

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

Revised – November 11, 2025

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: November 14, 2025

**APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE DOCUMENT
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY**

CONTENTS.....	PAGE
I Preamble.....	5
II Department Mission	5
III Definitions	6
A Committee of the Eligible Faculty.....	6
1 Tenure-track Faculty.....	6
2 Professional Practice Faculty.....	6
3 Research Faculty	7
4 Associated Faculty	7
5 Conflict of Interest.....	8
6 Minimum Composition	9
B Promotion and Tenure Committee.....	9
C Quorum	9
D Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty	10
1 Appointment	10
2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion.....	10
IV Appointments.....	10
A Criteria.....	10
1 Tenure-track Faculty.....	11
2 Professional Practice Faculty.....	12
3 Research Faculty	13
4 Associated Faculty.....	13
5 Regional Campus Faculty	14
6 Emeritus Faculty	15
7 Joint Appointments	15
8 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	15
B Procedures.....	15
1 Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus	16
2 Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus	18
3 Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus	18

4 Transfer from the Tenure Track	18
5 TIU Transfer	18
6 Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	19
7 Regional Campus Faculty	19
8 Joint Appointments	20
9 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	20
V Annual Performance and Merit Review	21
A Documentation	22
B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus	22
1 Fourth-Year Review	24
2 Extension of the Tenure Clock	24
C Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus	24
D Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus	25
E Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus	25
F Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	26
G Regional Campus Faculty	26
H Salary Recommendations.....	27
VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	29
A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion	29
1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	30
2 Promotion to Professor	35
3 Professional Practice Faculty	36
4 Research Faculty	37
5 Associated Faculty	38
6 Regional Campus Faculty	38
B Procedures	38
1 Tenure-track, Professional Practice, and Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus	38
a Candidate Responsibilities	39
b Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities	41
c Eligible Faculty Responsibilities	43
d Department Chair Responsibilities	44

2 Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	45
3 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty	45
4 External Evaluations	46
VII Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals	48
VIII Seventh-Year Reviews	48
IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching	48
A Student Evaluation of Teaching	48
B Peer Evaluation of Teaching	49

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE DOCUMENT

Department of Psychology

I. Preamble

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

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

This document must be approved by the Dean of the College 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 its criteria and procedures 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 candidates in relation to its mission and criteria

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

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

II. Department Mission

The Ohio State University Department of Psychology aims to produce exceptional, innovative research to advance knowledge about mind, brain, and behavior, with the goal of understanding and improving the human condition. We create, synthesize, and translate knowledge about behavioral, psychological, and brain processes to provide a foundation for educating our students and the public. We train undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral scholars to become 21st-century psychological scientists able to evaluate, apply, and create knowledge. We value inclusion of persons, perspectives, and approaches because it enriches our work and fosters a supportive and intellectually stimulating department community.

The department embraces and seeks to implement the university's [Shared Values](#) initiative. We are committed to academic freedom, to ensuring responsible research practices, to building nurturing

cultures, to fostering an ethic of care and mutual respect, and to promoting justice.

III. Definitions

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

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

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 Review.** For an appointment (hiring) review of an assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the department.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

2. **Professional Practice Faculty**

Appointment Reviews

- **Initial Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a professional practice assistant professor, a professional practice associate professor, or a professional practice professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all professional practice 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 professional practice faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

- The initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair based on recommendations from the search committee. For the initial appointment of uncompensated associated faculty (e.g., adjunct appointments) on the Columbus campus, the department chair's decision follows a vote by the eligible faculty, consisting of all tenure-track, professional practice, and research faculty on the Columbus campus.

- Initial appointments of compensated associated faculty at senior rank require a vote by the eligible faculty (all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and all non-probationary professional practice faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college dean.
- Reappointments are decided by the department chair in consultation with the vice chair for instruction and the associate vice chair for instruction.

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 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 reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Sections III.A.1, 2 or 3 above.
- For the promotion review of a lecturer to senior lecturer, the eligible faculty shall be all tenure-track and nonprobationary professional practice faculty at the rank of associate professor and professor .

5. Conflict of Interest

Search Committee Conflict of Interest

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

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

Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest

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

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

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

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

6. **Minimum Composition**

In the event that the Department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the Department Chair, after consulting with the Dean, will appoint one or more faculty members from another department or school within the College so that the minimum of three faculty members is reached.

B. **Promotion and Tenure Committee**

The Department has a Promotion and Tenure Committee that assists the Committee of Eligible Faculty in managing the personnel and promotion and tenure cases. The Promotion and Tenure Committee normally consists of five or six faculty members (4-5 from the Columbus campus and 1 faculty representative from the regional campuses) appointed by the Department Chair. Typically, 3-4 of the members of the committee will be Professors and two will be Associate Professors, but covering diverse areas of expertise within the Department that are related to the cases is paramount. If there are no regional promotion cases in a given year, the Chair may forgo appointment of a regional campus representative. Unless there is a conflict of interest or some other extenuating circumstance, the chair of the committee will be the Vice Chair for Faculty Research, Promotion, and Tenure (see department's POA). Both the committee chair and membership are appointed by the department chair. The terms of the committee members will be 1 year, with reappointment possible. The Chair of the committee, with input from committee members, is responsible for preparing all promotion and tenure reports for individual candidates.

When considering cases involving professional practice faculty the Promotion and Tenure Committee may be augmented by adding a nonprobationary professional practice faculty member, if available, at the rank of associate professor or professor, as appropriate to the case.

When considering cases involving research faculty the Promotion and Tenure Committee may be augmented by adding a nonprobationary research faculty member, if available, at the rank of associate professor or professor, as appropriate to the case.

C. **Quorum**

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is a simple majority of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all

proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count (i.e., the denominator) for purposes of determining quorum only if the Department Chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

D. Recommendation from the Committee of Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters, voting is by secret ballot and votes must be cast prior to meeting adjournment. Only “yes” and “no” votes are counted.

