Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Procedures Document for The Ohio State University Department of Physics

Revision Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: November 18, 2025

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures

Department of Physics

Table of Contents

I Introduction 4
II Department Mission 4
III Definitions 5
A Committee of the Eligible Faculty 5
1 Tenure-track Faculty 5
2 Teaching Faculty 6
3 Research Faculty 6
4 Associated Faculty 7
5 Conflict of Interest 8
6 Minimum Composition 8
B Annual Review Subcommittee 8
C Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee 9
D Quorum 9
E Recommendations from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty 10
1 Appointment 10
2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion 10
IV Appointments 10
A Criteria 11
1 Tenure-track Faculty 11
2 Teaching Faculty 13
3 Research Faculty 14
4 Associated Faculty 15
5 Regional Campus Faculty 17
6 Emeritus Faculty 17
7 Joint Appointments 17
8 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty 18
B Procedures 18
1 Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus 18
2 Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus 20
3 Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus 20
4 Transfer from the Tenure-track 20
5 TIU Transfer 20
6 Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus 21
7 Regional Campus Faculty 21
8 Joint Appointments 22
9 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty 22
V Annual Performance and Merit Review 22
A Documentation 23

B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus 24
1 Fourth-Year Review 26
2 Extension of the Tenure Clock 27
C Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus 27
D Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus 28
E Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus 28
F Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus 28
G Regional Campus Faculty 29
H Salary Recommendations 29
VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews 30
A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion 31
1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure 31
2 Promotion to Professor 36
3 Teaching Faculty 37
4 Research Faculty 39
5 Associated Faculty 40
6 Regional Campus Faculty 40
B Procedures 40
1 Tenure-Track, Teaching, and Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus 40
2 Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus 47
3 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty 47
4 External Evaluations 47
VII Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals 50
VIII Seventh-Year Reviews 50
A Student Evaluation of Teaching 50
B Peer Evaluation of Teaching 51
Appendix I: Faculty Mentoring 53

I Introduction

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty; the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Chapter 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook; and other policies and procedures of the College of Arts and Sciences and university to which the department and its faculty are subject. Should these rules and policies change, the department will follow the new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years on the appointment or reappointment of the Chair.

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

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

The university is committed to equal opportunity and eliminating discrimination and harassment. This commitment is both a moral imperative consistent with an intellectual community that celebrates individual differences, as well as a matter of law. Decisions considering appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the university's policy on equal employment opportunity.

This document is created in tandem with the Pattern of Administration of the Department of Physics.

II Department Mission

The Ohio State Department of Physics seeks to develop an innovative and transformative understanding of the physical universe through a research program whose excellence is recognized internationally; to educate a large group of students with a broad range of experiences, backgrounds, and interests to obtain a mastery of the subject and critical skills necessary for solving 21st-century challenges; and to disseminate our knowledge, for the betterment of society and the field, through impactful publications, education, and service & outreach.

The department embraces and seeks to implement the university's shared values initiative. We are committed to academic freedom, to ensuring responsible research practices, to building a

welcoming culture for all, to fostering an ethic of care and mutual respect, and to promoting justice.

Excellence in research involves advancing our understanding of the physical world and making those advances known through scholarly publications and presentations, stimulating the research work of graduate students and colleagues both at Ohio State and elsewhere, and establishing a reputation for independent work at the forefront of physics research. It requires continuously evaluating and updating our research efforts. It necessitates hiring, and then promoting, only outstanding new faculty to preserve and enhance the department's and college's strength in research.

Excellence in teaching involves (1) providing instruction in Physics undergraduate service courses that fully engages all our students; (2) introducing innovative approaches to improve learning courses designed primarily for our majors; (3) continuous updating of our upper level undergraduate and graduate courses to provide stimulating and exciting learning opportunities for these students; (4) integration of evidence-based instructional strategies in our courses at all levels; (5) helping to develop excellent research and workplace skills for all our students through high quality mentoring and professional development opportunities; and (6) regularly evaluating teaching quality and outcomes, both by peers and students, to improve our education product to the highest possible level.

Excellence in service involves (1) helping improve the department by participating in the decision-making process, engaging colleagues to seek creative solutions to problems and mentoring other faculty in research, teaching and service; (2) contributing to a positive workplace culture in the department; (3) serving responsibly on committees within the Physics Department, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the university; (4) serving on professional committees at state, national, and international levels; (5) providing professional service through editorial and reviewing activities, and evaluating colleagues at other universities involved in the promotion and tenure process; (6) sharing the fruits of our educational and research endeavors with the community beyond the university; and (7) visible leadership activities promoting positive workplace culture for all members of the department.

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

For all faculty appointment reviews, the search committee is responsible for making a recommendation to the department chair. In this department, the search committee's recommendation follows a vote of the eligible faculty, as described below.

1 Tenure-track Faculty

Appointment Reviews

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

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

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

2 Teaching Faculty

Appointment Reviews

- **Initial Appointment Reviews**. 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 whose tenure resides in the Department and all teaching faculty whose primary appointment is in the Department.

- **Rank Reviews.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and all nonprobationary teaching 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 consist of all tenured associate professors and professors, all nonprobationary associate teaching professors, and all nonprobationary teaching professors.

For the reappointment and promotion reviews of associate teaching professors, and the reappointment reviews of teaching professors, the eligible faculty consist of all tenured professors and all nonprobationary teaching professors.

3 Research Faculty

Appointment Reviews

- **Initial Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a research assistant professor, research associate professor, or research professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all research faculty in the department.

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

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

4 Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- For the initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of lecturers the decision is made by the department chair following a recommendation from the search committee.

- For the initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type), of all other compensated associated faculty members the eligible faculty consist of all tenure-track faculty, all teaching faculty, and all research faculty in the department.

- Initial appointments at senior rank (e.g. senior lecturer, adjunct associate professor, adjunct professor) require a vote by the eligible faculty (all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position, all non-probationary teaching faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested if the position has a significant teaching component, and all non-probationary research faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested if the position has a significant research component) and prior approval of the college dean.

- In all cases of initial appointments (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty, the recommendation to the department chair is the responsibility of the search committee, whether there is a faculty vote or not.

- The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty is decided by the Chair in consultation with appropriate faculty.

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 above.

- For the promotion review of a lecturer to senior lecturer, the eligible faculty shall be all tenure-track faculty and all nonprobationary teaching faculty at the ranks 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:
- decides to apply for the position;
- is related to or has a close interpersonal relationship with a candidate;
- has substantive financial ties with the candidate;
- is dependent in some way on the candidate's services;
- has a close professional relationship with the candidate (e.g., dissertation advisor); or
- has collaborated extensively with the candidate or is currently collaborating with the candidate.

Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest

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

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

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

6 Minimum Composition

In the event that the department at some point in time does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the Chair, after consulting with the divisional dean, will appoint a faculty member from another department within the College of Arts and Sciences.

