new review result in a negative decision, the faculty member's last day of employment is that stated in the letter of nonrenewal issued following the original negative decision.

A faculty member may not request a seventh year review, appeal the denial of a seventh year review petition initiated by his or her department, or appeal a negative decision following a seventh year review, since the faculty member has already been notified that tenure has been denied at the conclusion of the sixth year review.

IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The College of Arts and Sciences values excellence in teaching across disciplines and at all levels of instruction. Student and peer evaluations of teaching provide tools for assessing faculty teaching effectiveness and for providing faculty with regular opportunities for improvement.

Evaluation of teaching should be holistic, considering a variety of evidence of accomplishment in the classroom: for example, student evaluations (quantitative and narrative), peer evaluations, examples of curricular or pedagogic innovation, and efforts to improve teaching by taking advantage of college or university resources.

In no case should the evaluation of teaching rely exclusively on quantitative instruments (such as the SEI), which have been shown to be unreliable indicators of overall performance in the classroom.

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

The overall goal of the teaching program in the Department of Molecular Genetics is to provide students with an exceptional learning experience. To meet this goal, the members of the teaching staff in the Department of Molecular Genetics are expected to provide the best possible instruction in all courses in which they participate. The department will use the procedures described below to monitor the quality of instruction and to provide feedback that will lead to improvements in the quality of instruction.

A. Student Evaluations of Teaching

- Student evaluation of faculty instruction will be performed for each formal lecture and laboratory course for all faculty in the department.
- Faculty will use university approved forms (currently the SEI) for the evaluation of instruction in all lecture and laboratory courses since these forms will permit comparison of results with other colleagues in the department, college and university. Additional comments may also be obtained using a form that is designed by the instructor.
- The administration of the evaluation must not be under the control of the faculty member being evaluated.
- A copy of the results of the evaluation will be included with the annual Faculty Activity Report.
- Summaries of discursive evaluations for inclusion in the promotion and tenure dossier must be prepared by someone other than the candidate.

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 or designee oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process.

Peer evaluations of teaching for probationary faculty and for faculty seeking promotion or reappointment are comprehensive and include, in addition to classroom visitation (or the equivalent for an online course), review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and exams. Faculty under review should provide peer reviewers with the course syllabus and other materials well in advance of the

classroom visit or visits. They should also provide reviewers with a list of preferred visitation dates.

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

Peer Evaluations of Probationary Faculty: The department chair is responsible for coordinating peer review of teaching of probationary tenure-track and teaching faculty at least once per calendar year during the probationary period, with the goal of providing at least one evaluation for each individual course that they contribute to. When probationary tenure-track faculty are reviewed for tenure and promotion and when probationary teaching faculty are reviewed for reappointment and/or promotion, they are required to have a minimum of five peer evaluations of teaching from the probationary period. No more than two evaluations should be prepared by the same colleague.

Peer Evaluations of Tenured and Nonprobationary Faculty: The department chair is responsible for coordinating the review of teaching of tenured associate professors, non-probationary assistant teaching professors, and non-probationary associate teaching professors at least once every two years, with the goal of assessing teaching at all levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned and of having a minimum of two peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion or reappointment review.

The teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary teaching professors should be reviewed at least once every four years. When non-probationary teaching professors are reviewed for reappointment, they are required to have a minimum of two peer evaluations of instruction since the last promotion or reappointment.

The teaching of associated faculty with teaching responsibilities should be reviewed at least once each year of appointment.

The department will follow these procedures in peer evaluations of instruction:

- A faculty member who is of equal or greater rank than the faculty member who is being evaluated will conduct the evaluation.
- In team taught courses, wherever possible, at least one evaluation per promotion/reappointment period should be conducted by a co-instructor in the course.
- Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instructional materials. The peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to establish a time for the visit and to understand the goals of the course and the candidate's teaching philosophy. If possible, the peer reviewer should attend two different class sessions over the course of the semester.
- In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should focus on such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and

assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the class visits, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give feedback and also submits a written report to the department chair, copied to the candidate. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if desired. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

- Upon the department chair's request, there will be a review of 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 suggesting a need for improvements. The teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, may also be reviewed, 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 department chair or faculty member and may or may not include class visitations.