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

1. Appointment

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

IV. Appointments

A. Criteria

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

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, professional practice, 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 are required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in [Workday](#) to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

1. Tenure Track Faculty:

Instructor. Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but requirements for the terminal degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. Procedures for appointment are identical to those for an 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. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year, or the appointment will not be renewed and the third year is the terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

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

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

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

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

(terminal) year of employment is offered.

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Professional Practice Faculty

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

The department supports Professional Practice Faculty. These appointments exist for faculty members who focus principally on the education needs of students in the department or college. Professional Practice Faculty members are expected to contribute to the department's research and education mission as reflected in undergraduate and graduate program development, teaching/training and supervision. Practice 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.

Professional Practice Instructor. Appointment is normally made at the rank of professional practice 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.

Professional Practice Assistant Professor. An earned doctorate, appropriate licensure, if relevant (e.g., providing supervision in Psychological Services Center), and proficiency in his or her specialty

(e.g., training students and faculty in pedagogical skills) are the minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of Professional Practice Assistant Professor. Evidence of teaching expertise and supervision skills, as appropriate, is highly desirable.

Professional Practice Associate Professor or Professor. Appointment at the rank of Professional Practice Associate Professor or Professional Practice Professor requires that the individual have an earned doctorate, the appropriate licensure, if relevant (e.g., providing supervision in Psychological Services Center), proficiency in the relevant specialty (e.g., training students and faculty in pedagogical skills), and meet, at a minimum, the Department criteria -- in teaching, professional practice and other service, and scholarship -- for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at the rank of Professional Practice Professor requires production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy or professional practice.

3. Research Faculty

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

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

Research faculty shall be engaged in funded research related to the mission and goals of the Department.

Research Assistant Professor. Appointment at the rank of Research Assistant Professor requires that the individual have an earned 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 both an earned doctorate and a substantial record of independent scholarship consistent with what is expected for promotion of a tenure-track faculty member to these ranks, and meet, at a minimum, the Department's criteria for promotion to these ranks.

4. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a 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, professional practice, or research faculty of equivalent rank. They may be given to individuals who give academic service to the department, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees, for which a faculty title is appropriate. The term of appointment is for one year with renewal contingent on continued significant contributions. Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. The adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

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

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

Senior Lecturer. Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a terminal degree 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. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for only three consecutive years.

5. Regional Campus Faculty

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

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

6. Emeritus Faculty

Emeritus faculty status is an honor given in recognition of sustained academic contributions to the university as described in Faculty Rule [3335-5-36](#)

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the department chair (regional campus dean for associated faculty on regional campuses) outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-4) will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair. The department chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean. Should the department chair deny the request, the faculty member may appeal the decision 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, professional practice, or research faculty member from another unit at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in this TIU. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course from time to time, or a combination of these. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

B. Procedures:

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, professional practice, 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 are required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in [Workday](#) to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

In addition, see the [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#) and the [Policy on Faculty Appointments](#) for information on the following topics:

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

1. Tenure-Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

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

The department chair 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.

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

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

- “Phase 1 | Search Preparation & Proactive Recruitment” is the earliest stage in the search process. Key steps during this phase include determining faculty needs for the unit, creating a search strategy (including timeline), establishing a budget, and identifying additional partners to include in the process. The steps in this phase provide guidance on forming committees, detail training requirements for search committee members, and innovative approaches to advertising and outreach. This section also

includes ideas and resources for developing qualified, talent pools to ensure alignment with university and unit EEO goals 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 department chair.
- “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 an offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If an offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor, with or without tenure, or professor, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

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

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

The Chair is assisted in recruitment by faculty search committees, the Executive Committee, and the faculty as a whole. All consultation with and votes by the faculty are advisory to the Chair. All Columbus campus position vacancies are Departmental, rather than by Area. The decision to allocate additional funds or to shift resources from one specialty program to another is the responsibility of the Chair, who will be advised in these matters by the Department’s Executive Committee and the Columbus faculty as a whole.

It is the responsibility of the faculty to attend, participate, and vote on every appointment. A quorum (51%; see also Quorum in Section III.C above) of Columbus campus faculty must be

present at the time of the vote and vote yes or no for the vote to be valid. Abstentions are not votes. Absentee and proxy voting are not permitted. The Chair shall, in all cases, share the vote tally with the eligible faculty in attendance.

2. Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

3. Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

4. Transfer from the Tenure Track

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a professional practice or research appointment if appropriate to the individual's circumstances and departmental and college needs, and if funding for the salary has been identified. Tenure or tenure eligibility is lost upon transfer, though rank is retained. Such transfers must be approved by the Department Chair, the college Dean, and the Executive Vice President and Provost.

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

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

5. TIU Transfer

Faculty requests to move from one TIU to another must be approved by a simple majority of 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 compensated associated faculty members follows a formal search following the [SHIFT](#) Framework, which includes a job posting in [Workday](#) (see Section IV.B above) and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the department chair based on recommendation from the search committee. The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair in consultation with the vice chair for instruction and the associate vice chair for instruction. Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one to three years, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances.

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department and are decided by the department chair in consultation with the committee of eligible faculty. Late each spring semester or early in the fall semester, the Chair shall solicit from each area coordinator a listing of those individuals the area wishes to recommend for adjunct faculty status for the impending academic year. A curriculum vitae and justification of the significant contribution expected by the appointee shall accompany each nomination. Formal input of the eligible faculty is provided in the form of a secret ballot. The Chair will share the results of the vote with the eligible faculty in attendance. All nominees shall be notified of their appointments by the Department Chair and approved by the college Dean or designee.

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

Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are made on an annual basis and rarely semester by semester. After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment of up to three years may be offered.

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

7. Regional Campus Faculty

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

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

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

chair and the regional campus dean.

Searches for regional campus professional practice and associated faculty are the same as those described above for tenure-track faculty.

