

**Appointments, Promotion, and  
Tenure  
Criteria and Procedures for  
The Ohio State University  
Tenure-Initiating Unit (TIU)  
Department of Spanish and  
Portuguese**

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: August 4, 2025

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	PREAMBLE.....	4
II.	DEPARTMENT MISSION.....	4
III.	DEFINITIONS .....	5
	A.    Committee of the Eligible Faculty (CEF) .....	5
	1.    Tenure-track Faculty .....	5
	2.    Teaching Faculty .....	6
	3.    Associated Faculty .....	6
	4.    Conflict of Interest.....	7
	5.    Minimum Composition .....	7
	B.    Promotion and Tenure Committee .....	8
	C.    Quorum.....	8
	D.    Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty.....	8
	1.    Appointment.....	8
	2.    Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion.....	8
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.    Joint Appointments.....	13
	7.    Courtesy Appointments for Faculty .....	13
	B.    Procedures .....	13
	1.    Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	13
	2.    Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	15
	3.    Transfer from the Tenure Track .....	15
	4.    TIU Transfer.....	15
	5.    Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....	16
	6.    Regional Campus Faculty .....	16
	7.    Joint Appointments.....	17
	8.    Courtesy Appointments for Faculty .....	17

V.	ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW .....	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.....	20
E.	Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....	21
F.	Regional Campus Faculty .....	21
G.	Salary Recommendations .....	21
VI.	PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS.....	22
A.	Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion.....	23
1.	Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.....	23
2.	Promotion to Professor .....	28
3.	Teaching Faculty .....	29
4.	Associated Faculty .....	30
5.	Regional Campus Faculty .....	30
B.	Procedures .....	30
1.	Tenure-Track and Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	31
2.	Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	37
3.	Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty .....	38
4.	External Evaluations.....	38
VII.	PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS .....	40
VIII.	SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS.....	41
IX.	PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING .....	41
A.	Student Evaluation of Teaching .....	41
B.	Peer Evaluation of Teaching .....	41
X.	APPENDIX 1: MENTORSHIP PLAN .....	44

## **I. PREAMBLE**

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

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

This document must be approved by the dean of the college and the Office of Academic Affairs before it may be implemented. It sets forth the department's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the college and university, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and 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 department 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 TIU 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**

### **VISION**

The Department of Spanish and Portuguese (SPPO) will be among the top undergraduate and graduate programs in the United States in the fields of Hispanic Linguistics, Iberian Studies, Latin American and Latinx Literary and Cultural Studies, and Portuguese.

### **MISSION**

To teach, create and exchange knowledge about the languages, linguistics, literatures and cultures of Latin America, Portugal, Spain, the United States, and Portuguese- and Spanish- speaking Africa and Asia through teaching and learning, research and creative activity, and community engagement from local to global levels.

To realize this vision and mission, we will dedicate ourselves to the following goals that demonstrate our commitment to the productive interrelationships between research, teaching and community engagement:

#### **Excellent Faculty and Academic Programs**

- Support innovative and relevant research about language, language contact, linguistic phenomena, literature, film and visual studies, and overarching cultural dynamics in Latin America, Portugal, Spain, the United States, and Portuguese- and Spanish-speaking Africa and Asia
- Offer programs of distinction; and support innovative teaching
- Promote interdisciplinary research and collaboration

### **Values**

- Promote the understanding of and engagement with the rich diversity of the languages, literatures and cultures of Latin America, Portugal, Spain, the United States, and Portuguese- and Spanish-speaking Africa and Asia in the classroom and outside of it
- Foster an environment of productive exchange of viewpoints

### **Citizenship and Advocacy**

- Prepare our students to be leaders and engaged citizens on local, regional, national and global levels by promoting multilingual and cross-cultural competencies
- Affirm the vital importance of education in diverse languages, literatures and cultures to the preparation of student-citizens

### **Community Engagement**

- Foster collaborations between faculty, students, and community partners (on local, regional, national, and global levels) through classes and extracurricular activities
- Support innovative efforts to integrate teaching, research/creative activity and community engagement with the Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking communities in central Ohio

### **Access, Affordability, and Student Success**

- Expand access to teaching and learning opportunities through the use of new digital technologies
- Streamline undergraduate programs and provide cost-efficient study abroad opportunities to Latin America, Portugal and Spain.
- Enhance linkages between classroom and experiential learning and post-university opportunities

## **III. DEFINITIONS**

### **A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty (CEF)**

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

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

### **1. Tenure-track Faculty**

#### **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.

## **2. Teaching Faculty**

### **Initial Appointment Reviews**

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

### **Reappointment and Promotion Reviews**

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

## **3. Associated Faculty**

### **Initial Appointment and Reappointment**

The initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members is based on the search committee's recommendation to the department chair.

Initial appointments at senior rank (e.g. Sr. Lecturer) require a vote by the eligible faculty (all non-probationary teaching faculty and tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college dean.

The reappointment of associated faculty members is decided by the department chair in consultation with Language Program Director and Vice-Chair.

## **Promotion Reviews**

Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have adjunct titles, tenure-track titles with service at 49% FTE or below, or lecturer titles.

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

For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with tenure-track titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section III.A.1.

## **4. Conflict of Interest**

### **Search Committee Conflict of Interest**

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

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

### **Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest**

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

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

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

## **5. 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 divisional dean, will appoint one or more faculty

members from another tenure-initiating unit within the college so that the minimum of three faculty members is reached.