B Annual Review Subcommittee

Prior to autumn semester each year the Chair will appoint separate Annual Review Subcommittees of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty for each assistant and associate professor in the department, including tenure-track, research, and teaching faculty. Each Annual Review Subcommittee will be responsible for reviewing the performance of the faculty member to whom they are assigned (see also Section V, Annual Performance and Merit Review). The subcommittee will consist of four faculty members at higher rank than the faculty member to be reviewed. In the case of tenure track and research faculty two of these members shall be from the candidate's discipline, with a combination of experimental and theoretical backgrounds when

possible, and two members shall be from outside the candidate's discipline. The chair will appoint one of the faculty members (from outside the discipline as applicable) to serve as chair of the subcommittee. For tenure track and research faculty, the chair will further assign a faculty member from the candidate's discipline to be a research mentor. For tenure track and teaching faculty the chair will further assign a separate faculty member for the subcommittee (not the chair or the research mentor as applicable) as the teaching mentor. The membership of this subcommittee will be maintained throughout the promotion and/or tenure process, but substitutions will be allowed. Reason for substitutions include availability of faculty members in any given year, a request by the faculty member being reviewed, or a new conflict of interest. The assignment of chair shall rotate between the eligible faculty members with different faculty serving as chair during the fourth-year review and the promotion and tenure review. The department Chair will provide the subcommittee with a written charge that describes its duties and expected milestones during the academic year.

In addition, the Chair will appoint for each probationary tenure track, teaching, and research faculty member two faculty mentors that do not serve on the annual review subcommittee. This will be done in consultation with the probationary faculty member. These faculty mentors each will meet regularly such as twice a semester with the probationary faculty to provide advice and guidance on all of their professional activities. The faculty mentors should meet with the annual review subcommittee twice a year to ensure that the advice and guidance provided by the faculty mentors and the annual review subcommittee does not provide conflicting advice. Additional details on mentoring are provided in Appendix I.

C Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee

When a tenure-track assistant or associate professor is considered for promotion and/or tenure and when a teaching faculty member or research faculty member is considered for reappointment or promotion, the Annual Review Subcommittee will be designated as the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee. In addition to the normal assignments described above, the chair of the subcommittee will appoint one member of the subcommittee to serve as the Procedures Oversight Designee (POD). The chair of the subcommittee may not serve as the POD. The department Chair will provide the subcommittee with a written charge that describes its duties and expected milestones during the academic year.

D Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is a simple majority of the eligible faculty (excluding absent from OSU on an official approved leave). Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. A member of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty who is on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the Chair has approved an off-campus assignment. Reasonable accommodations for participation by faculty assigned to a regional campus will be made, and those who cannot participate will not be counted in determining the quorum.

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

E Recommendations from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

All votes taken on personnel matters will be by secret ballot and only "yes" and "no" votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to consider whether they are participating fully in the review process when abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter. (A personnel matter is one that leads to an action by Human Resources.) Abstentions are not allowed on votes for promotion and tenure reviews.

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted. However, faculty participating fully in discussions by two-way video such as Zoom are allowed to vote.

1 Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment in a tenure-track, research or teaching faculty position is secured when at least two-thirds of the votes cast are positive. (The Chair's final recommendation to the dean will be based on this recommendation, only after considering all competing candidates for the position, as per section IV Appointments below. If the Chair's likely recommendation differs from that of the faculty, the Chair shall consult with the faculty before submitting the final recommendation.)

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

2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion is secured when at least two-thirds of the votes cast are positive. Abstentions are not votes.

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

IV Appointments

The Personnel Resources Committee (PRC) is charged with advising the faculty and the Chair of the department on matters of new faculty hiring, and thus it is appropriate to describe this committee in the present document. The PRC shall have at least eleven tenure track faculty members appointed for two-year terms with five or six members being replaced each year. The composition of the committee should be representative of the research areas in the department. It may be asked to prepare long-range hiring plans that will satisfy the needs for departmental growth and replacement of faculty vacancies. Special hiring opportunities such as, e.g., dual career hiring requests or requests for partial appointments by candidates from other departments will be considered by the PRC, which will evaluate the request and make a recommendation to the faculty and to the Chair. When an appointment of a foreign national is under consideration, the department will consult with the Office of International Affairs.

At the time of a new appointment of a tenure track, teaching, or research faculty, the Department Chair will organize an onboarding process that familiarizes the new faculty with department, college, and university policies, procedures, and expectations. This should include both the POA and APT documents emphasizing the promotion and tenure policies and criteria. The Chair's office should maintain a best practices document that is regularly updated, which details this onboarding process.

A Criteria

The department is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the department. Tenure-track faculty candidates must meet the highest possible standards of excellence, consistent with the mission of the Department of Physics, and their appointment must be based on criteria that reflect strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the faculty ranks. In general, the successful candidate must demonstrate high promise for performing independent, significant and visible research, excellence in teaching, and responsible departmental service. A demonstrated commitment to positive contributions to the department culture will be considered an important aspect of enhancing the quality of the department. To ensure the long-term success of the candidate and maximum impact for the department, there must be a strong consensus within the department and within the relevant area of specialization (if one exists) prior to appointing a new faculty member.

Teaching faculty, research faculty, and associated faculty must meet similarly high standards appropriate to their roles.

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 canceled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

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

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

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

1 Tenure-track Faculty

Instructor

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

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department Chair, the Dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be

revoked without a formal request for an extension of the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor

- Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the 7th year will be the final year of employment. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Annual Review Subcommittee determines such a review to be appropriate. The faculty member may also request such a review in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-04. 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 without approval of a formal extension of the probationary period. A doctorate is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Typically a candidate will also have postdoctoral research experience.
- The successful candidate must provide clear evidence of research promise as defined by demonstrated ability to perform, complete, and publish a major body of work that is relevant to the specific area of specialization.
- The successful candidate must demonstrate potential to develop into an internationally recognized scholar.
- The successful candidate must have outstanding recommendation letters that establish the candidate as one of the very top candidates of their peer group nationally.
- The successful candidate must demonstrate potential for excellent teaching, communication, and writing skills as determined, in part, by the departmental colloquium and interactions with faculty during the interview process and by careful evaluation of published work by the relevant search committee.
- The successful candidate must have strong potential and interest in contributing to the university's Shared Values
- The successful candidate must display potential to perform effective service to the university and the professional community.
- The successful candidate must have strong growth potential that will lead to tenure and advancement through the faculty ranks.

Associate Professor

In contrast to the assistant professor appointment described above, 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.

Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor and offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

Such an appointment requires, therefore, critical decisions both for the Department of Physics and for the candidate involved, and as such merits the most serious consideration.