8. Joint Appointments

A TIU 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, professional practice, or research faculty member from another Ohio State tenure-initiating unit. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the eligible faculty, the department chair extends an offer of appointment. The department chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting. Tenure-track faculty are eligible to vote on courtesy appointments of tenure-track, professional practice, and research faculty members. Professional practice faculty may vote on courtesy appointments of professional practice faculty, and research faculty may vote on courtesy appointments of research faculty.

Nominations for courtesy appointments of individuals holding tenure-track, professional practice, or research appointments in other tenure initiating units at Ohio State typically are initiated by the tenure-track faculty via the faculty member's program area.

Nominations shall be made to the faculty as a whole and shall consist of an oral presentation by the area coordinator accompanied by the distribution of the nominee's curriculum vitae and any other materials deemed useful. Emphasis should be placed on the contributions the nominee will make to the area and the Department.

Following discussion, a vote by confidential ballot will be taken by the Chair. The Chair will share the vote tally with the faculty in attendance. The Chair will notify the nominee of the Department decision. In the event of an appointment, the Chair also will seek approval of the college Dean or designee and will notify the nominee's Department Chair.

Procedures for termination of a courtesy appointment may be initiated by any faculty member. Following discussion of the case for termination, a vote by confidential ballot will be taken by the

Chair. All courtesy appointments will be reviewed every three years. The primary reason for failing to renew an appointment is the lack of a substantive contribution to the Department. In the event of a non-renewal, the Chair will notify the individual and the individual's Department Chair.

V. Annual Performance and Merit Review

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

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

The 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 department chair or the chair's designee must be provided to all tenured and non-probationary faculty.

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

- Depending on a faculty member's appointment type, the 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; 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 department chair 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.

Per Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#), department chairs are required to include a reminder in annual review letters that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#)) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material included 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 unit cultures that are supportive and characterized by civility and mutual respect. The full range of activities assigned to a faculty member should be formally recognized and, when done well, rewarded. Annual review letters should describe each faculty member's workload allocation for the upcoming year in accordance with the university's faculty workload guideline.

A. Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to the department chair no later than December 31:

- Annual Activity Report (a 3-year rolling summary of research, teaching, and service activity (*all faculty*)
 - All faculty members must provide the Chair with their Annual Activity Report available in the faculty resources tab on the department website. The documentation must include, but is not limited to: 1) a written report of accomplishments in instruction, research and other scholarly activity, and service for the three year period preceding the annual review, 2) teaching evaluations, including summaries of SEI surveys collected in all classroom courses during the prior three academic years (or period since hire if less than three years), and 3) a list of other accomplishments to date.
- Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#) (*required for probationary faculty*)
- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)
 - CVs should be prepared in a conventional format, which ensures comparability of these documents across faculty in the Department. Copies of faculty CVs are available in the Department main office, and any faculty member may arrange to review them.

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

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

B. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

At the time of appointment, probationary faculty members shall be provided with all pertinent documents detailing Department, College, and University promotion and tenure policies and criteria. If these documents are revised during the probationary period, probationary faculty members shall be provided with copies of the revised documents. Performance reviews of probationary faculty take place during the Spring semester of every year. For untenured faculty, this review is a critical component of monitoring progress toward tenure and promotion. The annual review also serves as a basis for annual salary recommendations, for assisting faculty in developing and carrying out professional plans, and for calling attention to performance problems where they may exist. It is expected that probationary faculty will exhibit substantial strength and continued progress in research, teaching, and service within the context of the mission of the Department, university rules pertaining to promotion and tenure, and years in service as an Assistant Professor. Performance in all three areas should show a trajectory toward demonstrating excellence, though excellence in research and teaching are especially important as these are the chief dimensions of performance appraisal at the time of consideration for promotion and tenure.

Faculty Review: Formal annual review of probationary faculty is conducted by the Chair and Peer Review Committee, as well as during a meeting of the tenured faculty late in Spring semester each year. The review by the Peer Review Committee and Chair is largely for the purpose of determining annual salary adjustments, but summaries of this information also will be shared with the tenured faculty. Evaluation of probationary faculty by the full tenured faculty is largely for purposes of giving feedback about progress toward tenure. Criteria and procedures for annual reviews are comparable to those used for formal review for promotion and tenure, with expectations appropriately adjusted for years in service. The assessment of performance should include both strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate. Ordinarily, annual external evaluations of scholarly work are not solicited.

Feedback: At the time of appointment of each probationary faculty member, the Department Chair appoints a mentoring committee that consists of three tenured faculty in the Department. The committee may be selected in consultation with the probationary faculty member. The committee must include at least one member from the probationary faculty member's program area and one faculty member outside of that area. If the faculty member is part of a cross-disciplinary area, the committee must include at least one member from the home area and the cross-disciplinary area; the third member can be from any area. The committee meets with the faculty member at least twice per semester to provide advice and feedback about performance. The mentoring committee also reports to the Department's promotion and tenure committee about progress of the probationary faculty member. The Department of Psychology's mentoring plan is described in greater detail in Appendix A.

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

If the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty

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

1 Fourth-Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exceptions that external evaluations are optional and the dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

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

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

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

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the department chair or designee, the peer review committee, and in a meeting of the Professors. The department chair or designee 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 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 annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the

mission of the department, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the college, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty. The department chair prepares a written evaluation of performance against these expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review 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. Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

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

If the position is to continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. The focus of the review is on professional training, instructional activities (e.g., course SEIs; student feedback), and service contributions for professional practice faculty.

Appointments also may be terminated during a contract period for cause (see rule [3335-5-04](#) of the Administrative Code), or financial exigency (see rule [3335-5-02.1](#) of the Administrative Code), and the termination decision for either of these reasons shall result from procedures established by faculty rules. A contract may be renegotiated during a contract period only with the voluntary consent of the faculty member.

The Department Chair makes a recommendation on reappointment to the college dean. 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, except that non-

probationary research faculty may participate in the review of research faculty of lower rank.

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

If the position is to continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. The focus of the review is on research activity (e.g., publications, grants) for research faculty.