## **B. Promotion and Tenure Committee**

The Department of Spanish and Portuguese utilizes a separate Promotion and Tenure Committee for each faculty member under review. Each committee consists of a minimum of three tenured faculty members who assist the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in managing the promotion and tenure review. Each Promotion and Tenure committee is appointed by the Chair and consists of colleagues at a rank higher than the candidate within the candidate's primary field(s) of expertise.

When considering cases involving teaching faculty, the Promotion and Tenure Committee may be augmented by a non-probationary teaching faculty member at the rank of associate professor or professor, as appropriate to the case.

## **C. Quorum**

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count 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 Eligible Faculty**

In all votes taken on personnel matters, voting is by secret ballot, and votes must be cast prior to meeting adjournment. Only "yes" and "no" votes are counted. Abstentions are not permitted. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to consider whether they are participating fully in the review process when abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter.

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

### **1. Appointment**

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

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

- A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.



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

## IV. APPOINTMENTS

### A. Criteria

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

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, 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. A formal review and selection process, including interviews, using pre-designed evaluations rubrics are required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in [Workday](#) to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

### 1. Tenure-track Faculty

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

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

**Assistant Professor.** Minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of assistant professor include an earned terminal degree (Ph.D. or equivalent) in an appropriate field of study, evidence of potential for scholarly productivity and potential to develop into an internationally recognized scholar, demonstrated potential as an effective teacher at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, a willingness to provide high-quality service to the department, the institution, and the profession, and a strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the ranks in a timely fashion. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. For individuals

not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the 7<sup>th</sup> year will be the final year of employment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

External hires at the associate professor or professor level with tenure will demonstrate the same accomplishments in research/creative work, teaching and service as persons promoted within the university. For all, the substantial probability that a high rate of quality research/creative work and excellence in teaching and service will continue needs to be established. The claim that promotion of the candidate will improve the overall quality and standing of the unit needs to be supported.

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

## **2. Teaching Faculty**

Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all other teaching faculty members must be for a period of five years. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for assistant and associate teaching professors must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for teaching professors must be for a period of at least

three years and no more than eight years. These extended appointments are not probationary, and the individual may be terminated only 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. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. The terms of a contract may be re-negotiated at the time of reappointment.

The department supports Teaching Faculty. These appointments exist for faculty members who focus principally on the education needs of students in the department or college. Teaching Faculty members are expected to contribute to the department's research and education mission as reflected in undergraduate and graduate program development and teaching. Teaching Faculty appointments are made in accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-7](#). Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the department.

**Teaching Instructor.** Appointment is normally made at the rank of teaching instructor when the appointee has not completed the requirements for the terminal degree. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. As noted above, an appointment at the instructor level is limited to a three-year contract. In such cases, if the instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the penultimate year of the three-year contract period, a new contract will not be considered even if performance is otherwise adequate and the position itself will continue.

**Assistant Teaching Professor.** An earned doctorate or other terminal degree and the required licensure/certification in his/her/their specialty, if applicable, are the minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of assistant teaching professor. Evidence of ability to teach is highly desirable.

**Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor.** Appointment at the rank of associate teaching professor or teaching professor requires that the individual have an earned doctorate or other terminal degree and the required licensure/certification in his/her/their specialty, if applicable, and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria—in teaching, professional practice and other service, and scholarship—for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at the rank of teaching associate professor or teaching professor requires production and dissemination of scholarly materials.

### **3. Associated Faculty**

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a few weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. Associated faculty may be reappointed. Appointments of all associated faculty must be reviewed and approved by the College of Arts and Sciences.

**Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor.** Adjunct titles are used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to tenure-track or teaching faculty of equivalent rank. The term of appointment is for one year with renewal contingent on continued significant contributions. The adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. 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. 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.

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

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

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

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

#### **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, and professor are similar to those for Columbus campus faculty but give relatively greater emphasis at each rank to teaching experience and quality.

Regional campus criteria for the appointment of teaching faculty 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 years of service or at any age with twenty-five or more years of service.

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the department chair (regional campus dean for associated faculty on regional campuses) outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-2) will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair. The department chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean. Should the department chair deny

the request, the faculty member may appeal the decision to the dean.

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

## **6. Joint Appointments**

Joint appointments are created to leverage a faculty member's unique expertise to advance the mission areas of the academic units involved and promote cross-disciplinary collaboration. To establish a joint faculty appointment, a [memorandum of understanding \(MOU\)](#) is developed by all affected TIUs, centers, and/or institutes. The MOU will clearly define the distribution of the faculty member's time commitment to the different units. The MOU will also state the sources of compensation directed to the faculty member, distribution of resources, the planned acknowledgement of the academic units in publications, the manner in which credit for any grant funding will be attributed to the different units, and the distribution of grant funds among the appointing units. Unless other arrangements are specified in the MOU, the TIU in which the faculty member's FTE is greater than 50% will be considered that faculty member's TIU. Joint-appointed faculty may vote on promotion and tenure cases only in their TIU.

## **7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty**

Occasionally the active academic involvement in this department by a tenure-track or teaching faculty member from another unit 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. A formal review and selection process, including interviews using pre-designed evaluation rubrics, is required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in [Workday](#) to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

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

- recruitment of tenure-track, 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 Chapter 5, section 4.1 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

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

The department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the department. In some cases in which the position is interdisciplinary in nature, it is expected that members of the search committee will be drawn from other TIUs as well.