- The successful candidate must meet or exceed the department's and the college's criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure.
- Criteria for appointment offers at the rank of associate professor with tenure include:
- National recognition for a high-quality body of scholarship
- Demonstrated excellence in teaching undergraduate and/or graduate students
- Demonstrated excellence in service/outreach to their profession and field as well as locally to the institution.
- Strong potential to advance to the rank of professor in a timely fashion.
- If the candidate does not currently hold a faculty position, then the candidate might not have had the opportunity to engage in teaching or in the training of graduate students, or in independently raising and continuing grant support for their research program. There should be very strong evidence that the candidate will establish a well-funded, productive and nationally and internationally recognized research program, after a short transition period, which will involve the education and training of undergraduate and graduate students. The evidence that must be evaluated would include the quality of the seminar presentations within the Physics department, results of workshops or other presentations provided by the individual and documentation of mentoring of individuals. Documentation of service would be evaluated from the individual's CV.

Professor

Appointment at the rank of professor will entail tenure.

Appointment offers at the rank of Professor and offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

Such an appointment requires, therefore, critical decisions both for the Department of Physics and for the candidate involved, and as such merits the most serious consideration.

- The successful candidate must meet or exceed the department's and college's criteria for promotion to professor, with a particular emphasis on the requirement that the candidate have national and international recognition as a scholar in their area.
- Criteria for appointment offers at the rank of professor with tenure in the College of Arts and Sciences include:
- An established national or international reputation as a leading scholar in their field with an outstanding body of scholarship
- Demonstrated excellence in teaching at graduate and/or undergraduate levels
- Demonstrated record of high-quality service to their field and institution.
- If the candidate does not currently hold a faculty position, then the candidate might not have had the opportunity to engage in teaching or in the training of graduate students, or in independently raising and continuing grant support for their research program. There should be very strong evidence that the candidate will establish a well-funded, productive and nationally and internationally recognized research program, after a short transition period, which will involve the education and training of undergraduate and graduate students. The evidence that must be evaluated would include the quality of the seminar presentations within the Physics department, results of workshops or other presentations provided by the individual and documentation of mentoring of individuals. Documentation of service would be evaluated from the individual's CV.

2 Teaching Faculty

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

Teaching faculty appointments exist for faculty members who focus principally on the educational needs of students in Physics. Teaching Faculty members are expected to contribute to the Department's Scholarship of Teaching and Learning and education mission as reflected in undergraduate and graduate program development and teaching. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning involves the systematic study and practice of teaching and learning including the development, application, or assessment of evidence-based teaching methods and materials, the collection and analysis of relevant data, and sharing broadly with peers such as by presentations external to the department, publications, or other shared products. 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 instructor when the appointee has not completed the requirements for the terminal degree. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. As noted above, an appointment at the instructor level is limited to a three-year contract. In such cases, if the instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the penultimate year of the three-year contract period, a new contract will not be considered even if performance is otherwise adequate, and the position itself will continue.

Assistant Teaching Professor. An earned doctorate in Physics or closely related field is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of Assistant Teaching Professor. Additional qualifications for appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor of teaching are:

- Significant teaching experience using evidence-based instructional materials and methods
- Broad expertise in evidence-based instructional materials and methods
- Evidence of productivity in Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
- Consistency with the university's Shared Values

Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor. Appointment at the rank of associate teaching professor or teaching professor requires that the individual have a doctorate in Physics or closely related field and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria for promotion to these ranks as well as the additional criteria listed above. Appointment at the rank of teaching associate professor or teaching professor requires production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice.

3 Research Faculty

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

performance. If the department wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see Faculty Rule 3335-7.

In establishing the title, the Board of Trustees restricts the duties and responsibilities (Faculty Rule 3335-7): primary emphasis on research, limited teaching (with approval of the department), supervision of graduate students (with approval of the Graduate School), limited service, with the exclusion of university governance.

In the Department of Physics, research faculty at all ranks are appointed for research in specific areas under the assumption that the cost of the salary (with benefits and overhead) and the associated research will be supported by external funds with full overhead. Normally research faculty will be associated with specific tenure-track faculty or an OSU-connected research facility. No research faculty shall have continuing teaching assignments, although occasional use in junior/senior, graduate and specialized courses is possible with consent of the funding source, the tenure-track faculty, and the Chair. Departmental service is limited to mentoring research students at all levels and to serving on selected departmental committees related to the research role of the relevant faculty. Research faculty can be principal investigators on external contacts or grants. Only with permission of the Chair can research faculty compete for internal funding or funding not returning full overhead.

The criteria for the appointment of a research faculty member in a specific research area at any level shall be the quality of their research achievements and the potential for significant future research. Letters of recommendation should support these criteria. The distinctions between assistant research professor, associate research professor and research professor shall reflect the relative division among the tenure-track faculty ranks.

Any research faculty appointment is targeted to a capable individual who sees benefits in doing research at a university: greater freedom to select projects and secure funding, opportunity to interact with research students and postdocs, general ambience of a university community.

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

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 to these ranks.

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

Research Associate Professor and Research Professor. Appointment at the rank of research associate professor or research professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and meet, at a minimum, the department's research criteria for promotion 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. Adjunct appointments may be compensated but are typically uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who provide considerable academic service to the department, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track, teaching, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

For an adjunct position to be appropriate, there must be a specific need in the department for a person to perform departmental duties such as teaching courses, advising graduate students, or providing research project leadership that would enhance the graduate program. The criteria for the adjunct appointment are dependent on the nature of the appointment:

- If the person receives an adjunct appointment for teaching a course, that person must provide evidence that he or she has the capability for good teaching and has a good knowledge of the material taught in the course. Evidence of this includes an advanced degree and/or teaching experience in the subject area. The person is expected to demonstrate good communication skills as judged through any appropriate means such as an interview.
- If the purpose of the adjunct appointment is for research collaboration along with student advising, the criterion for appointment is evidence of research excellence as judged by publications, letters of recommendation, and experience in performing and directing research within a government laboratory, company or university.

The term of appointment is for one year with renewal contingent on continued significant contributions. The adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track, teaching, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

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

Lecturer. The Lecturer position is to be used only when a specific instructional need is identified in the department. 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 a senior lecturer requires that the individual have at a minimum a doctorate in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with

evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction; or a Master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience with documentation of high quality. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The initial appointment for a senior lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for senior lecturers cannot exceed three years.

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

It is expected that the visiting faculty member will be collaborating with a tenure-track or research faculty member within the department. Evidence of the collaboration would be provided in the nominating letter from that faculty member.

5 Regional Campus Faculty

As the mission of the regional campuses emphasizes undergraduate instruction, regional campus criteria for appointment at the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor are similar to those for Columbus campus faculty but give relatively greater emphasis at each rank to teaching experience and quality.

