Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures for The Ohio State University Department of Slavic and East European Languages and Cultures

Revised June 30, 2023

Revision Approved by The Office of Academic Affairs October 14, 2025

Table of Contents

I. Preamble 4

II. Department Mission 4

III. Definitions 5

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty *5*
1. Tenure-track Faculty 6
2. Teaching Faculty 6
3. Associated Faculty 7

B. Conflict of Interest *7*
1. Minimum Composition 8

C. Quorum *8*

D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty *9*

IV. Appointments 9

A. Criteria *9*
1. Tenure-track Faculty 9
2. Teaching Faculty 10
3. Associated Faculty 11
4. Regional Campus Faculty 12
5. Emeritus Faculty 12
6. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty 13

B. Procedures *13*
1. Tenure Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus 14
2. Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus 16
3. Transfer from the Tenure Track 16
4. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus 16
5. Regional Campus Faculty 17
6. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty 17

V. Annual Performance and Merit Review Procedures 17

A. Documentation *18*

B. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus *19*
1. Fourth-Year Review 19
2. Extension of the Tenure Clock 20

C. Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus *20*

D. Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus *21*

E. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus *21*

F. Regional Campus Faculty *21*

G. Salary Recommendations *22*

VI. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews 22
A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion *22*
1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure 23
2. Promotion to Professor 26
3. Teaching Faculty 28
4. Associated Faculty 29
5. Regional Campus Faculty 29
B. Procedures *29*
1. Tenure-Track and Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus 30
C. Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus *36*
D. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty *36*
E. External Evaluations *37*
VII. Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals 39
VIII. Seventh-year Reviews 39
IX. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching 40
A. Student Evaluation of Teaching *40*
B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching *40*

I. Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs' Policies and Procedures Handbook and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the department 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 for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the dean and the Office of Academic Affairs accept the mission and criteria of the department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to departmental mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 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

Established in 1962, the Department of Slavic and East European Languages and Cultures is dedicated to researching and teaching the languages, literatures, and cultures of the East, Central, and Southeast European nations and peoples. From the outset, the department has embraced the identity of a genuinely "Slavic and East European" (rather than "Russian") department, and it has maintained that broad scope ever since. At the same time, the Department has responded to recent needs to serve a body of students with interests in a variety of disciplines outside the Humanities by making the transition from a traditional "languages, linguistics, and literatures" department to one that increasingly explores Slavic and other cultures of the region from an interdisciplinary perspective. Active engagement with research in turn enhances the teaching, advising, and community outreach missions of the Department. The activities the department engages in to achieve its mission comprise, but are not limited to:

- Serving three main constituencies: undergraduate students, in particular those majoring and minoring in Departmental programs or pursuing double majors, students in General Education courses, and graduate students at the master's and doctoral levels;

- Supporting innovative research in literary history and criticism, cultural studies, Slavic linguistics, second language acquisition and language pedagogy;

- Offering effective instruction in Russian, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, Polish, and Romanian, and occasionally Albanian, Czech, Hungarian, and other languages, in support of the mission of the department;

- Keeping a range of lived experiences and ideas at the forefront of our research, teaching, and/or outreach and engagement activities, and working collaboratively to develop programs, policies, practices and initiatives that reflect our commitment to building an effective and successful workforce in our communities;

- Appointing qualified faculty who will enhance or have strong potential to enhance its excellence in teaching, research and service;

- Sponsoring and organizing scholarly and cultural activities such as conferences, symposia, guest lecturers by distinguished speakers, and a variety of educational events to create a stimulating atmosphere of intellectual exchange;

- Engaging international audiences through publication, collaboration, and scholarly presentations;

- Encouraging interdisciplinary research and collaboration among faculty and students from the department and with other units on campus and groups within the wider community who share related interests;

- Disseminating knowledge and enhancing community outreach and engagement through presentations, events, and other opportunities to network with community organizations.

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 notparticipate as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure.

1. Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **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, 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.

Tenure-track faculty joint appointees whose TIU is another department may participate in all governance matters and may vote on all governance matters except appointment, promotion and tenure reviews. In accordance with OAA policy, voting rights on appointment, promotion and tenure reviews are not granted to faculty whose TIU is another department. However, the department strives to ensure that joint appointees are afforded opportunity for input on appointment, promotion, and tenure cases.

2. Teaching Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

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

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

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

- The eligible faculty for reappointment and promotion reviews of assistant teaching professors consists of all tenured associate professors and professors and all non-probationary associate teaching associate professors and professors.