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 the university’s commitment to EEO principles and advance the eminence of the institution.
- “Phase 2 | Preliminary Review of Applicants” focuses on best practices for the application review and candidate screening processes. The guidelines and resources in this section support consistency and fairness in the review, assessment, and selection of candidates moving forward in the recruitment process. This section also outlines how to select a list of candidates for on-campus interviews.
- “Phase 3 | Finalists Interviews & Evaluations” provides guidance and tools for conducting interviews and campus visits, requesting reference letters (if not requested earlier in the application stage), and collecting feedback from everyone who interacted with the candidates. Adherence to the guidelines outlined in this section has a direct impact on enhancing the candidate experience and ensuring a consistent evaluation process. This phase concludes with the submission of a letter from the search committee to the department 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 an offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If an offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor, with or without tenure, or professor, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs.

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

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

## **2. Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

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

## **3. Transfer from the Tenure Track**

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

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

Transfers from a 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. TIU Transfer**

Faculty requests to move from one TIU to another must be approved by a simple majority of eligible faculty in the receiving TIU, by both TIU heads, the college dean(s), and the Office of Academic Affairs. The eligible faculty in such cases are the tenure-track faculty eligible to vote on faculty appointments at the transferee’s rank. See Section III.A.1 above.

Approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements for the change have been made and requires the establishment of mutually agreed-upon arrangements among the affected TIU heads,



college dean(s), and the faculty member. An MOU signed by all parties, including the Office of Academic Affairs, must describe in detail the arrangements of the transfer. Since normally the transferring faculty member will fill an existing vacancy in the receiving unit, the MOU will describe the resources supporting the position, including salary, provided by the receiving unit.

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

## **5. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

The appointment of compensated associated faculty members follows a formal search following the [SHIFT](#) Framework, which includes a job posting in [Workday](#) (see Section IV.B above) and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the department chair based on recommendation from the search committee. The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair in consultation with the Language Program Director and Vice-Chair.

Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one to three years.

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department and are decided by the department chair in consultation with the Advisory Committee, excluding the graduate student member on the Advisory Committee.

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

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

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

## **6. Regional Campus Faculty**

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

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

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



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

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

## **7. Joint Appointments**

The department may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another Ohio State TIU as described in Section IV.A.6. The potential for a joint appointment is typically evaluated during the recruitment process and, as such, is subject to all criteria outlined above for each faculty category.

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

## **8. 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 tenure-initiating unit. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the eligible faculty, the department chair extends an offer of appointment. The department chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

# **V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW**

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

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

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

review. An opportunity for a face-to-face meeting with the chair or the chair's designee must be provided to all tenured and non-probationary faculty.

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

- Depending on a faculty member's appointment type, the review is based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.
- The review of faculty with budgeted joint appointments must include input from the joint appointment department chair for every annual evaluation cycle. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on goals specific to the individual in the joint unit.
- Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.
- Per Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#), TIU heads are required to include a reminder in annual review letters that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#)) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

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

## **A. Documentation**

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

- Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#), (*required for probationary faculty*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (*non-probationary faculty*)
- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)

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

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

## **B. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

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

If the department chair recommends renewal of the probationary appointment, this recommendation is final. The department chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review and the department chair may respond in writing if warranted. The department chair's letter (along with written 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 written comments, if provided).

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

### **1. Fourth-Year Review**

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

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

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

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

Renewal of the appointment of a probationary faculty member for the fifth year requires the approval of the divisional dean. In cases where the divisional dean concurs with the department's recommendations to approve the renewal of the appointment, review by the College of Arts and Sciences Divisional Promotion and Tenure Review Panel is optional and at the divisional dean's discretion. The divisional review panel, however, must review negative departmental reappointment recommendations. If either the department chair or the divisional dean recommends nonrenewal of a faculty member's probationary contract, the case will be referred to the college's Promotion and Tenure Committee, which will review the case, vote and make a recommendation to the dean. The dean makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

## **2. Extension of the Tenure Clock**

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

### **C. Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the professors in the department who comment on the faculty member's performance in relation to department and individual goals and on progress toward promotion. The department chair conducts an independent assessment; meets with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review and the department chair may respond in writing if warranted.

Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair, who may meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their performance and future plans and goals. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the department, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the college, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, in civil and collegial interaction with colleagues, staff, and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest-ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty. The department chair prepares a written evaluation of performance against these expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review and the department chair may respond in writing if warranted.

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

### **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 teaching faculty of lower rank.

In the penultimate contract year of a teaching faculty member's appointment, the department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed. According to the [Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment Policy](#), an initial decision by the department chair to not reappoint the faculty member to another term requires review by the eligible faculty.

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

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

#### **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/her/their performance, future plans, and goals.

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

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

#### **F. Regional Campus Faculty**

Regional campus tenure-track faculty are reviewed according to the process established on that campus, with the review focusing on teaching and service. Following the review by the regional campus, the regional campus dean meets with the department head for each regional campus faculty member for evaluation of the faculty member's research and creative activity during the review period. The regional campus dean provides an annual performance and merit review letter. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice. For probationary tenure-track faculty, in the event that the regional campus dean recommends renewal and the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the case shall be reviewed by the college dean or their designee, with the college dean's or their designee's judgment prevailing.

Regional campus 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 clinical/teaching/professional practice faculty member's annual performance and merit review letter.

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

#### **G. Salary Recommendations**

The College of Arts and Sciences requires that units:

- Adopt procedures for the distribution of merit salary and other rewards that recognize the importance of qualitative rather than merely quantitative contributions in each area of faculty

activity.