Appointments also may be terminated during a contract period for cause (see rule [3335-5-04](#) of the Administrative Code), or financial exigency (see rule [3335-5-02.1](#) of the Administrative Code), and the termination decision for either of these reasons shall result from procedures established by faculty rules. A contract may be renegotiated during a contract period only with the voluntary consent of the faculty member.

The Department Chair makes a recommendation on reappointment to the college dean. 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 Department Chair or designee (i.e., Vice Chair for Instruction) prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance, future plans, and goals.

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

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

G. Regional Campus Faculty

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

discusses the matter with the regional campus dean in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice. For probationary tenure-track faculty, in the event that the regional campus dean recommends renewal, and the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the case shall be reviewed by the college dean or their designee, with the college dean's or their designee's judgment prevailing.

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

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

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 the department's APT document and other relevant policies, procedures, practices, and standards established by: (1) the college, (2) the Faculty Rules, (3) the Office of Academic Affairs, and (4) the Office of Human Resources.

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

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

Except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increases, all funds for annual salary increases are directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and the active promotion of an enriching working and learning environment through collegiality, civility, and openness to diverse ideas and opinions. Market and internal equity may also be considered by the department chair in making salary recommendations to the dean.

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

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

In the department of psychology, salary increases are thus based exclusively on merit unless a clear case for equity adjustments can also be made. For tenure-track faculty, accomplishments in research, teaching, and service are all considered in arriving at a final determination of any salary increase. For teaching faculty, the quality of performance and accomplishments in teaching, professional practice and training, and service to the Department will be considered along with any other criteria outlined in the letter of offer. For research faculty, accomplishments in research and grant activity will be considered in salary decisions along with any other criteria outlined in the letter of offer. Raises for regional campus faculty are determined by the regional campus Deans/Directors after consultation with the Department Chair (limited to an evaluation of research activity).

On occasion, one-time cash payments or other rewards, such as extra travel funds, may be 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 divisional dean. Practice and research faculty are not eligible for travel funds or bonuses that may be awarded to tenure-track faculty in recognition of non-continuing contributions.

Ordinarily, assessment of research accomplishments for the purposes of salary is centered on the amount of high-quality scholarly research published in well-respected outlets (e.g., refereed journals and/or refereed books) in psychology and brain sciences, presentation of scholarly papers at scientific meetings, citations to one's work, and generation of grant support for research. Teaching is evaluated by the Peer Review Committee in conjunction with the Vice Chair for Instruction and the Department Chair. The quality of teaching contribution is assessed by the same criteria and evidence used for promotion to these ranks.

Assessments of teaching for purposes of salary require faculty to obtain SEI data for every classroom course taught. Any written evaluations distributed in class must be collected by someone other than the faculty member (e.g., a department staff person). Elements that contribute to positive ratings include: a balance between undergraduate and graduate courses; enrollment figures; importance of the course to the Department's undergraduate and graduate curricula; and (particularly with respect to junior faculty) annual peer reviews of pedagogical efficacy. Beyond formal instructional activities, faculty also are evaluated on the basis of their supervision of high-quality dissertations, masters and honors theses, and scholarly papers and presentations by students. Assessment of service includes a judgment of the extent of effort, accomplishment, and value to the Department whether one's professional expertise is devoted to a task within the Department, the University, the State of Ohio, the Nation, or the profession of psychology.

Annually, the Department's Peer Review Committee is asked to review all tenure-track faculty members' accomplishments in the teaching, research, and service domains for the previous three-year period. The Peer Review Committee, using the criteria above, conveys to the Chair a numerical and narrative assessment of each faculty member's performance in each area. For Columbus faculty, it is the responsibility of the Department Chair to translate the Peer Review Committee ratings and

any other pertinent information available into a salary recommendation reflecting annual and career accomplishments. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the department chair considers continuing productivity, market, and internal equity issues. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

Professional Practice faculty are evaluated by the department chair in consultation with relevant vice chairs or the Director of Clinical Training in the case of the professional practice faculty member overseeing the clinic. For professional practice faculty, the evaluation procedures will be the same as for tenure-track faculty, but the documentation and, therefore, the evaluation of performance in research will necessarily be limited or nonexistent.

Research faculty are evaluated by the department chair in consultation with the faculty overseeing their work, for research faculty who are grant funded with one or more tenure-track faculty members in the department. For research faculty, the evaluation procedures will be the same as for tenure-track faculty, but the documentation and, therefore, the evaluation of performance in teaching and service activities will necessarily be limited or nonexistent.

VI. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

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

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

A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

Although institutional citizenship and collegiality are expected, they cannot be used as an independent criterion for promotion or tenure. The department recognizes, however, that these positive attributes define the ability of a faculty member to contribute effectively to exemplary teaching, scholarship, and service. A commitment to these values and principles is demonstrated, for example, by participation in faculty governance and community outreach; activities related to the University's [Shared Values](#); adherence to principles of the responsible conduct of research; constructive conduct and ethical behavior during the discharge of responsibilities and authority; and the exercise of rights and privileges consistent with the [American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics](#). This department is committed to assessing the practice of these values and principles as part of all performance evaluations.

