

# **Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure**

## **Criteria and Procedures for The Ohio State University Department of Statistics**

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: December 12, 2025

## Table of Contents

I Preamble .....	4
II Department Mission .....	4
III Definitions .....	5
A Committee of the Eligible Faculty .....	5
1 Tenure-track Faculty .....	5
2 Teaching and Professional Practice Faculty .....	6
3 Associated Faculty .....	6
4 Conflict of Interest .....	7
5 Minimum Composition .....	8
B Quorum .....	8
C Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty .....	8
1 Appointment .....	8
2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion .....	9
IV Appointments .....	9
A Criteria .....	9
1 Tenure-track Faculty .....	9
2 Teaching and Professional Practice 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 .....	14
2 Teaching and Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....	16
3 Transfer from the Tenure Track .....	16
4 TIU Transfer .....	17
5 Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....	17
6 Regional Campus Faculty .....	18
7 Joint Appointments .....	18
8 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty .....	18
V Annual Performance and Merit Review .....	19
A Documentation .....	20
B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....	21

1 Fourth-Year Review.....	21
2 Extension of the Tenure Clock.....	22
C Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	22
D Teaching and Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	23
E Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	23
F Regional Campus Faculty .....	23
G Salary Recommendations .....	24
VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews.....	25
A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion .....	25
1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure .....	25
2 Tenure of Probationary Associate Professor without Tenure .....	29
3 Promotion to Professor .....	29
4 Teaching and Professional Practice Faculty .....	30
5 Associated Faculty .....	31
6 Regional Campus Faculty .....	32
B Procedures.....	32
1 Tenure-Track, Teaching, and Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....	32
a Candidate Responsibilities.....	33
b Eligible Faculty Responsibilities .....	35
c Department Chair Responsibilities .....	37
2 Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus .....	38
3 Regional Campus Faculty .....	39
4 External Evaluations .....	39
VII Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals .....	41
VIII Seventh-Year Reviews.....	42
IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching .....	42
A Student Evaluation of Teaching.....	42
B Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	42
APPENDIX A: Faculty Mentoring.....	45
APPENDIX B: Definitions Visual Aid .....	47

## **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 departmental mission and criteria.

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

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

## **II Department Mission**

The mission of the Department of Statistics is to produce research in statistical and data science at the level of the best universities in the country and to provide teaching and service at equally high levels of excellence.

Excellence in research involves advancing the state of knowledge in statistical and data science and its application. We place a high value on research in methodology, theoretical statistics, applied statistics and probability, computational science in the presence of uncertainty, and interdisciplinary research. The attainment of excellence necessitates hiring, and then promoting, outstanding new faculty to preserve and enhance our department's strengths in research.

Excellence in teaching involves (1) presenting the most complete and engaging educational product possible in our courses, (2) continuously updating our courses to present accurate, state-of-the-art information to our students, (3) introducing innovation in teaching statistical ideas, including new and effective ways to communicate our knowledge, (4) producing outstanding scholars who are capable of serving on the faculty of the very best departments, or as leaders in the industrial, governmental, or non-profit sectors, and (5) ongoing evaluation of teaching quality, by both peers and students, to continually improve our educational products. At the graduate level, these educational goals can be achieved only in conjunction with excellence in research. For the department, excellence in teaching requires that we keep our educational programs current.

Excellence in service involves demonstrating leadership and carrying out duties responsibly and in a collegial manner. It involves ongoing evaluation to ensure that duties are carried out professionally and that the audiences we serve are satisfied. Duties for the individual faculty member will include service on committees within the Department and may include service on committees at the College and University levels. They may also entail serving on professional committees at the local, state, national, and international levels; evaluating other programs as they strive for excellence; and evaluating colleagues at other universities involved in the promotion and tenure process. They will entail providing peer review of manuscripts or editing for journals, conferences, and funding agencies. Finally, many faculty members will share their educational and research endeavors with the community outside of the University through statistical consulting.

The department embraces and seeks to implement the university's shared values initiative. We are committed to academic freedom, to ensuring responsible research practices, to building a welcoming environment, to fostering an ethic of care and mutual respect, and to promoting justice.

### **III Definitions**

#### **A Committee of the Eligible Faculty**

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

The department chair, the dean 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.