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

The department chair makes annual salary recommendations to the divisional dean, who may modify them. The recommendations are based on the current annual performance and merit review as well as on the performance and merit reviews of the preceding 12 months.

Except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increases, all funds for annual salary increases are directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and the active promotion of an enriching working and learning environment through collegiality, civility, and openness to a broad spectrum of ideas and opinions. To the extent possible given financial constraints, attention is also given to assuring that salaries are aligned with the market and are internally equitable.

Meritorious performance in research/creative work, teaching, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. Faculty with high quality performance in the three areas of endeavor, as applicable to appointment type, and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

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

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

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

## **VI. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS**

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

*In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the university enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established academic patterns. In such cases care must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances superior intellectual*

*attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.*

## **A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion**

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

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

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

### **1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**

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

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

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

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

Every candidate is expected to meet the criteria for promotion in all aspects of performance (e.g., teaching, scholarship, and service). A mediocre performance in one area would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another area.

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

Consistent with these guidelines, promotion to associate professor with tenure in the College of Arts and Sciences requires excellence in both research/creative work and teaching. Evidence of service to the unit and the promise of excellence in service beyond the unit are desirable.



Excellence in research/creative work means attainment of measurable national or international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of high-quality published research and/or other relevant creative endeavors. A successful candidate will have an emerging national reputation as a scholar or creative artist. Excellence in teaching means the provision 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. Excellence in service means the provision of a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more publics – including the university, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations. The service contribution during the probationary period of assistant professors is limited by design. The most important judgment is that the candidate will achieve excellence in service in the future.

The substantial probability that a high rate of quality research/creative work and excellence in teaching and service will continue needs to be established. The claim that awarding tenure to the candidate will improve the overall quality and standing of the unit needs to be supported.

The following tables specify criteria and types of evidence expected of faculty undergoing review for promotion to associate professor with tenure. “Criteria” refers to qualities which candidates must have. “Types of Evidence” refers to documentation candidates may be asked to submit, demonstrating impact and showing that the corresponding criteria have been met. There are separate tables for teaching, scholarship/creative works/research, and service.

Not all points in Types of Evidence need to be fulfilled for each candidate; these points are listed to provide a span of reasonably expected possible measures of the corresponding criteria for the Committee of the Eligible Faculty to assess.

TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
High standard of quality in direct teaching activities and in advising, mentoring and program development, or program enrichment, in candidate’s areas of responsibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student-opinion surveys (SEIs and other instruments)</li> <li>• Required peer evaluations of instruction</li> <li>• Nominations or selection for teaching awards as documented in the core dossier</li> <li>• List of undergraduate theses, MA papers, doctoral theses on which candidate served as an advisor or committee member (less expected for promotion to Associate Professor; more expected for promotion to Professor)</li> <li>• List and/or description in the teaching narrative outlining courses developed by the candidate; or other contributions to program development, or program enrichment.</li> <li>• Professional success of current and former students as outlined in the core dossier</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Self-assessment by the candidate through narrative on teaching included in core dossier</li> </ul>
Continued growth as a teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Record of participation in workshops, webinars and other professionalization opportunities focused on teaching and/or advising/mentoring</li> <li>• Completed courses at the Drake Institute</li> <li>• Awarded endorsements by the Drake Institute</li> <li>• Demonstrated improvement via student-opinion surveys and peer evaluations</li> <li>• Self-assessment by the candidate through narrative on teaching included in core dossier</li> </ul>

#### SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH

Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Demonstrated focused research/scholarship/creative outcomes that contribute to knowledge in area of expertise and relationship to his/her/their scholarly agenda and unit mission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A book or monograph (either published or in press) in addition to a series of refereed journal articles and/or book chapters and/or an edited book, which the candidate is the (co-) editor of, in high-quality outlets is a standard expectation in the fields of literary and cultural studies, while in linguistics and pedagogy more weight may be attributed to a series of substantive articles.</li> <li>• Critical bibliographies, editions of conference proceedings, and/or editions of a collection of research articles</li> <li>• Textbooks, source books, instructional software, readers, anthologies of texts, contributions in the area of foreign language teaching, and similar publications which are conceived primarily for undergraduate or graduate instruction. These shall be judged scholarly works to the extent that they utilize or present new methodologies or incorporate ideas derived from original research and that they are pertinent to the academic mission of the department</li> <li>• Translations</li> <li>• Creation and dissemination of significant (linguistic) corpora</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creative work</li> <li>• Curatorial commissions</li> <li>• Performance/screening of work</li> <li>• Public-facing and/or collaborative projects of knowledge production and creative activity</li> <li>• Creation of digital media or digital humanities projects</li> <li>• Reviews of scholarly works written for professional journals</li> <li>• Regular scholarly activity at significant international, national, and regional professional meetings (e.g., the presentation of papers, formal participation in symposia, official commentaries as discussant of the papers of others, and organization of scholarly meetings)</li> <li>• Invitations to deliver public lectures at other institutions</li> <li>• Persistence in soliciting, and, wherever applicable, the success in obtaining, internal and external funding for scholarly activities</li> </ul>
High quality and significance of the research/creative/scholarly activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation of research/scholarship/creative activity (e.g. annual review letters, required external evaluations of scholarship)</li> <li>• Published reviews of candidate's published work</li> <li>• Publications in the field of study in reputable journals and/or with reputable publishers</li> <li>• Creative activity in respected venues and/or reviewed in respected venues</li> <li>• Citations, especially for linguists.</li> <li>• Scholarly prizes and awards</li> <li>• Required external evaluations of scholarship</li> </ul>
Gain an emerging national or international reputation as a scholar and/or creative artist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research impact narrative</li> <li>• Citations and awards</li> <li>• Invitations to present as a keynote, plenary or colloquium speaker at reputable national or international venues, including important disciplinary meetings, academic departments and other meetings.</li> </ul>