1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure requires candidates to meet the following criteria in scholarship:

RESEARCH	
Criteria Candidates must have:	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met Candidates may have:
Conducted an appropriate amount and rate of visible and high-quality scholarly research.	Publication record in the dossier including publications in psychology and related fields, in professional peer-reviewed journals and books,

	indicate an appropriate amount and rate of scholarly research • Publication record in the dossier indicates that an appropriate amount of research is being published in top-tier refereed journals. Original works producing new knowledge in such journals is the most highly valued research accomplishment • Listing of research grants in dossier indicates high-quality scholarly research. • Listing of invited presentations in dossier that indicate visibility of research program • External letters indicate that the amount and rate of scholarly activity is appropriate and/or recognize the high-quality and impact of the research. • Research awards that recognize amount, rate, and quality of scholarly research • Candidate has met any expectations for amount, rate, and quality of scholarly research communicated in annual review letters. • Citation metrics reported in dossier are indicative of high-quality scholarly research. • Research narratives in the dossier document impact of the research on interventions or use of the research beyond academia.
Attained measurable national or international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of high-quality published research.	• External letters that indicate the candidate has a measurable national or international reputation • Listing of invited presentations in dossier that indicate national or international recognition as a scholar • Research awards indicating national or international recognition • Research narratives in the dossier provide evidence of national or international recognition of scholarship • Invitations to serve on journal editorial boards, as journal editorial positions, or to other high profile elected or invited service positions that indicate national or international recognition for scholarship (such as service on grant review panels).
A research program that demonstrates developing impact on the field	• Listing of invited presentations in dossier indicate that the research program has demonstrated impact on the field • External letters comment on the impact of the scholarship on the field. • Research awards that are indicative of impact of the scholarship on the field • Candidate has met any expectations for demonstrating impact on the field communicated in annual review letters. • Citation metrics reported in dossier are indicative of a research program with an impact on the field.

	• Research narratives in the dossier document impact of the research on interventions or use of the research beyond academia.
--	---

Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure requires candidates to meet the following criteria in teaching:

TEACHING	
Criteria Candidates must have:	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met Candidates may have:
Provided to all students the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning in psychology and providing to the most capable and motivated students an enhanced learning experience	• Student evaluations of instruction in all or most courses indicate an appropriate level of student satisfaction and/or that candidate has met requirements for improving student satisfaction communicated in annual review letters. • Peer evaluations of instructional materials (e.g., course development, syllabi, assignments, and evaluation materials and procedures) indicate high-quality instruction to all students, and an enhanced learning experience to the most capable and motivated students • Peer evaluations of classroom processes (e.g., engagement of students, effective conveyance of class material) indicate that this criterion has been met • Teaching narratives in the dossier of subsequent annual review letters indicate that any concerns about student outcomes (e.g. enrollment figures, dropout rates) communicated in annual review letters have been adequately addressed. • Awards for teaching excellence described in core dossier indicative of high-quality teaching • Candidate's teaching narratives in core dossier indicate attention to providing to all students an opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning in psychology and to providing the most capable and motivated students an enhanced learning experience • List of undergraduate student mentorship in core include supervision of undergraduate honors theses or other involvement of undergraduate students in research indicate the provision of an enhanced learning experience to the most capable and motivated students • List of undergraduate student accomplishments in core dossier (e.g., publications and presentations) indicate high-quality mentorship and provision of

	an enhanced learning experience to the most capable and motivated students • Awards for undergraduate student mentorship listed in core dossier or described in teaching narratives.
Engaged in an appropriate amount of high-quality graduate student mentorship	• List of graduate student mentorship and supervision of dissertations and master's theses in core dossier indicate an appropriate amount of supervision of graduate student research and/or • Core dossier listing of graduate student mentorship and/or teaching narratives indicate candidate has met any requirements for supervision of graduate student research/mentorship communicated in annual review letters • List of graduate student accomplishments in core dossier, including scholarly publications and presentations indicate high-quality mentorship • List of candidate publications provide evidence of co-authorship or publications and/or conference presentations with graduate students • Awards for graduate student mentorship listed in core dossier indicate high-quality mentorship. • Teaching narratives describe effective approaches to graduate student mentorship
Continuing growth in subject knowledge and teaching quality	• Teaching narratives in the core dossier indicate ongoing attention to improving subject knowledge and teaching quality • Listing of continuing education in the dossier includes evidence of professional development (at the Drake Institute or other outlets) focused on improving subject matter knowledge and/or teaching quality. • Contributions to curricular development in core dossier indicate attention to improving subject knowledge and teaching quality. • Student evaluations of instruction in all or most courses indicate an appropriate level of student satisfaction and/or that candidate has met requirements for improving student satisfaction communicated in annual review letters. • Peer evaluations of instructional materials (e.g., course development, syllabi, assignments, and evaluation materials and procedures) indicate continuing growth in subject knowledge and/or high quality • Peer evaluations of classroom processes (e.g., engagement of students, effective conveyance of class material) indicate continuing growth in subject knowledge and/or high-quality • Awards for teaching indicative of teaching quality

The amount of service contribution expected during the probationary period of assistant professors is limited by design, but the service contribution must be of high quality. Promotion to associate professor with tenure requires candidates to meet the following criteria in service:

SERVICE	
Criteria Candidates must have:	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met Candidates may have:
full participation in assigned service and regular attendance at faculty meetings	- Evaluations of service contributions by departmental, college, or university colleagues and administrators documented in annual review letters. - Written peer evaluation of service contributions solicited by the chair at the candidate's request and included in the "Internal Letters of Evaluation" section of the dossier - Election or appointment to leadership roles in departmental service activities; - Annual review letters do not indicate problems with general attendance and participation at faculty meetings and as a member of the eligible faculty as appropriate or they indicate that any such concerns raised in previous annual review letters have been adequately addressed.
Demonstrated potential for excellence in service to one or more publics, including the university, the Columbus community, the state of Ohio, the nation, and/or professional organizations.	- Evaluations in annual review letters indicate potential for excellence in service and/or that expectations in service have been met and/or that any previous concerns about service documented in annual review letters have been corrected. - Listing of service record and service narrative in core dossier include an appropriate amount of involvement in service to one or more publics and/or community engagement. Evidence of election or appointment to leadership roles in service activities (e.g., chairing a committee, journal board membership) are especially indicative of potential for excellence in this domain. - Awards for service to the department, college, university, community, or profession described in core dossier indicate potential for excellence
Active contributions to the Department community of scholars and promotion of collaborative efforts and advances in knowledge	- Election or appointment to leadership roles in departmental service activities - Listing of service record and service narrative in core dossier include an appropriate amount of involvement in service to one or more graduate programs in the department (e.g., master's, dissertation, or general exam committee service; affiliation with and consistent participation in a second area or cross-area initiative within the department). - Research includes collaborative efforts with other

The claim that promotion of the candidate will improve the overall scholarly quality and standing of the Department and Program area needs to be supported. Internal cases for promotion to Associate Professor and external hires at that rank should be equally strong and meet the same standards. Internal cases of promotion also should be comparable to the quality of external candidates who could be hired at the same level. Put simply, successful candidates for tenure should be among the strongest in their academic cohort nationally.