- The eligible faculty for the reappointment and promotion reviews of associate

teaching professors, and the reappointment reviews of teaching professors consists of all tenured professors and all non-probationary teaching professors.

3. Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- For the initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a compensated associated faculty member, the eligible faculty are all tenure-track faculty members.

- For reappointments, the eligible faculty are all tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank than the candidate.

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

Promotion Reviews

- Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have adjunct titles or lecturer titles.

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

- The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the department chair in consultation with the eligible faculty.

B. Conflict of Interest

Search Committee Conflict of Interest

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

- decides to apply for the position;

- is related to or has a close interpersonal relationship with a candidate;

- has substantive financial ties with the candidate;

- is dependent in some way on the candidate's services;

- has a close professional relationship with the candidate (e.g., dissertation advisor);

or

- has collaborated extensively with the candidate or is currently collaborating with the candidate.

Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest

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

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

1. 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 or designee, will appoint one or more faculty members from another department within the college, as needed to form a committee of three members.

C. Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty on approved leaves of absence are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-campus assignment. Faculty members who recuse themselves because of a conflict of interest are not counted when determining quorum.

D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters only "yes" and "no" votes are counted. There are no abstentions permitted, as it is the obligation of faculty members to participate fully in the review process of personnel.

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

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive. In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment TIU prior to his or her appointment, 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 cancelled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, teaching, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the SHIFT Framework for faculty recruitment. All faculty positions must be posted in Workday, the university's system of record for faculty and staff. Formal interviews 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 to what stage they progressed 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. When an instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the dean or designee, 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 tenure clock. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

- **Assistant Professor.** An earned terminal degree is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the department and the profession are highly desirable. 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 tenure clock.

- **Associate Professor and Professor.** Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor, with or without tenure, Professor with tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to these ranks. 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 should not occur.

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

2. Teaching Faculty

Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all other teaching faculty must be for a period of five years. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for assistant and associate teaching professors must be for a period of at

least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for teaching professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. There is no presumption that subsequent appointments will be offered, regardless of performance. The terms of a contract may be re-negotiated at the time of reappointment. For faculty in their second and subsequent appointment terms, the teaching faculty member may be reappointed by the affirmative vote of the eligible faculty as defined in Section III.A.2. These extended appointments are not probationary, and the individual may only be terminated for cause (see rule 3335-5-04 of the Administrative Code) or financial exigency (see rule 3335-5-02.1 of the Administrative Code).

Tenure is not granted to teaching faculty. Teaching faculty have fixed-term contract appointments that do not entail tenure but provide a career path for the best non-tenure track faculty.

- **Assistant Teaching Professor**. An earned doctorate in the relevant field is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant teaching professor. In addition, SEELC expects the following qualifications and teaching experience for appointment as assistant teaching professor: at least three years of experience teaching in a North American institution of higher education with demonstrated pedagogical achievements in the language and literature/culture classrooms as well as demonstrated contribution to student success (extracurricular activities, mentorship, student life, etc.).

- **Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor**. Appointment at the rank of associate teaching professor or teaching professor requires that the individual have an earned doctorate, and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria in teaching for promotion to the rank. Appointment at the rank of associate teaching professor requires service to the department, college, university, community and/or profession. These activities can include a combination of the following: curriculum and program development, advising, extra-curricular activities (participation in talent shows, in student club's activities, and language Olympiadas), involvement with professional organizations (AATSEEL, ACTFL, etc.), demonstrated pedagogical advancement, contributions to student life, and engagement with community groups.

Appointment at the rank of teaching professor additionally requires production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice.

3. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a couple of weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. Associated faculty may be reappointed.

- **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. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is desirable. 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 should generally not exceed one year.

- **Senior Lecturer:** Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a doctorate in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction; or a Master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience with documentation of high quality. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The initial appointment for a senior lecturer should generally not exceed one year.

- **Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor:** Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty.Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. They may not be reappointed for more than three consecutive years at 100% FTE.

- **Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor:** Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give academic service to the department, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Typically, the adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track or teaching faculty, as relevant to the appointment. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

4. Regional Campus Faculty

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

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

5. Emeritus Faculty

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

service.

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the department chair (regional campus dean for associated faculty on regional campuses) outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-2) will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair. The chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule 3335-5-04, emeritus status will not be considered.