<b>SERVICE</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met</b>
Demonstrated excellence in service to the department or college	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work on appointed and elected department and college ad hoc or standing committees.</li> <li>• Work on organizing talks, workshops, events, programs, and otherwise promoting scholarly exchange at OSU or elsewhere.</li> <li>• Work to develop or build inter-unit and interdisciplinary initiatives or clusters within the college.</li> <li>• Recognition (awards and prizes) for service to department or college.</li> <li>• Annual evaluations documenting excellence in service to department or college.</li> </ul> <p>Evaluative statements concerning hard work, dependability, integrity, collegiality, or similar qualities will be noted.</p>
Demonstrated potential for excellence in service to the university	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appointed and elected university ad hoc or standing committees, councils, task forces, and boards.</li> <li>• Administrative responsibilities including the direction/coordination of programs or offices, participation in special studies on behalf of the university, grants received in support of the institution.</li> <li>• Quality indicators of the outcomes of contributions, including roles in any major reports issued, policy changes recommended and implemented, and administrative units restructured.</li> <li>• Awards and prizes for service to the University.</li> </ul>
Demonstrated excellence in service to the students of Ohio State	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advising student clubs, College Honors Committee, or other organizations, clubs, or committees focused on Ohio State students</li> <li>• Serving on advisory boards, or as outside Graduate School Representative on examination committees of graduate students</li> <li>• Serving on university committees with a student focus (e.g., Committee on Academic Misconduct)</li> <li>• Service as a STEP faculty mentor</li> </ul>
Demonstrated significant service to a profession or field (less expected for promotion to Associate Professor; more expected for promotion to Professor)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Involvement with professional journals (journal editorships, reviewer) or professional and scholarly societies (offices or committees). Those with international scope and reputation will be particularly noted.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leadership or substantial service in professional conference organizations.</li> <li>• Consultation activity with industry, professional discipline education development, other universities, or government.</li> <li>• Evidence of professional expertise to public and private entities as a reviewer for funding proposals, study sections, external examiner, member of panels and commissions,</li> <li>• Awards and prizes for service to profession.</li> <li>• Available evidence (e.g., letters from committee chairs) of the quality of service.</li> <li>• Evaluative statements concerning hard work, dependability, integrity, collegiality, or similar qualities will be noted.</li> </ul>
Demonstrated community-engagement (less expected for promotion to Associate Professor; more expected for promotion to Professor)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality indicators of activities within community settings beyond the academic campus.</li> <li>• Activities building public understanding of societal and community-relevant issues; creation of knowledge (including digital) resources for public use; thematic public-oriented talks, conferences, exhibitions, and performances.</li> <li>• Unique service to marginalized, disadvantaged, and at-risk communities.</li> </ul>

## 2. Promotion to Professor

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

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

The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national or international reputation in the field.

The College of Arts and Sciences establishes the following additional criteria for promotion to the rank of professor:

*Promotion to professor in the College of Arts and Sciences takes the pursuit of research and creative excellence as our core value. The college also recognizes that a career may consist of various phases in which a concentration on research/creative work, teaching, or service creates a composite professional life. Promotion to professor typically requires excellence in*

*scholarship/creative work. Where a candidate has made truly extraordinary contributions in the areas of teaching or service, that record may warrant promotion in combination with a less extensive, though excellent, record of continued productivity in research/creative work.*

*Excellence in research/creative work means attainment of measurable national or international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of high-quality published research and/or other relevant creative endeavors. A successful candidate will have achieved national distinction as a researcher or creative artist and have an emerging international reputation. Excellence in teaching means the provision 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. It can be measured by the attainment of national or international recognition, as evidenced by pedagogical publications, awards, honors, and/or critical student outcomes. Excellence in service means the provision of a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more publics – including the university, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations.*

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

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

The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national distinction as a scholar and, at a minimum, an emerging international reputation in the field, along with demonstrated excellence in service to one or more publics, including the university, the college, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations.

### **3. Teaching Faculty**

**Promotion to Assistant Teaching Professor.** For promotion to assistant teaching professor, a faculty member must hold a doctoral degree or a master's degree along with equivalent experience 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.** For promotion to associate teaching professor, a faculty member must hold a doctoral or other terminal degree in the field or a master's degree and equivalent experience; show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service; must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of this department and show convincing evidence of production and dissemination of scholarly materials

pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to associate teaching professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

**Promotion to Teaching Professor.** For promotion to teaching professor, a faculty member must have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching and professional practice; leadership in service to this department and to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. 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 or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, above.

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

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

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

#### **5. Regional Campus Faculty**

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

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

#### **B. Procedures**

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

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

### **a) *Candidate Responsibilities***

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

#### **• Dossier**

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

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

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

For 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.