Appendix B contains a simplified visual aid for voting eligibility for the types of appointments made in this department. The text in this section supersedes any interpretation of the visual aid in Appendix B.

#### **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 and Professional Practice Faculty

### Initial Appointment Reviews

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

### Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

## 3 Associated Faculty

### Initial Appointment and Reappointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** Appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) reviews of compensated associated faculty members are made by the department chair after receiving a recommendation from the search committee.
- **Rank Review.** With the exception of visiting positions, for appointments at senior rank, 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. For visiting positions and lecturer positions, the chair determines the appropriate rank after consultation with the Executive Committee (Section IV.A.3 describes the requirements for visiting and lecturer positions). Senior rank appointments require prior approval of the college dean.
- **Reappointment Review.** Reappointment reviews of compensated associated faculty members are made by the department chair after consulting with the Executive Advisory Committee.

### 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, and lecturer titles.

For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track, teaching, or professional practice 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.

For the promotion review of a lecturer to senior lecturer, the eligible faculty shall be all tenure-track and non-probationary teaching/professional practice faculty at the rank of associate professor and professor.

#### **4 Conflict of Interest**

Conflicts of interest exist whenever there are circumstances under which objective review of a candidate's work is not possible. Faculty should refrain from participating in search committee activities and eligible faculty duties whenever there is a conflict of interest or could be a reasonable perception of a 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 for an applicant or candidate if the member decides to apply for the position or:

- is related to or has a close interpersonal relationship with an applicant or candidate;
- has substantive financial ties with an applicant or candidate;
- is dependent in some way on the applicant or candidate's services;
- has a close professional relationship with the applicant or candidate (e.g., dissertation advisor or postdoctoral advisor);
- has collaborated extensively with the applicant or candidate or is currently collaborating extensively with the applicant or candidate; or
- is in any relationship such that the member of the search committee stands to gain or lose professionally from the outcome of the review of the applicant or candidate.

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

A member of the eligible faculty must disclose to the committee and refrain from participation in any of the committee of eligible faculty related to a candidate if the member has the following relationships with 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;
- as listed in the College of Arts and Sciences APT document, a collaborator on a project within the past 3 years, 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; or
- is in a relationship such that the eligible faculty member stands to gain or lose professionally from the outcome of the review of the candidate.

Generally, a faculty member who has collaborated with an applicant or candidate on at least 50% of the applicant or candidate's published work since appointment or the last promotion or who has collaborated with the applicant or candidate on at least 50% of the faculty member's published work since the applicant or candidate's last promotion is considered to be collaborating extensively with the applicant or candidate and would be expected to withdraw from that applicant or candidate's review.

The department recognizes that there are multiple ways to assess the fraction of work on which two individuals have collaborated. These include a simple count of published works and also an assessment where more important works are weighted more heavily. Faculty members are expected to consider multiple reasonable perspectives when determining whether a conflict of interest exists. If a conflict exists under any of the perspectives, they are expected to withdraw from the review of the applicant or 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 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 or for other reasons are not counted when determining a quorum.

## **C Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty**

In all votes taken on personnel matters only "yes" and "no" votes are counted. It is generally the duty of all un-recused eligible faculty to participate in discussion and cast a "yes" or "no" vote. Abstentions are not votes, nor are spoiled ballots.

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

All votes on personnel matters are taken by secret ballot.

## **1 Appointment**

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

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

- A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for renewal of the probationary appointment of a tenure-track faculty member in the probationary period is secured when more than half of the votes cast are positive.
- A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for any other reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.
- In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment unit prior to the candidate's 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/professional practice, 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.

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

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

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

**Assistant Professor.** Minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of assistant professor include an earned doctoral degree in a relevant field of study, evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, 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 College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs.

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

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

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 and Professional Practice Faculty**

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

assistant and associate professors must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years.

Second and subsequent contracts for assistant and associate teaching and professional practice professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for teaching and professional practice professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. Second and subsequent appointments are not probationary and the individual may only be terminated for cause (see rule [3335-5-04](#) of the Administrative Code) or financial exigency (see rule [3335-5-02.1](#) of the Administrative Code).