X. APPENDICES

A. Directions for Peer Evaluations of Teaching

A single evaluator will visit at least two class sessions, and will review relevant class materials before completing the evaluation form.

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluation is comprehensive and includes, in addition to classroom visitation, review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and exams. Faculty undergoing evaluation must provide evaluators a syllabus to be used to schedule classroom visits, as well as providing access to other relevant class materials. The evaluator will be granted access as a guest to any website or course management site associated with the class being evaluated.

Copies of the evaluation report will be provided to the faculty member who is evaluated, the department chair and the peer evaluation coordinator. In addition, a copy will be placed in the faculty member's permanent file in the departmental office.

The following information will be included in the evaluation report:

- Name of instructor being evaluated
- Name and number of course being evaluated
- Academic term when the course was evaluated
- Name of evaluator
- Number of lectures/laboratories that were attended by the evaluator

The following topics should be addressed:

- Appropriateness of syllabus and course content
 - appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course
 - appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge
 - Quality of handouts and assessments
 - effectiveness of the instructional materials
 - appropriateness of assignments and assessments in evaluating student achievement of learning goals and supporting student success
- Clarity, organization and pace of presentation
- Mechanics of presentation (voice volume, speed, mannerisms)
- Use of teaching aids (projector, blackboard, etc.)
- Student interactions (questions/answers)
- Strong points
- Suggestions for improvements
- Overall summary

B. Mentorship Plan

The broad goals of the faculty development and mentoring program are:

- To help the probationary faculty understand the reappointment, promotion, and Promotion and Tenure (P&T) process
- To help the probationary faculty develop their careers, including a vibrant research program in the case of tenure track and research faculty, as well as contributions to the teaching and service missions of the department.
- To help ensure (in conjunction with the POD of the Committee of Eligible Faculty) that evaluation of probationary faculty follows due process, a process that is transparent to the probationary faculty and all members on the Committee of the eligible faculty.

Composition of Faculty Development and Mentoring Committees:

- The committee will be assembled by the Department Chair and Vice Chairs in consultation with the probationary faculty with a goal of assembling the committee prior to the formal start date, and no later than the end of the first semester of employment.
- The committee can be chaired by a tenured professor whose TIU is the Department of Molecular Genetics or can be co-chaired by a tenured professor and a tenured associate professor with their TIU in the department. For teaching faculty, the committee can be co-chaired by a teaching professor, and for research faculty, the committee can be co-chaired by a research professor.
- One faculty member will be appointed to provide support in the realms of teaching and service. The rest of the committee can be any OSU faculty, including teaching or research faculty, if relevant. In addition, emeritus faculty are welcome to serve. However, faculty from other departments and emeritus faculty cannot take part in departmental discussions of the Committee of Eligible Faculty. Committees should include at least two and no more than four members with at least 50% having appointments in Molecular Genetics.
- At times it may be necessary for the composition of a faculty development committee to change in the short term or in the long term. The appropriate composition of the faculty development committee will be discussed by the faculty candidate and the department chair during the annual review process and can also be addressed at any time that concerns arise.
- In some cases, it may be appropriate to assemble a committee that advises more than one probationary faculty member, allowing for peer:peer support between probationary faculty.
- Probationary faculty who believe they would benefit from additional or alternative mentorship support should discuss the issue with the department chair or designee who will seek a resolution, which may include reconstituting the faculty development committee. 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.

Duties of the Faculty Development and Mentoring Committees:

- Provision of comprehensive mentorship across the full range of responsibilities throughout the probationary period.
- Discussions with probationary faculty about their research programs via formal and informal meetings. These can include discussions of science, critiques of grant proposals, insights on the relevant study sections, and providing networking opportunities.
- Discussions with probationary faculty about how to balance research, teaching, and service commitments. This can include discussions of appropriate teaching and service assignments,