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

### **Teaching**

Some of the means which may be used to appraise quality of teaching are the following:

- a. Written evaluations from faculty colleagues who have worked with the faculty member in team-teaching projects that are solicited by the chair at the candidate's request or other reports from such colleagues that are summarized in annual review letters
- b. Departmental policy requires that all faculty, probationary and tenured, make use of student opinion surveys through the use of the University-wide SEI forms for all formal classes taught during each

semester of each year. The summary reports are received each semester as a complete set by the Department Chair and archived in the respective personnel files. Efforts should always be made to obtain such evaluations from the largest possible number of enrolled students in order to ensure an accurate assessment of student opinion. Faculty members may dedicate class time to do so, but should not be physically present as students fill out the evaluations. In addition, optional documentation of formal instruction may comprise department, college or university evaluation forms other than the S.E.I.

c. Peer Evaluations of Teaching, as described in Section IX.B.

Careful consideration and evaluation should also be applied to indirect teaching, including advising and mentoring of students, thesis and dissertation direction, development of new courses and curricula. Such teaching activities are considered part of the normal duties of a faculty member. Quantitative and qualitative assessment of such instructional activities should be commensurate with a faculty member's rank. Appropriate instruments for assessment include written evaluations by current or former advisees or mentees solicited by the P&T Committee at the candidate's request and included in the Internal Evaluations section of the dossier. Information on such teaching activities summarized by the department chair in annual review letters may also be considered.

- c. Special accomplishments in teaching (such as nominations or selection for particular awards).
- d. Self-assessment by the faculty member in dossier teaching narratives.
- e. Professional success of former students as described in the core dossier.

## Research

In evaluating scholarly achievement, the committee of the eligible faculty should consider both its quality and quantity, but place special emphasis on quality. Work in progress should be assessed whenever possible. An important aspect is the assessment of the value of specific publication outlets, the frequency and significance of citations of the faculty member's work, and published reviews of the candidate's work. Citations in relevant publications or other evidence that the work of the candidate has been recognized by authorities in the field should also be considered. In arriving at the essential internal evaluation of the candidate's research, the type and scope of each publication shall be carefully considered in assessing its impact in the field. In all cases, the committee of the eligible faculty shall also consider the external evaluations and any internal evaluations it has solicited in attempting to ascertain whether the scholarly efforts of the candidate make an important contribution to the field and show promise of continuing development.

Primary examples of publications that are appropriate kinds of research activity are the following:

a. Publications

- 1) Monographic and comprehensive works (books, monographs, articles, etc.) based on original research. These shall be accorded special importance as evidence of scholarly achievement and development.
- 2) Critical bibliographies as well as authorship of papers in editions of conference proceedings and in editions of a collection of research articles.
- 3) Textbooks, source books, instructional software, readers, anthologies of texts, contributions in the area of foreign language teaching, and similar publications which are conceived primarily for undergraduate or graduate instruction. These shall be judged scholarly works



to the extent that they utilize or present new methodologies or incorporate ideas derived from original research and that they are pertinent to the academic mission of the department.

- 4) Translations and creative work. These shall be evaluated in the light of such criteria as originality, significance, and pertinence to the academic mission of the department.
- 5) Reviews of scholarly works written for professional journals. In taking such reviews into account, consideration shall be given to the kind and size of the review (review essay, regular review, book notice), and to the type and quality of the scholarly journal in which they appear

b. Other Scholarly Activities

- 1) The quality and frequency of scholarly activity at significant international, national, and regional professional meetings shall be assessed, especially the presentation of papers, formal participation in symposia, official commentaries as discussant of the papers of others, and organization of scholarly meetings.
- 2) Consideration commensurate with the prestige of the citation shall be given to scholarly prizes, awards, grants or fellowships as well as to invitations to deliver public lectures or teach at other universities. The persistence in soliciting, and, wherever applicable, the success in obtaining, external funding for scholarly activities is a regular criterion of evaluation, since the University guidelines require all faculty members to develop consistent activities in this regard.

## Service

The form that service may take varies greatly among faculty members. The most usual kinds of service, and the ways in which they may be documented, are as follows:

- a. Departmental Service: Work on departmental committees to which the faculty member has been assigned, fulfilling ad hoc assignments. The amount, and quality, of this service may be documented by written reports, solicited by the department chair at the candidate's request, from those who have worked with the faculty member as well as from those who have had occasion in other ways to evaluate that service. Evaluations of service documented in annual review letters may also be considered. It must be recognized that all those with heavy administrative responsibilities, e.g., departmental officers, chairs of major committees, and directors of language programs perform service in which the time commitment is considerable; such service should be appropriately considered by the review committee. To the extent that such service resulted in a reduced course load, the corresponding weight of the assignment should be shifted from teaching to service for the purpose of assessing overall merit. In all cases, effectiveness of a faculty member's service contribution is the primary criterion of quality.
- b. College and University Service: Service to the college and University should be evaluated according to the same principles as service to the department.
- c. Service to the Profession at Large: Service to the profession at large may include service in state, regional, and national professional organizations in the individual's academic field, as office-holder, as member of committees, or in ad hoc assignments on behalf of an organization relevant to the candidate's professional expertise; work as an academic consultant; work on editorial boards

and as referee for scholarly journals; service as referee for faculty members under review at other universities. Candidates may submit letters of appointment or appreciation for professional service for inclusion in the dossier. Any such material shall be taken into due consideration as an indication of the growing national and/or international stature of the faculty member in question.

- d. Outreach to the community: The criteria for outreach to the community must inevitably vary from individual to individual. It is documented in the same way as service to the profession. To be considered, such service must be relevant to the candidate's professional expertise. Community outreach in support of the academic mission of the department is especially valued. It should be recognized that the University is becoming increasingly community-oriented, and since members of the faculty are called on more and more to make significant contributions to furthering such community relations by promoting the academic mission of the department, appropriate recognition should be given. The criteria for evaluation will concern effectiveness, continued demand, timeliness, and topicality.