Tenure is not granted to teaching and professional practice 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 and professional practice faculty. These appointments exist for faculty members who focus principally on the educational needs of students in the department or college. Teaching and professional practice 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 and professional practice faculty appointments are made in accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-7](#). Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the department.

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

**Assistant Teaching Professor and Professional Practice Assistant Professor.** An earned doctorate in a relevant field of study is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant teaching professor or professional practice assistant professor. Evidence of ability to teach is highly desirable.

**Associate Teaching Professor, Professional Practice Associate Professor, Teaching Professor, and Professional Practice Professor.** Appointment at the rank of associate teaching professor and professional practice associate professor, or teaching professor and professional practice professor requires that the individual have an earned doctorate in a relevant field of study 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 professor requires production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice.

### **3 Associated Faculty**

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a 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 appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct titles are used to confer faculty status on individuals

who have credentials comparable to tenure-track, teaching, or professional practice faculty of equivalent rank. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give academic service to the department, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees, for which a faculty title is appropriate. The term of appointment is for one year with renewal contingent on continued significant contributions. The adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track, teaching, or professional practice faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track, teaching, or professional practice 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, at a minimum, a doctorate in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction; or a Master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience with documentation of high quality performance. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The initial appointment for a senior lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent appointments 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, professional practice, 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](#).

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.1-3) 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 TIU head 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. Appointments for greater than 0% but less than 50% time in the department require the same level of academic achievement expected of all other departmental faculty at the same rank. The proportion of teaching, scholarship, and service activities in statistics should be commensurate with the proportion of appointment in the department. Any appointment made with the department as the tenure initiating unit (TIU) must be for 50% or greater full time equivalent (FTE). Jointly appointed faculty whose TIU is not this department may not vote on appointments, reappointments, nor promotion and tenure issues, but may vote on all other departmental matters brought before the faculty.

## **7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty**

Occasionally the active academic involvement in this department by a tenure-track, teaching, or professional practice 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, professional practice, 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, professional practice, 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](#).

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

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 in the department. The department chair will appoint one (or more) member of the search committee to serve as the Faculty Hiring Procedure Oversight Designee (POD). The POD is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to achieve a pool of qualified applicants.

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 TIU chair/director.
- “Phase 4 | Extend Offer” provides guidance and resources related to effectively selecting the most qualified candidate(s) for the position(s) and successfully negotiating to result in an accepted offer.
- “Phase 5 | Preboard and Onboard” offers resources to help prepare and support new faculty as they transition to Ohio State. The suggestions in this phase focus on creating a seamless transition for incoming faculty and their partners/families, if applicable.
- “Phase 6 | Reflect and Assess the Search” is a process supported by OAA to reflect on the hiring cycle each year and evaluate areas that may need improvement and additional support.

During phase 3, the search process should provide confidentiality options to candidates for senior rank positions, as practical and consistent with university policy.

As part of phase 3, the search committee provides an evaluation rubric to the eligible faculty and collects eligible faculty rubric scores via an anonymous survey. Additional comments may be collected on this survey at the discretion of the search committee. As part of phase 3 and with timing at the discretion of the department chair, after the on-campus or virtual interviews and after relevant surveys are collected, the eligible faculty meets to discuss perceptions and preferences and to vote on each candidate who interviewed and has not withdrawn their application. This discussion is guided by the survey results. The department chair attends this meeting but does not vote.

Each vote proceeds in three stages. The first stage consists of a screen to eliminate candidates that do not meet a minimum threshold. For this stage, faculty may vote either Yes or No for each candidate. Abstentions, non-votes and spoiled ballots are not used to determine whether a candidate is deemed acceptable. If more than  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the votes cast are Yes, the candidate passes to the second stage; if  $\frac{1}{2}$  or fewer of the votes cast are Yes, the candidate is eliminated from consideration. Eliminated candidates are normally excluded in any future votes for the same search.

During the second stage of the vote, the candidates will be ranked, from most preferred to least preferred. Each faculty member will rank the eligible candidates, assigning ranks of 3 (best), 2 (second best), 1 (third best), and 0 (remaining candidates). The candidates are ordered by the sum of their ranks.