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

6 Emeritus Faculty

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

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the department chair (regional campus dean for associated faculty on regional campuses) outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-4) will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair. The department chair 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 for Faculty

Occasionally the active academic involvement in this department by a tenure-track, teaching, or research faculty member from another department at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in this department. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course from time to time, or a combination of these. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized. Continuation of the appointment should reflect ongoing contributions. Courtesy appointments do not require formal annual review.

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

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

- recruitment of tenure track, teaching, 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

Requests to hire new tenure-track faculty may originate in various ways. Faculty may propose a position, either as part of a long-range plan adopted by the faculty or as a perceived special opportunity or replacement. Standing departmental committees or ad hoc committees appointed by the Chair may also request a position to address a specific need of the department. Such requests are reviewed and prioritized by the PRC, which then makes a recommendation to the faculty and Chair pertaining to the specific request(s). Next, the Chair calls a meeting of the faculty for the purpose of discussing the recommendation and acting on the faculty request. If approved by the faculty, the Chair will proceed with the process, starting with seeking approval from the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The Dean's approval may be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise.

Once a search is approved, the Chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as

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

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

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

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

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

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank and tenure. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit (see IV. A. 1 above). The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the Chair. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor, with or without tenure, or Professor and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the Chair decides, in consultation with the divisional dean, which candidate to approach first. At that time, the Chair must discuss the details of the offer, including compensation, with the divisional dean and receive approval before extending an offer.

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

2 Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Searches for teaching faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the interview is on teaching practice, philosophy, and/or Scholarship of Teaching and Learning rather than research.

3 Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate should provide plans for securing research funding sufficient to support their salary and benefits, and the interview process will not, except under highly unusual circumstances, include a teaching demonstration.

4 Transfer from the Tenure-track

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a research or teaching appointment if appropriate to the individual's circumstances, skill set, and department and college needs, and if funding for the salary has been identified. Tenure is lost upon transfer, and transfers must be approved by the Chair, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, 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 research or teaching appointment to the tenure-track are not permitted. Research and teaching 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 eligible faculty in the receiving TIU, by both TIU heads, the college dean(s), and the Office of

Academic Affairs. The eligible faculty in such cases are the tenure-track faculty eligible to vote on faculty appointments at the transferee's rank. See Section III.A.1 above.

Approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements for the change have been made and requires the establishment of mutually agreed-upon arrangements among the affected TIU heads, college dean(s), and the faculty member. An MOU signed by all parties, including the Office of Academic Affairs, must describe in detail the arrangements of the transfer. Since normally the transferring faculty member will fill an existing vacancy in the receiving unit, the MOU will describe the resources supporting the position, including salary, provided by the receiving unit.

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

6 Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

The appointment of all compensated associated faculty 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 Chair based on recommendation from the search committee in the case of lecturers and senior lecturers and following a vote of the eligible faculty in the case of all other compensated associated faculty. The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the Chair in consultation with the vice chair for administration in the case of lecturers and senior lecturers and the Personnel Resources Committee for all other titles. Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances. Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are usually made on an annual basis, and when necessary semester by semester. After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, an appointment of up to three years may be offered.

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department. The proposal is considered at a regular faculty meeting and if approved by the faculty, the Chair extends an offer.

All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three consecutive years. Adjunct appointments may be renewed only when the academic service for which the appointment was made continues.

7 Regional Campus Faculty

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

The regional campus has primary responsibility for determining the position description for a tenure-track faculty search, but the Dean/director or designee consults with the 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, the 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 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 Chair and the regional campus Dean/Director.

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

8 Joint Appointments

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

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

9 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track or research faculty member from another Ohio State department. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to the department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. The proposal should include a complete curriculum vitae. If the proposal is approved by the eligible faculty, the Chair extends an offer of appointment. The Chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting. Termination of courtesy appointments can be initiated by a faculty member in a recommendation to the Chair, or by the Chair. It must then be approved by the departmental faculty excluding those with either adjunct or courtesy appointments.

Courtesy appointees are expected to list their affiliation with the department on publications. The department also requests that courtesy appointees provide the department with an annual report of their publications. To minimize the administrative burden on the appointee, this may be fulfilled by providing this information in the format required by the appointee's home department.

V Annual Performance and Merit Review

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

- Assist faculty in improving professional productivity through candid and constructive feedback and through the establishment of professional development plans;
- Establish the goals against which a faculty member's performance will be assessed in the foreseeable future; and

- Document faculty performance in the achievement of stated goals in order to determine salary increases and other resource allocations, progress toward promotion, and, in the event of poor performance, the need for remedial steps.

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

In all cases, accountability for the annual performance and merit review process resides with the department chair.

The department chair delegates responsibility for drafting the annual review letters for lecturers and senior lecturers to the Vice Chair for Administration.

Depending on a faculty member's appointment type, the annual performance and merit review is based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload in the Pattern of Administration; 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 Chair is required (Faculty Rule 3335-6-03) to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (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. Department chairs 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 positive unit cultures that are welcoming, 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 of activities in the previous calendar year, faculty members must submit the following documents to the department chair in the spring following

the calendar year under review. The specific deadline is set by the department chair before the end of that calendar year:

Only for probationary faculty and tenured associate professors

- Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline

For all probationary and tenured faculty

- 2-page narrative on research, teaching and service that covers activities from the past year and includes future plans and goals. This should include how contributions to positive and welcoming environments are integrated into each of these categories.
- 3-year publication list.
- 3-year presentation list, if not already included in the CV.
- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place
- Complete and accurate information spreadsheet, which is provided to the faculty by the department chair.

Cumulative Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) reports (computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar reports for every class taught), along with peer evaluation of teaching reports, will be compiled by the Vice Chair for Administration for the annual performance and merit review.

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.

As appropriate, the department chair will make this documentation accessible to the Annual Review Subcommittee for each probationary tenure-track assistant professor and tenured associate professor and for all teaching and research faculty at the rank of assistant and associate professor.

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

B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the Chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance, future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation with sufficient detail and meaningful feedback that includes a recommendation on whether to renew a probationary appointment. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

Probationary tenure-track faculty members are also reviewed annually during spring semester by the Annual Review Subcommittee assigned to each assistant professor, except those who have in the prior autumn been recommended for promotion and/or tenure. The Annual Review Subcommittee will:

- Evaluate the performance of the faculty member under review with regard to teaching, research, and service.

- Evaluate how contributions to positive and welcoming environments are integrated into these three categories teaching, research and service.
- Consider and include the reports of previous annual review committees in this evaluation.
- Prepare a report summarizing the evaluation for the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.

It is not the duty of the Annual Review Subcommittee to review or to decide upon the general staffing needs of the department or to make explicit comparisons or rank orderings of the person under review with other members of the department.

Prior to its deliberations, the department chair will have made all relevant documentation accessible to the Committee of Eligible Faculty about the faculty member under review (see Section V.A above).