pedagogical support, and formal reviews of teaching effectiveness

Meetings of the Faculty Development and Mentoring Committee

- Meetings can be initiated by the probationary faculty or by members of the faculty development committee. In many cases the most useful meetings for mentoring purposes may be relatively informal meetings (over a meal or coffee) that need not include all members of the committee
- Individual members of the mentoring committee are expected to initiate at least one informal mentoring session each year, with the expectation that at least three informal mentoring meetings will occur each year that are initiated by one or more committee members. Members of the committee will also be available more frequently at the request of the probationary faculty member.
- The full committee must hold at least one formal meeting with the probationary faculty member each year, initiated by the committee chair, but may hold more if warranted. At least one formal meeting should inform the probationary faculty's completion of their annual activity report
- With input from other members on the committee, the chair(s) of the mentoring committee will draft an annual letter describing the committee's activities (including both formal and informal meetings) and the activities and progress of the probationary faculty, using the template provided in the "best practices" document. This letter is not evaluative, but should contain supportive, but candid feedback along with suggestions that will support the probationary faculty's future development and success. This letter will be reviewed by the probationary faculty and submitted to the department chair in advance of the annual review meeting between the chair and the probationary faculty. Specifics of this letter may be addressed during the annual review meeting. This letter will not be available to other members of the Committee of Eligible Faculty and does not contribute to the materials used for annual review, fourth year review, or promotion reviews by the Committee of Eligible Faculty.

The **chair of the department** has the following duties regarding the faculty mentoring and development process:

- Work with the probationary faculty to assemble their mentoring committee.
- Discuss the mentoring process during the annual review and alter the composition of the development committee as needed.
- Provide guidance on the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) process and suggestions on matters related to career development. These include clarifying the expectations for tenure, helping the probationary faculty to prioritize their responsibilities, and providing help on networking (if appropriate).
- Serve as a contact point for the probationary faculty and new hires to ask questions—supplementing other available contact points, such as the Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, their faculty development committees, other faculty members, and the front office.
- Serve as an informal avenue for conflict resolution.
- Meet annually with the probationary faculty to discuss the annual review.

Best practices:

- To maximize the usefulness of the mentoring process the department will maintain a best

practices document that outlines additional approaches that support effective mentoring relationships.

- This document will be reviewed regularly by the active mentoring committees and the committee of the eligible faculty for necessary updates.

C. Details of the Teaching Portfolio

Teaching portfolios are required for reappointment and promotion reviews of teaching faculty and are optional for promotion reviews of tenure track faculty. Teaching portfolios are used by the Committee of Eligible Faculty to develop a more informed evaluation of the teaching of faculty under review. Teaching portfolios are included in the dossier in the "Other Unit-Required Documentation" section in Interfolio but are not forwarded to the higher-level review bodies with the dossier when the department review is complete. Some overlap of materials in the teaching portfolio with the lists and narrative descriptions of teaching in the core dossier is expected; the teaching portfolio is an opportunity to provide the committee of eligible faculty with a focused and in-depth view of your growth as an educator.

The Drake Institute of Teaching provides a [Teaching Portfolio Development guide](#) with links to resources at Ohio State and at other institutions that outline principles and methods for formative and summative evaluation of teaching.

Teaching Portfolio Expectations

Teaching portfolios should include:

1. a **philosophy of teaching statement** (2-3 pages, details below)
2. a statement outlining any professional development efforts and describing how your instruction has changed and what you have learned about yourself as a teacher during the review period (1-2 pages)
3. selected sample course materials such as syllabuses, handouts, assignments, and exams. You may also choose to include one or more **teachable units** (described below). Course materials should include a rationale for each item in the portfolio: a short paragraph explaining why the sample was included and how it supports your teaching philosophy. Be sure to include the syllabus for any new courses you developed.

Philosophy of Teaching statement

The point of this statement is to give the reader a sense of who you are as a teacher. You don't need to make this sound extravagant or like you have grand ideas that will revolutionize teaching. Be honest about your experiences, how you have grown for them, and what you would like to achieve as a teacher.

Think about the following:

- What do you see as your role as an instructor?
- What goals do you have for your students? (In other words, what skills or knowledge do you hope they will be able to take away from a course you teach?)
- What do you see as obstacles to achieving those goals? How do you address those obstacles?
- What courses/types of students have you taught? (majors vs. nonmajors, freshmen vs. seniors, small classes vs. large classes, labs vs. lectures, etc.)
- What are examples of how you teach in these various formats to achieve the goals you have for students?
- How do you assess students to determine whether or not they (and you) are achieving the goals?

Teachable Unit

This is a structured plan for teaching a specific topic or concept. It will typically include slides and handouts you would use to teach the topic and a rationale for why you have structured it the way you have. The scope can be anything from part of a class to multiple class days – whatever it takes to teach the topic you have chosen.