See the OAA *Policies and Procedures Handbook* Volume 1, Chapter 1, for information about the types of perquisites that may be offered to emeritus faculty,provided resources are available.

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

6. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

B. Procedures

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, teaching, 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. Formal interviews 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.

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

- Recruitment of tenure-track, teaching, and associated faculty
- Appointments at senior rank or with prior service credit
- Hiring faculty from other institutions after April 30

- Appointment of foreign nationals
- Letters of offer

1. Tenure Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

A national search is required to ensure a 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 Volume 1, Chapter 4, section 5.1 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 entailsubstantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection.

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

At a regular or special meeting of all voting faculty, the scope and research profile of a needed position is discussed and after agreement is reached by a simple majority vote, the chair submits a recruitment proposal to the dean. The dean of the college provides approval for the department to commence a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise.

The department chair appoints an ad hoc search committee for that position, consisting of no fewer than three members of the voting faculty of SEELC, and appoints one of these to chair the committee. The department chair may also appoint faculty from other appropriate units and a graduate student representative, but ensures that the voting faculty of SEELC constitutes a majority of the committee members. The department chair may serve as a non-voting member of the search committee.

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 TIU chair/director.

- "Phase 4 | Extend Offer" provides guidance and resources related to effectively selecting the most qualified candidate(s) for the position(s) and successfully negotiating to result in an accepted offer.

- "Phase 5 | Preboard and Onboard" offers resources to help prepare and support new faculty as they transition to Ohio State. The suggestions in this phase focus on creating a seamless transition for incoming faculty and their partners/families, if applicable.

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

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer involves prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. Only faculty members for whom SEELC is their TIU may vote on the appointment and the matter of rank and service credit. A two-thirds vote is required for a positive recommendation. 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 which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the department chair.

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

2. Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Searches for teaching faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty. The candidate's presentation during the interview can address issues in teaching or professional teaching practice rather than scholarship, as desired and appropriate. Given that SEELC teaching faculty are expert in culture, a presentation of the candidate's scholarship is also permissible, and the candidate can demonstrate how that scholarship is relevant to teaching. Such presentations may be in person or virtual, and eligible faculty are expected to attend or if that is impossible to review a recording of the presentation prior to voting in the search.

3. Transfer from the Tenure Track

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a teaching appointment if appropriate circumstances exist. Tenure or tenure eligibility is lost upon transfer, and transfers must be approved by the department chair, the college dean, and the executive vice president and provost.

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

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

4. 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 is decided by the department chair in consultation with the eligible faculty.

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 tenure-eligible and teaching faculty.

Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed in order to be continued.

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

up to three consecutive years.

Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are made by the chair 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 may be offered.

Renewal of associated appointments is based on the same criteria as appointment and on positive peer and student evaluation of teaching.

5. Regional Campus Faculty

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

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

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, department chair, and either the regional campus search committee or 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. The letter of offer must be signed by both the department chair and the regional campus dean.

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

Associated faculty are appointed by the regional campus associate dean, in consultation with the dean, department chair, program coordinators, and other relevant faculty members.

6. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track or teaching faculty member from another Ohio State department. A proposal (accompanied by the prospective appointee's curriculum vitae and a brief statement) is considered at a regular faculty meeting and is followed by a simple majority vote of approval. If approved, the department chair extends an offer of appointment. The department chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

V. Annual Performance and Merit Review Procedures

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 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.

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

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

A. Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, compensated faculty members must submit the following documents to the department chair by February 1:

- Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, *Policies and Procedures Handbook*, Volume 3 (*required for probationary faculty*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (*non-probationary faculty*)

- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)

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

of this document.

Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes ofthe 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

The annual review committee for probationary assistant professors will consist of the tenured associate professors and professors of the department. The review committee will be chaired by the department chair, who will participate in its deliberations. After the meeting and discussion of the progress of the probationary faculty, the chair meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals; and prepares a written evaluation, reflecting the opinions voiced during the review committee meeting, which includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

If the department chair recommends renewal of the 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. The department chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the dean of the college. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments, if he or she chooses).

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 only solicited when either the department chair or the eligiblefaculty 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 thescholarship without outside input.

The chair convenes a meeting with the eligible faculty, who conduct a review of the candidate. The chair may provide information during the discussion, but has no vote.On completion of the review, the eligible faculty vote by written ballot on whether torenew the probationary appointment.

The eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the

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

2. Extension of the Tenure Clock

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

C. Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus

The annual performance and merit review evaluates the performance of tenured faculty members in the areas of teaching, research, and service and, in the case of associate professors, their progress toward promotion. Associate Professors' and Professors' evaluations will include review of support they provide for the professional development of faculty serving at ranks below them. The annual review is intended to encourage and advise faculty members in their professional development and to identify departmental resources that may aid in furthering that development.

Tenured faculty must demonstrate evidence of support for the professional development of assistant professors.

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the department chair, who conducts an independent assessment; meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the tenure initiating unit, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the college, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest-ranking members of the faculty, professors are expected to demonstrate academic leadership and mentoring at the highest level.

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

D. Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus

The annual performance and merit review process for teaching probationary and non-probationary faculty is identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty respectively, except that non-probationary teaching faculty may participate in the review of teaching faculty of lower rank. For assistant teaching professors in their initial contract, the Fourth-Year Review generally proceeds in the same manner as the Fourth-Year Review for tenure-track faculty.

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

If the position will continue, a mandatory formal performance review for reappointment occurs in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

E. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

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

F. Regional Campus Faculty

Regional campus tenure-track faculty are reviewed according to the process established on that campus, with a focus on teaching and service. Following the review by the regional campus, the regional campus dean meets with the department chair for 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/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

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

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

G. Salary Recommendations

The department chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the dean or designee, who may modify these recommendations. 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 faculty. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the department chair divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) and considers market and internal equity issues. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations. Salary increases may be formulated in dollar amounts rather than percentage increases, with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries.
Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation (see Section V-A above) for an annual 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.

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

VI. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 provides the following context for promotion and tenureand 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.*

1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service constitutes the criterion for promotion and tenure. While the department recognizes that some faculty may be stronger in one area than the other, there nonetheless must be a balance among the three areas.
Extraordinary teaching cannot compensate for a poor publication record, and extraordinary scholarship cannot compensate for unsatisfactory teaching. Outstanding undergraduate and graduate teaching is essential to the department's successful maintenance of a viable and coherent curriculum. Therefore, due consideration is given during tenure and promotion reviews to demonstrated teaching proficiency. It is also one of the primary objectives of the department to establish and maintain successful undergraduate and graduate programs that attract qualified students and assure them of a rigorous and stimulating educational experience. Excellence in scholarship also is essential to the department's standing as a vibrant intellectual and educational program. Therefore, evidence of scholarly productivity, as outlined below, is a necessary condition for tenure and promotion.

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 provides the following general criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure:

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

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

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

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

responsibilities.

Excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service is moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics. The chart below describes in more detail the criteria for promotion and tenure.

TEACHING	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates must have:	Candidates may be asked to submit:
Developed new and effective instructional techniques and materials appropriate for the objectives and level of courses taught	• syllabi for courses they have developed and/or modified that further the department's instructional mission on both undergraduate and graduate levels; • student and peer evaluations of teaching; • awards or other formal recognition of teaching expertise; • a statement on teaching that explores techniques and philosophies of classroom experiences; • evidence of student advising for majors and/or students preparing for examinations and/or MA and/or PhD theses.
Demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge, including efforts in teaching that pursue the goals of expanding opportunities to our student population and of the role of pedagogical work in shaping a more just world.	

SCHOLARSHIP & RESEARCH	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates for tenure in the field of Literature, Film and Cultural Studies:	Candidates **may be asked** to submit:
Must complete a body of significant and original scholarly work, which may include translations from original works in Slavic and East European languages into English and/or digital humanities projects; interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary work is welcome, and attention to issues of equity and justice are encouraged. Should demonstrate continuing growth in subject matter knowledge, including efforts in scholarship that pursue the goals of expanding opportunities to our student population and of the role of scholarly work in shaping a more just world.	• a book that is published or is under board-approved final contract with a respected academic press; • published articles in peer-reviewed journals; • published articles and/or chapters in peer-reviewed edited volumes; • papers presented at professional conferences; • translations, particularly scholarly publications that explicate the historical, aesthetic, cultural, and/or social significance of the original work, and/or in conjunction with critical scholarly apparatus; • significant evidence of evaluated digital work that includes material that explicates its design, innovative features, efficacy, and/or theoretical significance;