The evaluation by the Annual Review Subcommittee of the faculty member's teaching performance is particularly important for effective mentoring. The results of student evaluations may be used as an indicator of possible teaching concerns. Information from peer reviews will further aid in diagnosis and treatment of concerns. If a faculty member's student evaluation results, as informed by peer reviews, are significantly below the departmental average, then the Committee of the Eligible Faculty may recommend appropriate actions. Such measures may include additional classroom visitations by faculty with a subsequent written report containing possible suggestions for improvement, and a plan of action by the faculty member for making such improvements as advised.

The Annual Review Subcommittee, after carefully examining and discussing the information provided to it regarding the faculty member under review, will prepare a candid and discerning written report for the Chair. The chair of the Annual Review Subcommittee should discuss the report with the faculty member under review before it is discussed by the full Committee of the Eligible Faculty to ensure the accuracy of the report.

The report of the Annual Review Subcommittee will be summarized by the subcommittee chair (or another member of the subcommittee if needed) and discussed at a meeting of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in the spring semester. For probationary faculty, this discussion must occur each year. Following discussion of the Annual Review Subcommittee report, the Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty shall work with the Annual Review Subcommittee to update the report based on the discussion and feedback and include a vote and signature on the final document.

As part of each discussion of a case at the annual review faculty meeting, the Committee of Eligible Faculty will discuss whether to recommend that the faculty member under review be considered as a candidate for an early nonmandatory promotion and tenure review. In addition, the committee shall communicate to the faculty under review the outcome of this discussion and suggest actions that may be helpful in progressing toward promotion. In the case of such a recommendation and if the faculty member agrees to proceed with a nonmandatory review, the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee will prepare the case for consideration by the eligible faculty in the following autumn semester's promotion and tenure process.

The report of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty must also contain a recommendation to reappoint or not reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year. In the case of a

recommendation of nonrenewal in the first, second, third, or fifth year of appointment of an assistant professor, fourth year review procedures (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-03) will be followed, except that external letters will only be solicited if the eligible faculty require such advice in order to evaluate the scholarship, especially in cases where the research is interdisciplinary or in an emergent field. The Committee of the Eligible Faculty may authorize the Annual Review Subcommittee to prepare the Committee's report, with the Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty coordinating the process and signing the report, which is forwarded to the Chair.

Following the meetings of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the chair of the Annual Review Subcommittee will provide the final report to the faculty member under review and meet with them to consider the report and the discussion in the faculty meeting. It is appropriate at each of these meetings for the chair of the Annual Review Subcommittee to discuss the departmental view of the faculty member's overall performance; in particular the chair has an obligation to discuss any perceived shortcomings. It is the obligation of the department Chair to foster this mentoring process and provide any appropriate advice and counsel. The faculty member under review may provide written comments on the report. The annual meeting of the Chair with each probationary faculty member shall include a discussion of the faculty member's report.

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

If the Chair recommends nonrenewal for a probationary faculty member, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-03) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the College of Arts and Sciences for review, and the Dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

1 Fourth-Year Review

In the fourth-year of the probationary period, the annual review shall follow the same process within the department as the mandatory review for tenure and promotion with the exception that the dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. Letters from persons outside the department (in accordance with section VI below) will be solicited by the Chair and supplied to the Annual Review Subcommittee prior to its deliberations. A minimum of two letters will be required for the fourth-year review, one of which may be from a writer proposed by the candidate. Once a report from the Annual Review Subcommittee has been produced, the chair of the Annual Review Subcommittee will discuss the report with the faculty member and provide an opportunity for a response to the report before the Committee of the Eligible Faculty conducts a review of the candidate. Upon completion of its review, the Committee of the Eligible Faculty vote 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 Chair.

The Chair conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04) is followed and the case is forwarded to the College of Arts and Sciences for review, regardless of whether the Chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

If either the chair or the dean recommends nonrenewal of a faculty member's probationary contract, the case will be referred to the college's Promotion and Tenure Committee, which will review the case, vote and make a recommendation to the dean. Renewal of the appointment of a probationary assistant professor for the fifth year requires the approval of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The dean, in consultation with the divisional dean, makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

2 Extension of the Tenure Clock

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure-track faculty member may 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

The annual performance and merit review of associate professors follows the same procedures as for the review of probationary faculty (see Section V.B above), except that the Committee of the Eligible Faculty discussion of the Annual Review Subcommittee's report will occur at least once every two years rather than annually. However, a discussion of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty will occur any spring semester if requested by the faculty member under review or a member of the Committee of Eligible Faculty. Furthermore, the report for a tenured associate professor that is not scheduled to be discussed that year by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty must be provided at least 3 weeks before the end of spring classes. The department chair conducts an independent assessment, meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance and future plans and goals, and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The annual meeting of the Chair with each tenured associate professor shall include a discussion of the report by the Annual Review Subcommittee. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review, and the department chair may respond in writing.

Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance and future plans and goals. The chair may seek the advice and opinions of faculty and staff within or outside the department who have relevant knowledge of the faculty member's performance during the review period. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the tenure initiating unit, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the college, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors in the form of formal or informal mentoring such as, e.g., feedback on teaching, proposal and manuscript drafts. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues

and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest-ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty. The department chair prepares a written evaluation of performance against these expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review, and the department chair may respond in writing.

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

D Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus

The annual performance and merit review process for probationary and nonprobationary teaching faculty is identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty, respectively, with the following differences:

- A formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review follows Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty, including review at the college level, except for the fact that no external letters will be requested.
- 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.
- Non-probationary teaching faculty may participate in the review of teaching faculty of lower rank.
- 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 nonprobationary faculty is identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty, respectively, with the following differences:

- In the penultimate contract year of a research faculty member's appointment, the department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If it will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 must be observed.
- If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review generally proceeds in the same manner as the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.
- Nonprobationary research faculty may participate in the review of research faculty of lower rank.
- All reappointment decisions are at the discretion of the college dean. 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 Chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance, future plans, and goals. The Chair's recommendation on renewal of the appointment is final. If the recommendation is to renew, the Chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

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

G Regional Campus Faculty

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

Regional campus teaching faculty are reviewed according to the process established on that campus, with the review focusing on teaching and service. The regional campus dean will provide the department chair a copy of a teaching 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 units:

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

Except when the university dictates any type of across the board salary increase, 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 a multitude of ideas and opinions.

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

Meritorious performance in teaching, research and scholarship, and service are assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. (Salary recommendations for research faculty are to be based on the same considerations, with the exception of the evaluation of teaching. Salary recommendations for teaching faculty are assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions for teaching faculty detailed in section VI.A.3 of this document.) Contributions to positive and welcoming environments in all three factors shall be considered as evidence of excellence. The time frame for assessing performance will be the past 36 months, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity. Faculty with high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation (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.

The Chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the Dean, who may modify these recommendations. In formulating recommendations, the Chair consults with the Vice Chairs. Salary increases are formulated with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries. The Chair will endeavor to be as fair and unbiased as possible in making salary recommendations and will apply to the extent possible criteria that reflect the collective standards of the faculty for individual performance. In addition, the Chair should proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in it.

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

VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

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

Every candidate is expected to meet the criteria for promotion in all aspects of performance. Accepting weakness in any aspect of performance in making a tenure decision is tantamount to deliberately handicapping the department's ability to perform and to progress academically. The standards for tenure will be based on nationally established signatures of excellence. Tenure-track faculty members of the Department of Physics are expected to participate and make significant and high-quality contributions in all three of the areas of teaching, research, and service, but some counterbalance may exist among those three areas in establishing the acceptability of performance. In the Department of Physics, research is given a high priority in all tenure and promotion cases.

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

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

The accomplishments listed below in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service are expected of faculty for promotion to associate professor with tenure. In the evaluation of untenured associate professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

Teaching

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, the following expectations apply:

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">TEACHING</th></tr>
<tr><th>Criteria</th><th>Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met</th></tr>
<tr><td>Candidates are expected to have</td><td>Candidates may be asked to submit</td></tr>
<tr><td>Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively</td><td rowspan="4">Positive peer evaluation documenting these areas demonstrate satisfactory performance and/or positive trajectory during review period
Cumulative SEI reports with scores consistent with the department average and/or with a positive trajectory
Positive student comments in independent summaries of SEI discursive responses outweighing negative comments
Constructive reflection on these areas in teaching narrative
Summaries of curricular improvements through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs
Documentation of implementation of evidence-based instructional methods
Evidence of student achievement of course or program goals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Demonstrated creative use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment
or
Demonstrated the use of evidence-based approaches to teaching and learning
or
Engaged students actively in the learning process regardless of background or ability and encourage independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process</td></tr>
<tr><td>Promoted a supportive learning environment and treated students with respect and courtesy</td></tr>
</table>

Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process	• Teaching awards
Engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching	• Completion of relevant workshops, courses, and certificates at the Drake Institute for teaching and Learning, or through other qualified professional development providers • Teaching portfolio demonstrating teaching outcomes after efforts to improve • Annual evaluations – setting goals, documenting changes made to teaching in response to student, peer, and annual evaluations, and outcomes of the change
Demonstrated quality mentoring of a number of students appropriate to the faculty member's area(s) of expertise	• Candidate advising a group of undergraduate and/or graduate students at varying stages of progress in their own development as apprentice researchers • Noteworthy achievements (e.g., presentations, publications, awards, placements) of students supervised in research • Reflection in teaching narrative on mentoring approaches especially with respect to mentoring of students from a broad range of backgrounds • Awards for undergraduate or graduate student mentorship

Scholarship

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, the following expectations apply:

SCHOLARSHIP	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates are expected to have	Candidates may be asked to submit
Demonstrated research outcomes that contribute to knowledge in area of expertise and relationship to his/her/their scholarly agenda and unit mission	• A body of work in high-quality peer-reviewed archival journals, that is focused, contributes substantively and uniquely to knowledge in the area of focus, and is beginning to show evidence of influence on the work of

	others. Collaborative work is encouraged, and indeed is essential in some subfields, but the candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described to permit accurate assessment. • Complete publication record including archival journal papers, conference papers and posters (both refereed and otherwise), monographs, books, book chapters, textbooks based on scholarship, magazine articles and on-line publications. • List of patents and invention disclosures. Generally, invention disclosures and copyrights will be considered equivalent to a professional meeting abstract or conference proceeding. Patents should be considered equivalent to an original peer-reviewed manuscript. • Sustained grants and contracts including foundations, federal agencies, major industry, or private sector
Demonstrated ability to obtain and potential to sustain research and scholarly program funding commensurate with the overall funding landscape.	• List of program funding applied for and obtained with durations, amounts, and other investigators. Competitive peer-reviewed funding is weighted more favorably than other types, since it serves as a quality indicator of research programs, and grants requiring the exercise of intellectual creativity are weighted more heavily than those that largely dictate the work to be done. • List of licensing agreements that generate revenue. Licensing activities that generate revenues should be considered equivalent to extramural grant awards.
Demonstrated a developing national/international reputation in the candidate's subfield	• External evaluations • List of invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums including conferences and research universities

	• List of invitations to review research papers and grant proposals • Citation numbers showing beginning trend of positive citations in other researchers' publications • Leadership positions in large collaborations • List of material transfer activities
Demonstrated the ability to mentor future scholars (students and/or postdoctoral fellows) as appropriate to their subfield	• Evidence of support for undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or postdoctoral researchers including, but not limited to, financial, grants, and positive mentoring reviews • Undergraduate students', graduate students', and postdoctoral researcher's awards • Student and/or postdoctoral researchers' placement information • Student and/or postdoctoral researcher success related to mentored work (productivity, dissemination, scholarships, grants)
Demonstrated a high degree of professional ethics in their capacity of a faculty at The Ohio State University and contributes to a positive and compelling working environment.	• Annual review letters do not indicate concerns about ethical or workplace conduct or they indicate that previous concerns have been adequately addressed.

Service

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, the following expectations apply:

SERVICE	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates are expected to have	Candidates may be asked to submit
Made substantive contributions to the governance of the department in a manner that facilitates positive contributions by others	• Documentation of participation in the work of departmental committees at a level that meets the appropriate balance of effort and performance • Annual evaluations documenting appropriate service to the department • Service awards
Demonstrated the potential for useful contributions to the profession	• Involvement with professional journals as reviewer

	• Involvement with funding agencies as grant reviewer • Participation in the organization of conferences or symposia • Participation in the work of committees of professional societies

2 Promotion to Professor

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

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

The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, evidence of established national and international reputation in the field, and excellence in service to one or more publics beyond the department. It is expected that efforts to foster positive and welcoming environments are integrated into all three areas at an appropriate level commensurate with the added expectations listed above. Promotion to this level should be made on the basis of a carefully considered judgment that the individual will continue to make significant contributions to the profession. The same criteria of excellence in research, teaching, and service apply here as at other levels, but judgments of the balance that exists among them should fully recognize the particular talents and assigned duties of the individual concerned, as specified by Faculty Rule 3335-6-02.

The candidate for promotion should have established a record of research achievements and publications that have had a notable impact on the field.

The candidate should have demonstrated excellence in teaching, documented as described in Section VI A 1 above.

The candidate should have demonstrated service at the leadership level to the department. In addition, there should be demonstrated service at the college and/or university level. Examples of such service may include serving as the Graduate School representative on graduate examination committees; advising student clubs; serving on ad hoc or standing committees, councils, task forces and boards; administrative responsibilities of programs or offices; and/or other such service that advances the mission of the university. The candidate should also have demonstrated service to the discipline at the national level.