The third stage of the vote consists of a decision (more rigorous than the first stage screen) as to whether the eligible candidates should be offered a position. For this stage, faculty may vote either Yes or No for each candidate. Abstentions, non-votes and spoiled ballots are not used to compute the fraction favoring an offer. If at least  $\frac{2}{3}$  of votes cast are Yes, the faculty supports an offer being made to the candidate; if fewer than  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the votes cast are Yes, the faculty does not support an offer being made to the candidate at this time. Candidates for which no offer is to be made at this time may be included in future third-stage votes for the same or different searches.

The search committee must use the eligible faculty vote to guide its recommendations to the chair. All candidates for which the faculty voted to support an offer being made must be recommended by the committee to the chair for this search. No candidate for which the faculty did not support an offer at this

time should be recommended by the committee to the chair at this time. The search committee shall also include the results of the second stage of the vote as context for the recommendations.

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor, with or without tenure, 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 consultation with and approval by the College of Arts and Sciences, the chair will, at the chair's discretion, make an offer to one or more of the highly ranked candidates. The chair will make offers only to candidates who have been recommended by the search committee. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the department chair in consultation with and approval by the divisional dean.

When multiple offers may be made, the chair will, at his/her/their discretion, extend offers to multiple candidates. These multiple offers will generally proceed in order, from higher ranked candidates to lower ranked candidates.

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

The timing of meetings for discussion and voting is at the chair's discretion. In exceptional circumstances, the chair may call for a vote conducted on an electronic platform. For example, if a disruption such as a connectivity issue prevents some individuals from voting during the meeting, the vote may be taken over an extended period on an electronic platform.

## **2 Teaching and Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

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

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

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a teaching or professional practice appointment if appropriate to the individual's circumstances and departmental and college needs, and if funding for the salary has been identified. Tenure or tenure eligibility is lost upon transfer, though rank is retained, and transfers must be approved by the department chair, the 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 or professional practice appointment to the tenure track are not permitted. Teaching and professional practice 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, unless a search waiver is obtained from OAA. After the dean authorizes a search, the chair appoints a search committee of at least three faculty members. At least two members of the committee will be eligible faculty. Tenure-track, teaching, professional practice, and associated faculty may be members of the search committee. One of the committee members is appointed to be the Faculty Hiring Procedures Oversight Designee.

The appointment is then decided by the department chair based on recommendation from the search committee and the Executive Advisory Committee, in consultation with the eligible faculty of the department when feasible. After a positive recommendation, the chair will, at his/her/their discretion, in consultation with and approval by the College of Arts and Sciences, make an offer.

The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair in consultation with the Executive Advisory Committee.

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

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

Appointments of compensated visiting faculty may be made on annual or semester bases and may be made for up to but not in excess of three years. These appointments are made by the department chair after receiving a recommendation from the search committee.

Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are usually made on a semester by semester or annual basis. After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment may be offered. These appointments are made by the department chair after receiving a recommendation from the search committee.

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, the department eligible faculty, and the regional campus search committee. 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/professional practice and associated faculty are the same as those described above for tenure-track faculty.

## **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.

Joint appointments of tenure track faculty whose tenure initiating unit is the department follow the same basic procedures as for 100% appointments, except that (i) the search committee may include individuals who do not have an appointment in the department, and (ii) feedback from faculty members from other department(s) involved will be considered by the search committee in determining which candidates will be interviewed and by the faculty of the department when voting on the candidates. For joint appointees with a different tenure initiating unit, approval of this department will be determined by the chair in consultation with the eligible faculty. Consultation with the eligible faculty should include a vote via secret ballot, with discussion at a meeting of the eligible faculty preceding the vote. A favorable vote of at least 2/3 of those voting is a positive recommendation.

## **8 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty**

Any department tenure-track faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track or teaching/professional practice faculty member from another Ohio State tenure-initiating unit. This requires a curriculum vitae and nomination letter to the chair by the nominating member describing why the appointment is appropriate and justifying the appointment. If the appointment is approved by the eligible faculty based on a secret vote which may be in electronic form, the department chair extends an

offer of appointment. The eligible faculty is deemed to approve of the appointment if at least two thirds of the votes cast are in favor of the appointment. Once appointed, the department chair shall review a courtesy appointee at the end of the four-year term of appointment to determine if the reasons for the appointment are still valid. The chair shall take recommendations for nonrenewal before the eligible faculty for a vote.