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 or international distinction as a scholar and, at minimum an emerging international reputation in the field, and demonstrated excellence in service to one or more publics, including the university, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations.

Promotion to Professor in the Department of Psychology embraces the pursuit of scholarly excellence as our core value. The Department also recognizes that a career may consist of various phases in which a concentration on scholarly activity, teaching, or administrative/professional service constitutes a professional career. Promotion to Professor typically requires excellence in scholarship. When a candidate has made truly extraordinary contributions in the areas of teaching or service, the record may warrant promotion in the presence of a less extensive, though excellent record of continued productivity in scholarship.

Excellence in scholarship is reflected in attainment of measurable national or international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of high-quality published research and/or other relevant creative endeavors. A successful candidate will have achieved national distinction as a scholar and have an emerging international reputation. Evidence of having established such a reputation could come from many of the same places noted earlier as useful for documenting an emerging national reputation for quality scholarship when undergoing evaluation for tenure, though some criteria, such as citations to one's work and impact beyond academia will have had more time to develop beyond tenure. Excellence in teaching is exhibited in providing to all students the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning and, to the most capable and motivated students, an enhanced learning experience. Evidence of teaching excellence could come from many of the same places noted earlier as useful when undergoing evaluation for tenure, but could also be documented through the attainment of national or international recognition for teaching and mentoring, as evidenced by pedagogical publications, awards, honors, and/or critical student

outcomes. Excellence in service is reflected in the provision of a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more public domains – including the University, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations. For example, service to the profession through editorial boards, journal editing positions (e.g., Editor or Associate Editor), grant review panels, or officer positions in professional societies could add to the kind of general quality service needed at the tenure stage, and greater service within the university beyond the department might also reflect the greater service responsibilities expected as one's faculty career develops.

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 relevant to teaching and scholarship.

In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#), assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another. Promotion should reflect the reality that (a) not all faculty members have the same distribution of assignments (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence equally in all evaluation dimensions; and (c) there is a multi-faceted institutional responsibility that must be achieved by the skills of the faculty collectively. Promotion to professor should be awarded not only to those faculty who have demonstrated impact in their scholarship of research and creative inquiry, teaching and learning, and service, but also to those who have exhibited excellence in leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the department, college and university.

3. Professional Practice Faculty

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

Promotion to Professional Practice Associate Professor. For promotion to professional practice associate professor, a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service; must have a documented high level of competence in professional practice; and must display potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of this department. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to professional practice associate professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure with the following additional expectations:

- innovative/effective teaching or training in professional practice for practice faculty.
- evidence that promotion of the candidate will improve the overall quality and standing of the Department and Program Area(s) in the relevant domain (professional practice training).
- demonstrated improvements in the departmental curriculum (design of new courses or programs, innovations in the delivery of training, attention to practices of assessing whether training is effectively meeting learning goals) or enhancements in the pedagogical expertise of graduate students and faculty within the Department.

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

Promotion to Professional Practice Professor. For promotion to professional practice professor, a faculty member must have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching and/or professional practice; leadership in service to this department and to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. Other specific criteria in teaching and service are similar to those for promotion to professor with tenure. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

The Department expects an individual ready for promotion to Professor to be a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. Exceptional performance in the areas described above for promotion to the level of Associate Professor is expected to be well- established and to be visible at the national and/or international levels of the discipline.

Documentation for the promotion of professional practice will comport with the above requirements for tenure-track faculty. However, normally professional practice faculty do not conduct research. Therefore, documentation of research is not generally expected for professional practice faculty.

4. Research Faculty

Promotion to Research Associate Professor. For promotion to research associate professor, a faculty member must have a record of excellence in scholarship, including substantial record of high-quality focused research consistent with an appointment devoted solely to research. Publications must appear in high-quality peer-reviewed venues and be judged by external evaluators as having substantial positive impact on the field. A record of significant continuous peer reviewed extramural and/or commercial funding for research and a substantial probability that such funding will continue is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation. There must be evidence that promotion of the candidate will improve the overall quality and standing of the Department and Program Area(s) in the relevant domain and demonstration of a thematically focused, systematic, and funded research program that contributes to knowledge in an area of expertise valued by the Department. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Research Professor. For promotion to research professor, a faculty member must have a record of excellence in scholarship, including a national or international reputation built on an extensive body of high-quality publications and with demonstrated impact on the field. A record of significant and continuous peer-reviewed extramural and/or commercial funding is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding and a substantial probability that external research support will continue. 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.

The Department expects an individual ready for promotion to Professor to be a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. Exceptional performance in the areas described above for promotion to the level of Associate Professor are expected to be well- established and to

be visible at the national and/or international levels of the discipline.

Documentation for the promotion of research faculty will comport with the above requirements for tenure-track faculty. However, normally research faculty conduct research but do not teach. Therefore, documentation of teaching is not generally expected for research faculty.

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

In evaluating regional campus professional practice faculty, the department will use the same criteria as described above for the promotion of faculty this category. Regional campus associated faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean. The decision of the regional campus dean is final.

B. Procedures

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rules [3335-6-04](#) for tenure-track faculty, [3335-7-05](#) for professional practice 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, Professional Practice, and Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus

a Candidate Responsibilities

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

• Dossier

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

While the Promotion and Tenure Committee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that the candidate is responsible for completing.