Candidates for promotion to professor must have a record of achievement in all three areas. As further specified by Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, however, 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. Where a candidate has made truly extraordinary contributions in the areas of teaching or service, that record may warrant promotion in combination with a less extensive, though excellent, record of continued productivity in research/creative work. Normally faculty being considered for promotion under this criterion will have undertaken a modified workload with additional duties in formal teaching and/or service.

In addition, 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 the scholarship of leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the department, college and university.

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.

3 Teaching Faculty

Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor. For promotion to Associate Teaching Professor, a faculty member must hold a doctoral or other terminal degree in the relevant field; show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and as 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 for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor are similar to those for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure with the following two exceptions: (i) Teaching faculty are not expected to have mentored students; (ii) teaching faculty are, in addition to the criteria for tenure track faculty, expected to have established strong evidence for course development and continued Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL):

TEACHING	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates are expected to have	Candidates may be asked to submit
• Made substantive contributions to course development	• Documentation of evidence-based redesign of existing courses • Documentation of evidence-based development of new courses • Teaching philosophy statement with commitment to evidence-based improvement of teaching • Documentation of implementation of evidence-based instructional methods • Evidence of contributions to other departments outside Physics, e.g.,

	guest lectures, assisting with accreditation efforts, course adaptations • Evidence of contributions to General Education course development and evaluation process

SCHOLARSHIP	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates are expected to have	Candidates may be asked to submit
• Made substantive contributions to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning as defined in section IV.A.2 of this document	• Presentations on pedagogy at relevant local and national conferences and external departmental seminars and colloquia • Publications or other products (such as evidence-based curricular materials) relevant to physics or STEM education. • Funding external to the physics department relevant to scholarship on physics or STEM education. • Awards related to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

In terms of service the following expectations apply for promotion to associate teaching professor:

SERVICE	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates are expected to have	Candidates may be asked to submit
• Made substantive contributions to the governance of the department in a manner that facilitates positive contributions by others	• Documentation of participation in the work of departmental committees at a level that meets the appropriate balance of effort and performance • Annual evaluations documenting appropriate service to the department • Service awards
Demonstrated outreach and engagement in the department, college, university, and/or community	• Evidence of leadership in or provision of professional development efforts related to teaching or curriculum at the

	department, college, university, and/or outside the university • Advising departmental or OSU clubs/organizations • Service on advisory board for community organizations or local schools • Development and/or participation in community programs for the department/OSU by working with, e.g., local schools, COSI, science fairs, businesses • Participation in department recruiting/welcoming events

Promotion will entail the generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Teaching Professor. For promotion to Teaching Professor, a faculty member must hold a doctoral or other terminal degree in the relevant field; have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions in meeting the criteria outlined for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor. This includes a sustained record of excellence in teaching and professional practice; leadership in service to the Department, University and to the profession of teaching and learning; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.

Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

4 Research Faculty

Promotion to Research Associate Professor. For promotion to research associate professor, a faculty member must have a substantial record of high-quality focused research consistent with an appointment devoted solely to research. Publications must appear in high-quality peer-reviewed journals and be judged by external evaluators as having substantial positive impact on the field. A record of continuous peer reviewed funding is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation. The claim that retention of the candidate will improve the overall scholarly quality and standing of the department must be supported. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

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

5 Associated Faculty

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

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

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

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

6 Regional Campus Faculty

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

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

B Procedures

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rules 3335-6-04 for tenure-track faculty, 3335-7-05 for teaching faculty, 3335-7-32 for research faculty, and the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Chapter 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook.

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

a Candidate Responsibilities

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

- 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 Promotion and Tenure Committee Subcommittee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by him or her.

1 Teaching

The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary tenure-track faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated. In general, there will be no evaluation of formal course instruction for research faculty. Documentation for tenure-track/tenured and teaching faculty should include:

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

2 Scholarship and Research

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

- a listing of all books, articles, and scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed.
- documentation of grants and contracts received
- other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted, h-index for citations, etc.)
- scholarly activities as listed in the core dossier including
    - documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options and commercial licenses
    - list of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work

3 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, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated. For research faculty there will be a minimal expectation of service to the department. Documentation should include:

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

In addition to the service documentation included in the core dossier, the review may also consider at the candidate's request and with the department chair's approval, additional documentation (e.g. letters from committee chairs) of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier

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

- Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document

Candidates must indicate the APT under which they wish to be reviewed. Candidates may submit the department's current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion (or last reappointment in the case of teaching and 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)

Candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee and submit a short list of additional potential external evaluators. Normally, the candidate should suggest no more than three names unless specifically requested, but is not required to submit any names. The candidate may also provide the names of no more than two individuals from whom the candidate would request that the department not solicit external evaluations. The Department Chair decides whether removal is justified.

b Annual Review Subcommittee Responsibilities

A faculty member may request a non-mandatory review at any time following consultation with the Chair and/or faculty mentors. The Chair will normally ask the faculty member's Annual Review Subcommittee to review the faculty member's CV and determine 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.

c Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee Responsibilities

- **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee. 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 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:** In collaboration with the Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, 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 provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on their dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.

- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The subcommittee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record. It is not the duty of the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee to review or to decide upon the general staffing needs of the department or to make explicit comparisons or rank orderings of the candidate with other members of the department. The draft report will be shown to the candidate prior to the meeting of the Committee of Eligible Faculty to allow for comments and clarifications.

- The report of the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee will be discussed at a meeting of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. Information on the present status of all contemporaries named in the report and/or letters of evaluation should be available to eligible faculty and to the candidate consistent with the Ohio Open Records Act. In cases where it has been established that the department's standard teaching evaluation procedure (i.e., a combination of written student comments, statistical summaries from SEIs, and peer reviews) gives a misleading indication of a candidate's teaching ability, the report should include an explanation of this discrepancy. It is the responsibility of the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee Chair to provide to the eligible faculty the full dossier of the candidate as well as any supplemental materials provided to the Subcommittee by the candidate prior to the meeting.

    - In collaboration with the Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty (see below), revise the draft analysis of each case following the eligible faculty meeting, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; the revised document must specify each of the unit's criteria in teaching, scholarship and service, summarize the faculty perspectives on whether the candidate has met each criterion, and include the sources of evidence in the dossier on which these perspectives are based; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the 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 Chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure initiating unit is another department. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure initiating unit substantially earlier than the Committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

d Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

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

- To review the department's APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.

- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year. Only professors on the subcommittee 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.

    - A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04A(3) only once. Faculty Rules 3335-07-08 and 3335-7-36 make the same provision for nonprobationary 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 eligible faculty to recommend that a review take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the Chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.