	• research statements and/or proposals for sustained scholarly activity that clearly demonstrate a research program that will continue to contribute to knowledge in the area of focus.
Candidates for tenure in the field of Linguistics:	Candidates **may be asked** to submit:
Must complete a body of significant and original scholarly work, which may include translations from original works in Slavic and East European languages into English and/or digital humanities projects; interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary work is welcome, and attention to issues of equity and justice are encouraged. Should demonstrate continuing growth in subject matter knowledge, including efforts in scholarship that pursue the goals of expanding opportunities to our student population and of the role of scholarly work in shaping a more just world.	• a book that is published or is under board-approved final contract with a respected academic press (a series of substantive refereed articles may be considered comparable to the publication of a book and may be substituted); • published articles in peer-reviewed journals; • published articles and/or chapters in peer-reviewed edited volumes; • papers presented at professional conferences; • translations, particularly scholarly publications that explicate the historical, aesthetic, cultural, and/or social significance of the original work, and/or in conjunction with critical scholarly apparatus; • significant evidence of evaluated digital work that includes material that explicates its design, innovative features, efficacy, and/or theoretical significance; • research statements and/or proposals for sustained scholarly activity that clearly demonstrate a research program that will continue to contribute to knowledge in the area of focus.
Candidates for tenure in the field of Language Methodology and Pedagogy or Philology:	Candidates **may be asked** to submit:
Must complete a body of significant and original scholarly work, which may include translations from original works in Slavic and East European languages into English and/or digital humanities projects; interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary work is welcome, and attention to issues of equity and justice are encouraged. Should demonstrate continuing growth in subject matter knowledge, including efforts in scholarship that pursue the goals of expanding opportunities to our student population and of the role of scholarly work in shaping a more just world.	• a book that is published or is under board-approved final contract with a respected academic press (innovative textbooks or instructional software that incorporate or present theoretical ideas or advances in methods of teaching may be judged to be equivalent to monographic works and may be substituted; similarly the publication of editions of texts with critical apparatus may be judged as equivalent evidence of scholarly productivity); • published articles in peer-reviewed journals; • published articles and/or chapters in peer-reviewed edited volumes; • papers presented at professional conferences; • translations, particularly scholarly publications that explicate the historical, aesthetic, cultural, and/or social significance of the original work,

	and/or in conjunction with critical scholarly apparatus; • significant evidence of evaluated digital work that includes material that explicates its design, innovative features, efficacy, and/or theoretical significance; • research statements and/or proposals for sustained scholarly activity that clearly demonstrate a research program that will continue to contribute to knowledge in the area of focus.

SERVICE	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates must have:	Candidates **may be asked** to submit:
Demonstrated excellence in service to the TIU	• contributions and quality indicators of the outcomes of the contributions • evidence of recognition for service to TIU • annual evaluations that document excellent service to TIU
Demonstrated high quality administration to the university at any level	• contributions and quality indicators of the outcomes of the contributions including positive change • evidence of service outside the TIU, including on center, college, and/or university committees

2. Promotion to Professor

The College of Arts and Sciences expectations for promotion to professor are set forth in the ASC College APT Document The information given below supplements these policies.

Consistent with Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C), promotion to the rank of professor is based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has furthered the department's distinctive mission by producing a sustained record of excellence in teaching, a significant body of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally, and a record of leadership in service, both on campus and to the profession. The department further expects a candidate for promotion to professor to be a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession.

When assessing a candidate's national and international reputation in the field, a national and international reputation for the scholarship of teaching may be counted as either teaching or scholarship. The chart below describes in more detail the criteria for promotion and tenure.

TEACHING	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates must have:	Candidates may be asked to submit:
Provided to all students of the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning and, to the most capable and motivated students, an enhanced learning experience. Demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge, including efforts in teaching that pursue the goals of expanding opportunities to our student population and of the role of pedagogical work in shaping a more just world.	• Syllabi for courses they have developed and/or modified that further the department's instructional mission on both undergraduate and graduate levels; • Student and peer evaluations of teaching; • Awards or other formal recognition of teaching expertise; • A statement on teaching that explores techniques and philosophies of classroom experiences; • Evidence of student advising for majors and/or students preparing for examinations and/or MA and/or PhD theses; • Evidence of national or international recognition including but not limited to pedagogical publications, awards, honors, and/or critical student outcomes.