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 department review only, unless reviewers at the college and university levels specifically request it.

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

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

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

**b) *Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities***

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

- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
  - **Late Spring:** Select from among the members of each P&T Committee, if there are multiple, 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 Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described [here](#).

- **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section VI.B.4 below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.
- **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
- Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his/her/their dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.
- Consider the interdisciplinary work of a candidate across multiple units as part of the whole work, especially if the candidate has a joint appointment in another unit.
- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed. To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance, to participate in discussion of every case, and to vote.
- On behalf of the eligible faculty, revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of the full eligible faculty, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting. The revised document must specify each of the department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service, summarize the faculty perspectives on whether the candidate has met each criterion, and discuss the sources of evidence in the dossier on which those perspectives are based. Following review by the full eligible faculty committee, the completed written evaluation and recommendation is forwarded to the department chair.
- Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

**c) *Department Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities***

The responsibilities of the members of the Eligible Faculty Committee 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 and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
  - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
  - A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04A\(3\)](#) only once. Faculty Rule [3335-7-08](#) makes the same provision for non-probationary 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.
- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.

**d) *Department Chair Responsibilities***

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. The department must ensure that such questions are asked of all candidates in a non-discriminatory manner. For tenure-track assistant professors, department chairs are to confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an [MOU](#) at the time of promotion with tenure.
- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this department. The department chair will seek a letter of evaluation from the TIU head of the joint appointment unit. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.

- To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To explain to the eligible faculty any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
  - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair;
  - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair; and
  - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten calendar days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he/she/they will submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline.
- To receive from the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the written evaluation and recommendation by the eligible faculty of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the head of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

## 2. **Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

Adjunct faculty and associated faculty with tenure-track titles 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 head's recommendation is negative (a negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases), and does not proceed to the executive vice president and provost if the dean's recommendation is negative.

### **3. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty**

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

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

Regional campus 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 regional campus dean consults with the faculty member's department chair. A request to promote follows the same procedures as tenure-track faculty except that external letters are not needed unless scholarship is a component of the assigned role.

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

### **4. External Evaluations**

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

#### **Peer and Near Peer Institutions**

- Penn State
- Georgetown
- University of Arizona
- University of Florida
- University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
- University of Illinois, Chicago
- University of Iowa
- University of Texas, Austin
- Indiana University
- Purdue University
- Northwestern University
- University of Michigan
- University of Chicago
- University of Pittsburgh
- University of Colorado, Boulder
- Michigan State University
- Rutgers University
- University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
- University of Wisconsin, Madison
- University of Georgia

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track faculty promotion and tenure or promotion reviews and all teaching faculty promotion reviews to the level of associate teaching professor and teaching professor. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for associated faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations in these cases will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

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

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

- Is written by a person at an appropriate peer or aspirational institution. The department will generally obtain evaluations from faculty at institutions defined as peer or near-peer as listed above and including institutions that are members of the [Association of American Universities \(AAU\)](#) and the [Big Ten Academic Alliance \(BTAA\)](#). Peer reviewers from other institutions, including universities outside of North America and liberal arts colleges, may be suggested in cases where the external reviewer is 1) a distinguished expert in the field, as indicated by publications; national and international awards; prominence in professional organizations; and presence on editorial boards of major journals; 2) is nationally or internationally known in a field outside of the field of study that is most directly related to a candidate's interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary projects; 3) meets the standards for a peer reviewer in a TIU in which the candidate is joint-appointed; and/or 4) where relevant, is a distinguished, award winning (e.g., Pulitzer Prize or Guggenheim Fellowship) creative writer or artist who is not affiliated with an academic institution.
- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate, or someone who has collaborated extensively with the candidate or is currently collaborating with the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will solicit evaluations only from professors with institutional affiliations predominately in the programs listed above. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

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

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. All potential evaluators must be approved by the College of Arts and Sciences through the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. No written justification is required for tenured professors at peer or near peer institutions as defined above, and including institutions in the BTAA or AAAU. If the potential evaluator is from an academic institution that is not clearly a peer or

aspirational peer for Ohio State, or if the potential evaluator is from a nonacademic institution (e.g., a public policy think tank, a private art academy or music conservatory, a museum, a biomedical company, or a governmental agency), a brief written justification is required. The department's justification should be based on the prestige of the institution, the credentials and experience of the evaluator, and/or the specific relevance of the evaluator's expertise to the candidate's activities. International evaluators from strong institutions are allowed. The research credentials of the evaluators should generally mirror those of a professor at the professor rank at Ohio State. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors. The department should provide justification if more than a minority of the evaluations are from associate professors (e.g., candidate's work is in a small or new field for which more senior people are not available, evaluators have gained prominence as national or international experts in the field). For reviews of associate professors, all evaluators must be professors (or equivalent). Emeritus professors are acceptable as long as they are active researchers.

If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, 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 none of the person(s) suggested by the candidate agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

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

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

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

## **VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS**

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

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

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

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



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

## **VIII. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS**

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

## **IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

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

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

In no case should the evaluation of teaching rely exclusively on quantitative instruments (such as the SEI), which have been shown to be unreliable indicators of overall performance in the classroom and to work systematically to the disadvantage of women, non-native English speakers, and faculty of color.