- 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.
- After sufficient discussion of the candidate's case, the eligible faculty present at the meeting will vote on whether or not to recommend promotion and/or tenure. The vote will be by a secret ballot, where the ballot choices will be: in favor or against.

e Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

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

- **In Late Spring:** Communicate to every candidate that will be considered for promotion and tenure, the required documents, and time for review process. Communicate to the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittees their responsibilities and timeline for the review process.
- **In Early Autumn:** In collaboration with the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittees, review candidates' core dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with OAA requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the core dossier before the formal review process begins.
- Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on their core dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- Chair the meeting of eligible faculty that considers promotion and tenure review cases.
- Work with each Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee to revise its analysis of each case following the eligible faculty meeting, to include the faculty vote, a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting, and signature.

f Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Department Chair are as follows:

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

- **Late Spring Semester:** To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this department. The 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.
- **Early Summer**: To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee, the Chair and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- On receiving the initial Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee report on the candidate, the Chair will notify the candidate, who may wish to review the essential contents of the report before the meetings of the eligible faculty. Confidentiality for persons who supplied information will be respected to the extent possible, consistent with the Ohio Open Records Act. At the candidate's request, the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee may correct any factual errors in their initial report.
- To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which reappointment, promotion, and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the Chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the review process:
    - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and Chair
    - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and Chair

    - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the Chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the Chair, indicating whether or not they expect to submit comments.
  - To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.

- To forward the completed dossier to the College of Arts and Sciences office by that office's deadline.

  - To receive the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the Chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the TIU head of the other tenure initiating unit by the date requested.

2 Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

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. Following the review, the dean consults with the department chair. A request to promote follows the same procedures as tenure-track faculty except that external letters are not needed unless scholarship is a component of the assigned role.

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 Associate Professor or Teaching Professor. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for other teaching or associated faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations for a teaching or associated faculty member will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and promotion and tenure subcommittee.

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

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

- Is written by a person at an appropriate peer or aspirational institution. In keeping with college guidelines, the department will generally obtain evaluations from faculty at R01 institutions that are members of the Association of American Universities (AAU) or the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA). The department further defines peer or near-peer institutions to include: McMaster University, Florida International University, Queen's University, University of British Columbia, University of Victoria, and Virginia Tech. 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 and liberal arts colleges, 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 Physics related to a candidate's interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary projects; 3) meets the standards for a peer reviewer in a TIU in which the candidate is joint-appointed; and/or 4) where relevant, is a distinguished, award winning (e.g., Fellow of the American Physical Society, Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences, National Academy of Sciences member) scientist who is not affiliated with an academic institution.
- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who can give an arms' length evaluation (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's area of and level of expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. The department normally will predominantly solicit evaluations from professors with institutional affiliations in the programs listed above. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to

perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

- The persons writing evaluation letters should be asked to comment on the quality of the candidate's research and compare the candidate with contemporary researchers at other leading academic institutions and, if relevant, national and industrial laboratories. They should not comment on whether or not tenure and/or promotion should be granted. Letters of evaluation should be requested sufficiently early (approximately 2 or 3 months prior to the review, thus in spring or very early summer) so they are available to the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee during its deliberations.

Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and/or the usefulness of the letters received, several more letters are sought than are required. In addition, requesting the letters by early summer at the latest allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests. Evaluators solicited for fourth-year review letters will not be solicited for a tenure review.

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee, the 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 national laboratory, a research-based 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.

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 Chair, who will decide what, if any, action is warranted (such as 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.

The candidate should prepare a CV, list of five publications and/or preprints, copies of those documents, and a research statement to be sent by the Chair to the evaluators that have agreed to provide an external evaluation.

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 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 Rear Review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year (mandatory tenure) review.

IX: Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

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

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

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

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

A Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) is required in every course offered in this department. Faculty members should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if s/he is going to provide in-class time for students to complete the evaluation using a mobile application. The faculty member must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation. The faculty member should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and to provide feedback that can be taken into account in future teaching.

B Peer Evaluation of Teaching

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

The Chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process, while usually delegating authority for organization of the process to the Vice Chair for Administration. Although there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible.

Peer Evaluations of Probationary Tenure-Track and Teaching Faculty: The department chair is responsible for coordinating peer review of teaching of probationary tenure-track faculty and probationary teaching faculty at least once per year during the probationary period, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. During the first two years of the probationary period additional peer reviews of teaching are scheduled to ensure that at least one peer review of teaching per course taught is obtained. A minimum of five peer reviews must be included in the dossier of probationary tenure-track assistant professors being considered for tenure and promotion. When probationary teaching faculty are reviewed for reappointment or promotion, they are required to have a minimum of four peer evaluations of instruction from the probationary period. No more than two evaluations should be prepared by the same colleague.

Peer Evaluations of Tenured Faculty, Non-Probationary Teaching Faculty, and Associated Faculty: The department chair is responsible for coordinating peer review of teaching of tenured associate professors, nonprobationary assistant teaching professors, and nonprobationary associate teaching professors, at least once per year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a three-year period. Before the commencement of a promotion or reappointment review, faculty in this category will be required to have at least three peer reviews of teaching.

The teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary teaching professors will 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 teaching-active associated faculty will be reviewed at least once a year. When teaching-active associated faculty are reviewed for promotion, they are required to have a minimum of two peer-evaluations of instruction since the last promotion or reappointment.

Additional Peer Reviews of Teaching: The chair may request peer reviews of the teaching of any faculty member who, in the chair's judgment, would benefit from review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for

assistance in improving teaching. Such a review could also be triggered by exceptionally high student satisfaction, which may be an indicator for a teaching award nomination. Reviews conducted upon the request of the Chair focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the Chair.

Formative Peer Reviews of Teaching: Any faculty member may request additional peer review of teaching. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The 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 faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by faculty member.

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations (the first two categories listed above) are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instruction materials in the case of those courses that are developed or revised by the faculty member under review. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, the class visitations are conducted by one or more senior peers whom the Chair, or designee, has identified. The peer reviewer normally should meet with the candidate to establish a time for the visits 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, and the degree to which an engaging learning environment welcoming of and suitable for all has been established. At the conclusion of the class visits, the reviewer should meet with the candidate to give feedback. For faculty members other than tenured professors, the reviewer submits a written report to the Chair, copied to the candidate. 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.

Appendix I: Faculty Mentoring

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

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

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

In addition, as described in section III.B, each assistant and associate Professor in the Physics Department gets assigned an Annual Review Subcommittee. These committees consist of four faculty members, two of which are from outside the candidate's specialty. One of these two will be appointed as chair of the review committee. In addition, there will be a teaching mentor (if applicable) and research mentor (if applicable). Annual Review Subcommittees are also expected to engage in active mentoring. The independent faculty mentors described above should meet with the annual review subcommittee twice a year to ensure that the advice and guidance provided by the faculty mentors and the annual review subcommittee does not provide conflicting advice.