An outline of all materials required for compliance with OAA guidelines and a list of dates by which all materials and responses are due to the P&T Committee and/or Chair will be provided to candidates by the Chair well in advance of the semester during which the formal review will be conducted. The following sections elaborate on department-specific or college-specific required materials or evaluation processes.

Teaching: Documentation for an evaluation of a candidate's teaching performance includes student ratings and written comments, peer review, and indicators of the magnitude of service to the Department's undergraduate and graduate teaching missions. The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion, 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.

- Student evaluation: OAA requires each department to utilize a single method for all faculty to solicit student input on their courses. For this purpose, the Psychology Department requires all faculty to obtain SEI data for each classroom course that they teach. All SEI summaries required by OAA must be included in the dossier materials for fourth year, tenure, and promotion reviews. Individual SEI scores will be compared to the College and University mean scores and trends over time in SEI scores will be considered. If annual review letters indicate a need for improvement in SEI scores, they will be examined to determine if those requirements have been met. SEI scores may not be used as the sole method of evaluation in assessing performance in instruction.
- Peer Review: Teaching will also be evaluated on a periodic basis through peer evaluation of classroom teaching and classes and evaluation of instructional materials (e.g., course design, syllabi, assignments and evaluation materials and procedures) with reports to the Chair

concerning the peer-evaluation of teaching conducted. See Section IX-B-1 for required numbers of peer evaluations. It is the responsibility of the chair to ensure that these peer evaluations have been completed and properly documented.

- Dossier narratives are opportunities for candidates to describe the contributions they have made to the teaching mission, including creation of new courses/curricula, modifications to existing courses/curricula, use of innovative teaching approaches, and the ways they have modified their teaching in response to peer and student feedback. Narratives may also be used to elaborate on the significance of any teaching awards received and on any noteworthy contributions to student mentorship or indicators of mentorship quality.
- All faculty provide to the designated staff person each semester the course syllabi for each classroom course that they teach to be submitted along with the dossier for review. For fourth year, tenure, and promotion reviews, dossier information is reviewed regarding the numbers of undergraduate and graduate students taught in formal and informal instructional activities; service on honors theses; service on graduate theses, candidacy exams, and dissertation committees; self-assessments of teaching activities; teaching publications; and teaching awards. Peer review of teaching is also required as explained further in Section IX.

Research: Evaluation of a candidate's research performance includes all OAA-required documentation in the core dossier of the quantity and quality of published research, magnitude of candidate's contributions to all publications, citations to the candidate's work, listing of refereed and invited presentations, listing of submitted grant proposals and obtained research funding and Department, College, University, and national research awards received. In addition to this information, external and any internal letters of evaluation are examined. 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. Department-specific and other important details on research documentation are described below.

- a. In addition to the list of publications, descriptions of the candidate's contribution to the work (if not solo-authored) and indicators of research quality (e.g., impact factor of the journal, published reviews of the candidate's books).
- b. Citation counts for published works, including those prior to the appointment start date and/or date of last promotion.
- c. A list of grants and contracts, both intra- and extra-mural in support of research or scholarly endeavors. Information should include direct and indirect costs awarded, the term of the award, and the role of the candidate on the grant/contract.
- d. A list of scholarly presentations, including whether they were invited or peer-reviewed, and whether they were poster or podium presentations. Presentations should be organized by the venue in which they delivered (local, state, national, international).
- e. Listing of awards for scholarship.

Service: Evaluation of a candidate's service activities includes listings of service provided to the Community, Department, College, University, as well as professional service activities (e.g., editorial and reviewing activities, leadership roles for professional organizations) in the OAA core dossier format and/or in the dossier service narrative. Additionally, attention is given to dossier listings of any service awards or honors won. 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.

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

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

Candidates must indicate the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. A candidate may be reviewed using the department's current APT document, or 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 professional practice 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)

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

b Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

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

- To review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.

- **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described [here](#).
- **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section VI.B.4 below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.
- **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
- Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his/her/their dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. Only the Professors on the P&T Committee will evaluate candidates for Professor. The committee shall review the qualifications of each candidate on the criteria of research, teaching, service and shall consult with the candidate's cognate area. The P&T Committee shall present a summary of its evaluation to the Committee of Eligible Faculty when that committee is convened to review and vote on candidates. The Report shall present a thorough assessment of the strengths and deficiencies of each candidate on research, teaching, and service. The report should avoid gross generalities and instead provide specifics regarding the quality and quantity of a candidate's scholarship and the national visibility of the candidate's program of research. Reports on teaching and service should be similarly specific, citing evidence and data rather than making gross evaluative statements. The report on a candidate will be presented to the Committee of Eligible Faculty by the Chair of the P&T Committee. The P&T Committee shall not recommend or endorse any candidate. Instead, it should report objectively as an evaluative body and present evidence regarding the candidate's standing in the field. The Committee of Eligible Faculty should draw its own conclusions from this report.
- Consider the interdisciplinary work of a candidate across multiple units as part of the whole work, especially if the candidate has a joint appointment in another unit.
- Following the informal vote, the P&T Committee presents its report and a full discussion of the candidate takes place. The formal vote is taken.
- Following the final vote, the P&T Committee chair will prepare a written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate summarizing the candidate's qualifications in comparison to the department's criteria for promotion in research, teaching, and service, the discussion of the eligible faculty, and the reason for the vote. The 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. This document shall be circulated to members of the Committee of Eligible Faculty who attended the voting meeting. Feedback on the document is solicited, and the document is revised accordingly and signed by the chair of the P&T committee. The written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate shall be approved by the Committee of Eligible Faculty, forwarded to the department chair, and added to the candidate's dossier.

- Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

c Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities

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

- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
 - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
 - A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04A\(3\)](#) only once. Faculty Rules [3335-7-08](#) and [3335-7-36](#) make the same provision for nonprobationary professional practice and research faculty, respectively. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
 - A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed. Only members of the Committee of Eligible Faculty who have read the candidate dossiers and who are in attendance at the voting meeting will be allowed a vote on the promotion and tenure decision.