SCHOLARSHIP & RESEARCH	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates for promotion:	Candidates **may be asked** to submit:
Must complete a second body of significant and original scholarly work, which may include translations from original works in Slavic and East European languages into English and/or digital humanities projects; as with promotion and tenure, interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary work is welcome, and attention to issues of equity and justice are encouraged. May also have exhibited excellence in the scholarship of leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the department, college and university.	• a second book that is published or is under board-approved final contract with a respected academic press (a series of substantive refereed articles may be considered comparable to the publication of a second book and may be substituted; in addition innovative textbooks or instructional software that incorporate or present theoretical ideas or advances in methods of teaching may be judged to be equivalent to monographic works and may be substituted; similarly the publication of editions of texts with critical apparatus may be judged as equivalent evidence of continued scholarly productivity); • published articles in peer-reviewed journals; • published articles and/or chapters in peer-reviewed edited volumes; • papers presented at professional conferences; • translations, particularly scholarly publications that explicate the historical, aesthetic, cultural, and/or social significance of the original work,

	and/or in conjunction with critical scholarly apparatus; • significant evidence of evaluated digital work that includes material that explicates its design, innovative features, efficacy, and/or theoretical significance.

SERVICE	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates must have:	Candidates **may be asked** to submit:
Demonstrated excellence in service to the TIU	• Contributions and quality indicators of the outcomes of the contributions • Evidence of recognition for service to TIU • Annual evaluations that document excellent service to TIU
Demonstrated high quality administration to the university at any level	• Contributions and quality indicators of the outcomes of the contributions including positive change • Evidence of service outside the TIU, including on center, college, and/or university committees
Demonstrated continuing efforts that pursue the goals of expanding opportunities to our student population and of the role of service in shaping a more just world, including but not limited to community engagement.	• Evidence of service to the profession • Activities / quality indicators within the community setting • Unique service to disadvantaged communities.

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 facultywho have demonstrated impact in their scholarship of research and creative inquiry, teaching and learning, and service, but also to those who have exhibited excellence in the scholarship of leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the department, college and university.

3. Teaching Faculty

Appointment to assistant teaching professor requires that a faculty member has completed their doctoral or other terminal degree in the relevant field or equivalent experience, met the required licensure/certification in their specialty and be performing satisfactorily in teaching and service. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to associate teaching professor requires that a faculty member hold a doctoral or other terminal degree in the relevant field or equivalent experience, show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service, have a documented high level of competence in professional practice and display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of the department. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms. Promotion to teaching professor requires that a faculty member have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching, leadership in service to the department, college, university, community and/or profession, and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy or professional practice. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

4. Associated Faculty

Promotion to Adjunct Associate Professor and Adjunct Professor. The relevant criteria for the promotion of adjunct faculty members shall be the same as those for the promotion of tenure-track 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.5.

Promotion of Visiting Faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible forpromotion.

5. Regional Campus Faculty

Expectations for regional campus faculty differ somewhat from those for faculty on the Columbus campus. The primary mission of the regional campuses is to provide high quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities. Therefore, in evaluating regional campus tenure-track faculty for promotion and tenure or promotion, the department will place greater emphasis on teaching and service relative to scholarship. The department expects regional campus faculty members to establish a program of high quality scholarship while recognizing that the greater teaching and service commitments of regional campus faculty require a different set of expectations. The judgment regarding whether a particular body of work meets departmental standards for tenure and/or promotion willtake into consideration the regional campuses' different mission, higher teaching expectations, and lesser access to research resources.

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

B. Procedures

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 and the Office Academic Affairs

annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook.

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

a) Candidate Responsibilities

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

- Dossier

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

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

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

Documentation for Teaching

The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is less, 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. Examples of documentation include:

- Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class;

- Peer evaluation of teaching reports (for probationary faculty at least once each year; candidates for promotion to professor are expected to have at least 5 peer evaluations for the 5-year period prior to consideration for promotion); the chair will appoint reviewers from the department and outside of it to visit probationary faculty's classes;

- Discursive student evaluations for every class taught (this is required for probationary faculty and highly recommended for all faculty);

- Copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed;

- Teaching activities as listed in the core dossier including:

    - Involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research

    - Mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers

    - Extension and continuing education instruction

    - Involvement in curriculum development

    - Awards and formal recognition of teaching

    - Presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences

    - Adoption of teaching materials at other colleges or universities;

    - Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.