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

### **A. Student Evaluation of Teaching**

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) is required in every course offered in this department. Faculty should encourage a high completion rate by explaining the significance of the evaluation. SEI scores are primarily an indicator of student satisfaction and may not be used as the sole evidence for teaching effectiveness. Faculty should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if students will be asked to complete the evaluation using a mobile application. In such cases, the faculty member must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation.

Faculty are also encouraged to use in-class discursive evaluations of teaching. Such evaluations should be developed, administered, and periodically assessed in accordance with unit policies and expectations. Someone other than the instructor should distribute and collect discursive evaluations while the instructor is out of the room, and completed evaluations should be held in the department office until the faculty member has turned in grades.

### **B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

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

their teaching at all levels. The department chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process and is responsible for ensuring that all required peer evaluations are obtained.

Annually the department head appoints a Peer Review of Teaching Committee of a size judged sufficient to meet the volume of peer review activity expected that year, without overburdening any of the members. The term of service is one year, with reappointment possible. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the tenured faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the department. Although there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible.

Peer Evaluations of Probationary Faculty: The department chair is responsible for coordinating the peer review of teaching in conjunction with the Peer Review of Teaching Committee of probationary tenure-track faculty, probationary teaching faculty, and associated faculty with multiple year appointments at least once per year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. When assistant professors are reviewed for tenure and promotion, they are required to have a minimum of five peer evaluations of teaching from the probationary period. When probationary teaching faculty are reviewed for reappointment or promotion, they are required to have a minimum of four peer evaluations of instruction from the probationary period. No more than two evaluations should be prepared by the same colleague.

Peer Evaluations of Tenured and Non-Probationary Faculty: The department chair is responsible for coordinating the peer review of teaching in conjunction with the Peer Review of Teaching Committee of tenured associate professors, non-probationary assistant teaching professors, and non-probationary associate teaching professors at least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a six year period and of having at least four peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion or reappointment review.

The Peer Review of Teaching Committee also evaluates the teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary teaching professors at least once every four years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review. When non-probationary teaching professors are reviewed for reappointment, they are required to have a minimum of two peer-evaluations of instruction since the last promotion or reappointment, whichever is more recent.

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations of probationary faculty and for tenured and non-probationary faculty described above are comprehensive and include, in addition to class visitation (or the equivalent for an online course), review of course syllabi and related instruction materials such as assignments and exams. Colleagues who are to evaluate peers will be appointed by the Department Chair.. The teaching of tenure-track assistant professors may be evaluated by tenure-track associate professors or tenure-track professors. The teaching of tenured associate professors may be evaluated by other tenured associate professors or by tenured professors. The teaching of teaching faculty may be evaluated by tenure-track faculty of equal or higher rank and teaching faculty of equal or higher rank. The Department Chair will ensure that an appropriate number of these evaluations will have been conducted by professors, especially in the three years predating formal consideration for promotion or reappointment for teaching faculty. The teaching of professors will be evaluated by associate professors or professors; the latter may be selected from the faculty of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese or from another department.

The Department Chair will ensure that all peer evaluators understand the nature of their task. The peer reviewer should arrange with the candidate a time for the visit and meet with the candidate to understand

the goals of the course, the candidate's teaching philosophy and any challenges related to instruction including feedback from previous evaluations of teaching. If possible, the peer reviewer should attend two different class sessions over the course of the semester.

In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should focus on such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. The college encourages the reviewer to first meet with the faculty member under review to discuss the instructor's teaching philosophy, goals and expected outcomes for the course, and any challenges related to instruction (including previous feedback from previous evaluations of teaching). In addition to preparing a written report for the faculty member's dossier, the reviewer should meet with the faculty member following the classroom visitation for a more informal consultation about their teaching effectiveness.

At the conclusion of the class visits and evaluation, and before the end of the semester of review, the peer evaluator will submit a report to the department chair copied to the candidate. Written reports of peer evaluation of teaching should focus not only on classroom performance (including interaction with students, resolutions of problems in the classroom, and the level of intellectual stimulation), but also on curricular choices, implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and engagement with current disciplinary knowledge. Written reports should be completed by the end of the semester of review and submitted to the department chair, copied to the faculty member. These reports are included in a faculty member's promotion dossier. The faculty member may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if desired. The comments are appended to the report for inclusion in the faculty member's promotion and tenure dossier, unless the faculty member requests the comments be excluded.

**Other Peer Reviews of Teaching:** The department chair may request peer reviews of the teaching of any faculty member who, in the chair's judgement, would benefit from review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching. Reviews conducted upon the request of the department chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the department chair or faculty member and may or may not include class visitations.

Any faculty member may request additional peer review of teaching. The Peer Review of Teaching Committee will fulfill such requests 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](#).

## **X. APPENDIX 1: MENTORSHIP PLAN**

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

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

Mentees must bring to their first, fall-semester meeting with their mentor an Individual Development Plan (IDP). The IDP minimally lists: 1) research, teaching and service goals for that academic year and the means that the mentee proposes to use to achieve them, and 2) the mentee's long-term research, teaching and service goals and the means that the mentee proposes to use to meet them. The IDP should be discussed with the mentor and the mentor is responsible for providing the department chair with a copy of each probationary tenure-track professor's IDP.

Though not required, mentors are encouraged to suggest at least two additional mentors, from outside the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, who share the mentee's research or other interests, and who could sponsor the mentee's effective integration into the OSU community of scholars.

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