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

d Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. For tenure-track assistant professors, department chairs are to confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an [MOU](#) at the time of promotion with tenure.
- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this department. The department chair will seek a letter of evaluation from the TIU head of the joint appointment unit. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.
- To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members. Following the vote of the eligible faculty, the department chair will communicate the results of the vote with those members of the eligible faculty present in the meeting.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To explain to the eligible faculty any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:

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

2 Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

3 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

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

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

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

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

4 External Evaluations

This department will seek external evaluations predominately from evaluators in the following programs:

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, all adjunct faculty promotion reviews, and all professional practice faculty promotion reviews to the level of Professional Practice Professor. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for promotion to Professional Practice Associate Professor or for associated faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations in these cases will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

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

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

- Is written by a person at an appropriate peer or aspirational institution. In keeping with college guidelines, the department will generally obtain evaluations from faculty at R01 institutions that are members of the Association of American Universities (AAU) and the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA). The department further defines peer or aspirational institutions to include programs in the top 50 of the Shanghai World Rankings by Subject who are not in the AAU or BTAA. Justification will be provided in each case in which a suggested evaluator is from a program not in one of these groups. For example, peer reviewers from other institutions, including universities outside of North America, 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) meets the standards for a peer reviewer in a TIU in which the candidate is joint-appointed; and/or 3) where relevant, is a distinguished scholar who is not affiliated with an academic institution but whose record is equivalent to that of a faculty member at the rank of Professor at a peer or near-peer institution.
- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship who is not a close personal friend, former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate, or someone who has collaborated extensively with the candidate or is currently collaborating with the

candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will solicit evaluations primarily from professors with institutional affiliations predominately in the AAU, BTAA, and the group of peer or near-peer institutions listed above or from those approved by the college as highly qualified to evaluate the candidate's scholarship. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.

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

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

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. All potential evaluators must be approved by the College of Arts and Sciences through the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. No written justification is required for tenured professors at institutions in the BTAA, AAU, or other peer or near peer institutions as defined above. If the potential evaluator is from an academic institution that is not clearly a peer or aspirational peer for Ohio State, or if the potential evaluator is from a nonacademic institution (e.g., a public policy think tank, a private art academy or music conservatory, a museum, a biomedical company, or a governmental agency), a brief written justification is required. The department's justification 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 and are approved by the College of Arts and Sciences, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format for letters requesting external evaluations. A sample letter for tenure-track and research faculty can be found [here](#). A sample letter for professional practice faculty can be found [here](#).

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

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

VII Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals

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

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

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions.

Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule [3335-5-05](#).

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

VIII Seventh-Year Reviews

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

IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

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 students will be asked 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

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

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

In no case should the evaluation of teaching rely exclusively on quantitative instruments (such as the SEI), which have been shown to be unreliable indicators of overall performance in the classroom and to work systematically to the disadvantage of women, non-native English speakers, and faculty of color. Evaluation of teaching should also be contextual, taking into account the particular challenges of teaching different kinds of material to different kinds of audiences, and situating each year's performance in relation to previous years and to goals set by the department.

The department chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process.

Annually the department chair appoints a Peer Review of Teaching Committee of a size judged sufficient to meet the volume of peer review activity expected that year, without overburdening any of the members. The term of service is one year, with reappointment possible. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the tenured faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the department. 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 reviewers will be asked:

- to review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and professional practice faculty and all associated faculty with multiple year appointments at least once per year during each year of service before the commencement of the mandatory tenure review, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. When tenure-track assistant professors are reviewed for tenure and promotion, they are required to have a minimum of five peer evaluations of teaching from the probationary period. When probationary professional practice faculty with teaching responsibilities 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.
- to review the teaching of tenured associate professors and non-probationary professional practice associate professors at least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a six-year period, providing at least four peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion or reappointment review.
- to review the teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary professional practice professors

at least once every other year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review. When non-probationary professional practice professors are reviewed for reappointment, they are required to have a minimum of two peer-evaluations of instruction since the last promotion or reappointment.

- To review, upon the Department Chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.
- To review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The Department Chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the [Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#).

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

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations (the first three situations listed above) are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation (or the equivalent for an online course), review of course syllabi, assignments, exams, and related instruction materials. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, the class visitation is conducted by one or more senior peers whom the promotion and tenure chair has identified in consultation with the candidate. Faculty under review should provide peer reviewers with the course syllabus and other required course materials well in advance of the classroom visit or visits. They should also provide reviewers with a list of preferred visitation dates. The college encourages the reviewer to first meet with the faculty member under review to discuss the instructor's teaching philosophy, goals and expected outcomes for the course, and any challenges related to instruction (including previous feedback from previous evaluations of teaching). If possible, the peer reviewer should attend two different class sessions over the course of the semester. In addition to preparing a written report for the faculty member's dossier, the reviewer should meet with the faculty member following the classroom visitation for a more informal consultation about their teaching effectiveness.

In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should focus on such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the class visits, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give feedback and also submits a written report to the Department Chair, copied to the candidate. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if he/she wishes. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

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 1

Faculty Mentorship Plan

At the time of appointment of each probationary tenure-track faculty member, the Department Chair appoints a mentoring committee that consists of three tenured faculty in the Department. The committee may be selected in consultation with the probationary faculty member. The committee must include at least one member from the probationary faculty member's program area and one faculty member outside of that area. If the faculty member is part of a cross-area initiative, the committee must include at least one member from the home area and the cross-area initiative; the third member can be from any area. The committee meets with the faculty member at least twice per semester to provide advice and feedback about performance. The mentoring committee also reports to the Department's promotion and tenure committee about progress of the probationary faculty member.

The mentoring committee and its members are expected 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.

The mentoring committee should initiate meetings with each mentee at least twice each semester and individual mentors are also expected to respond to additional requests from their mentees as needed. The chair's associate can help schedule these meetings.

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.