- Documentation for Research and Scholarship

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

    - **Publications:** The type and scope of each publication are considered. Because of the varied nature of scholarship encompassed within SEELC, publication may occur in emergent evaluated interdisciplinary works with a high impact on emergent fields of scholarship, as well as more established venues. Books, monographs, critical editions, articles, book reviews, etc., if based on original research, are accorded special importance as evidence of scholarly achievement and development. In general, monographs and papers that undergo considerable scrutiny before publication (e.g., by editorial boards of journals or anthology editors) are more highly valued than those that do not. The quality of the venue of publication (such as respected peer-

reviewed journals and appropriate academic presses) is also carefully weighed.

- Other publications that are conceived primarily for university instruction such as textbooks, source books, readers, anthologies of texts, translations, and contributions in the area of foreign language teaching, as well as similar publications are judged to be scholarly works only when they present new ideas or incorporate scholarly research.

  Translations and creative work are evaluated in light of their originality, depth, and pertinence to the academic mission of the department. Evaluation of reviews of scholarly works written for professional journals takes into account the scholarship of the reviews and the type and quality of the journals.

- **Scholarly Presentations:** The department expects scholarly activity at international, national, and regional professional meetings. Papers, formal participation in symposia, and official commentaries made as a discussant of the papers of others are appraised whenever possible by appropriate faculty and/or on the basis of opinions, oral and written, of scholars in the field.

- **Grants, Prizes, and Awards:** Importance is attached to scholarly recognition in the form of prizes, awards, grants, and fellowships, as well as to invitations to deliver public lectures or to teach at other major research universities.

- **Editorial Boards:** Recognition in the form of requests to serve on editorial boards of scholarly journals, to chair sessions at professional meetings and conventions, or to serve on program committees for such meetings may be considered as indicators of the faculty member's prominence in the field.

- **Other Evidence:** Any other evidence that a faculty member believes pertinent to his or her performance as a scholar may be submitted.

- Documentation for Service

The time period for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion 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. Recognition should be given to scholarly service that a faculty member has been asked to perform or that which he or she initiated on behalf of scholarly organizations, the department, college, and the university. In evaluating service, the department considers the nature, extent and impact of the faculty member's activities.Consideration is given to activities that enhance the department's mission to foster cooperation in research and teaching among Arts and Sciences faculty at the university. Those who perform service in which the commitment of time is considerable

(especially with little or no reduction in teaching responsibilities) can reasonably expect that such service receive due consideration. Any service obligations undertaken especially by non-tenured faculty members and submitted by them for evaluation under this rubric must be considered and discussed. Such requests are listed in the service portion of the dossier and document national or international service as well as university service.

- Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document

Candidates must indicate the APT under which they wish to be reviewed. Candidates may be reviewed using the department's current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion (or last reappointment in the case of teaching faculty), whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, for tenure-track faculty the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year.

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

- External Evaluations (see also External evaluations below)

As noted above, if external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed according to 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, providing the reasons for the request. The department chair decides whether removal is justified.

b) Committee of Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

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

- To review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty;

- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year (a faculty member may ask to be considered for non-mandatory promotion and tenure review or for promotion review at any time) 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 only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04(A)(3) for one year. Faculty Rule 3335-7-08 makes the same provision for nonprobationary teaching faculty. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful;

- A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself;

- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process asdescribed below.

  - **Late Spring/Summer:** 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 in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.

  - **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair by April 1 or as soon thereafter as feasible. 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.

  - Review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.

  - Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.

  - Meet to discuss the candidates' achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service. After discussion, vote via anonymous paper ballot.

  - Write a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting. The summary must include the faculty vote count. The completed written evaluation and recommendation must be forwarded to the department chair.

- Provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.

- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation (including an advisory vote) to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure-initiating unit is another department.

- Attend all P&T (Eligible Faculty) meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; participate indiscussion of every case; and vote.

c) Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.

- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status; for tenure-track assistant professors, the department chair will confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S.; candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an MOU at the time of promotion with tenure;;

- **Late Spring Semester (no later than April 15):** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the chair and the candidate. Also, see External Evaluations below;

- **Late spring/summer:** To appoint a chair of the Committee of EligibleFaculty;

- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments; the TIU head from the joint appointment unit must provide a letter of evaluation to the primary TIU head; 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 on the Ohio State University's approved storage clouds for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted;

- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review;

- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting; at the

request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members;

- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation;

- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee;

- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the departmentreview 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;

    - Of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.

- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier;

- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline;

- To receive the Committee of Eligible Faculty's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the department chair of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

C. Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Adjunct faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed in Section VI.B above, with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair’s recommendation is negative (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.

D. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

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

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.

E. External Evaluations

In keeping with the national standing of The Ohio State University, the Department of Slavic and East European Languages and Cultures will ask for evaluations from faculty in programs that are nationally recognized in their field or subfields. Because of the multidisciplinary nature of the department, a specific list of institutions or even programs cannot be easily assembled. This department will seek external evaluations predominantly from evaluators from the Big Ten Academic Alliance and the Association of American Universities. If the field of research requires additional expertise outside of AAU, a request for review and approval will be made to the College.

The following principles will be applied in identifying external reviewers: the external reviewer will be 1) a distinguished expert in their field, as demonstrated by their scholarship credentials: publications; creative work; national and international awards; prominence in professional organizations; and presence on editorial boards of major journals; and/or 2) will be nationally or internationally known in the field related to a candidate's interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary projects.

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for teaching or associated faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations for a teaching or associated faculty member will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Eligible Faculty 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 highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who can give an "arms' length" evaluation of the research record and is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will normally only solicit evaluations from professors with institutional affiliations that are equivalent to or more prestigious than our own institution. 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, a larger number of letters are sought than are required, and they are solicited no later than the end of May prior to the review year.

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the department chair, and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The department follows the College of Arts and Sciences' suggested format, provided here, for letters requesting external evaluations.

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

Only the candidate may appeal a negative tenure, promotion, or reappointment decision.

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

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Further detail on appeals alleging improper evaluation is provided 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

In keeping with Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (B), in rare instances the department may petition the dean to conduct a seventh-year review for an assistant professor who has been denied promotion and tenure as a result of a sixth year (mandatory tenure) review. Two-thirds of all eligible faculty of the department and the department chair must both approve proceeding with a petition for a seventh-year review. The petition must provide documentation of substantial new information regarding the candidate’s performance that is germane to the reasons for the original negative decision. Petitions for seventh-year reviews must be initiated before the beginning of the last year of employment and in accordance with the department’s tenure and promotion timetable because the seventh-year review, if approved, would take place during the regular university review cycle of the assistant professor’s seventh and last year of employment.

If the dean concurs with the department’s petition, the dean in turn petitions the executive vice president and provost for permission to conduct a seventh-year review. If the provost approves the request, a new review is conducted equivalent to the one that resulted in the nonrenewal of the appointment.

The conduct of a seventh-year review does not presume a positive outcome. In addition, should the new review result in a negative decision, the faculty member's last day of employment is that stated in the letter of nonrenewal issued following the original negative decision.

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

IX. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) is required in every course offered in this department. Faculty members should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if s/he is going to provide in-class time for students to complete the evaluation using a mobile application. The faculty member must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation. The faculty member should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and to provide feedback that can be taken into account in future teaching. In addition, probationary faculty are required to use discursive forms, and all faculty are strongly encouraged to do so. The faculty distribute the forms to the students and leave the classroom. A designated student submits the completed forms to the department. Instructors do not have access to results of either evaluation instrument until the final grades for the course have been recorded.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The department chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process. The chair appoints reviewers whose rank is above that of the faculty member whose instruction is being evaluated. Associate professors are evaluated by professors and professors by other professors. Teaching professors can be evaluated by associate professors or professors or by teaching professors at a higher rank. Because of the interdisciplinary nature of the department, the reviewer may be from outside the department.

All probationary tenure-track and teaching faculty undergo peer review of teaching at least once each year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. When assistant professors are reviewed for tenure and/or promotion, they are required to have a minimum of five peer evaluations of teaching from the probationary period.

The teaching of tenured associate professors and non-probationary assistant and associate teaching professors is reviewed 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. Candidates for promotion to tenured professor and teaching professor are expected to have at least 5 peer evaluations by tenured or teaching professors for five years prior to consideration for

promotion. The teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary teaching professors is reviewed at least once every three years.

In carrying out the teaching evaluation, the reviewer must evaluate the syllabus (its clarity, appropriateness to the course, explication of requirements and grading criteria, etc.), the mode of instruction (based on at least one class visitation), and the relevance of the course (including the way it is taught) to the mission of the department. 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.

Overall, teaching is evaluated in relation to the department's mission of promoting innovative and interdisciplinary undergraduate and graduate instruction.

Upon the department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review may be reviewed. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.

The teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review may also be reviewed 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.