## **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 must schedule a face-to-face meeting with all probationary faculty as part of the review. An opportunity for a face-to-face meeting with the department chair or the department 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 their appointment type, the annual performance and merit review of faculty members is based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. The review of faculty with budgeted joint appointments must include input from the joint appointment TIU head for every annual evaluation cycle. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on goals specific to the individual in the joint unit. Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. High quality and collegial performance in these areas is an essential component of meritorious performance.

The time frame for assessing performance will be the previous calendar year for teaching and service and the previous 5 calendar years for research and scholarly activities, with attention to patterns of increasing or decreasing productivity in the context of longer time frames.

Annual review letters should not merely be descriptive summaries of activities but should evaluate performance in relation to the unit's mission and the faculty member's assigned workload and previously articulated goals and expectations for the year. The annual review should also describe, when appropriate, actions the unit or its head will undertake to support the faculty member in achieving goals. When relevant, annual review letters should recognize engagement with partners beyond the university, which may take the form of research/creative work, teaching, or service. Department chairs may also comment upon and/or recognize ways in which individual faculty members exemplify and reinforce the university's shared values, including creating unit cultures that are welcoming, supportive

and characterized by civility and mutual respect. The full range of activities assigned to a faculty member should be formally recognized and, when done well, rewarded.

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

## **A Documentation**

The goal of the annual review is to provide a balanced assessment of the performance of the faculty member. Documentation should be prepared with this end in mind. 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.

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to the department chair no later than a date specified by him/her/them:

- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)
- Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#) (*required for probationary faculty*) and Annual Activities report (*probationary and non-probationary faculty*), which includes the following content. The report is to follow the format requested by the chair:
  1. Teaching
    - Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught for which SEI reports are generated
    - Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation or teaching program (details provided in section IX.B of this document)
    - Other relevant documentation of teaching, as appropriate
  2. Scholarship
    - A listing of all scholarly papers published or accepted for publication
    - Documentation of grants and contracts received as well as all activities related to entrepreneurial work with business entities
    - Other relevant documentation of scholarship as appropriate, including a listing of grants and contract proposals that have been submitted
  3. Service
    - Any available documentation of the quality of the service that enhances the list of service activities in the annual report.

The purpose of these documents is to provide information for the review, and so they should be written in an unbiased fashion, covering both positive and negative aspects of performance, and avoiding “spin”. The chair may, at his/her/their discretion, request additional information.

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

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the department chair based on information provided by the candidate (see required documentation above) and by the eligible faculty during annual review meetings held as part of the annual review process. The chair meets with every probationary tenure-track faculty member to discuss performance, future goals and plans. The chair shall provide the faculty member and the divisional dean with a written assessment of the faculty member’s performance and professional development and a recommendation as to whether the faculty member will be re-appointed for an additional year. The assessment should include both strengths and weaknesses, and should provide suggestions for improvement of performance, as appropriate.

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

If either the department chair or the dean recommends nonrenewal of a faculty member's probationary contract, the case will be referred to the college's Promotion and Tenure Committee, which will review the case, vote and make a recommendation to the dean. 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. While not on leave, 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 eligible faculty for associate professor promotion reviews, who comment on the faculty member's performance in relation to department and individual goals and on progress toward promotion. This review includes a recommendation by the eligible faculty that is one of the following: (a) a promotion review for possible promotion to professor should occur in the next academic year; (b) no action at this time. The recommendation will be made on the basis of a vote by the eligible faculty. If a majority of votes are in favor of a promotion review, the recommendation is (a); if no more than  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the votes are in favor of a promotion review the recommendation is (b). The committee should provide to the chair a short written summary of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses relative to the criteria for promotion if the recommendation is for no action at this time in the sixth year in rank or thereafter whenever four years have elapsed since the last promotion review, up to a total of three written reports.

In accord with the college deadline, the chair conducts an independent assessment and prepares a written evaluation of their performance, documenting strengths, weaknesses, and providing suggestions for improvement of performance.

Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair, in conjunction with the Executive Advisory Committee, based on the annual report submitted by each professor. 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 (including 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.

If a faculty member has an administrative role, the impact of that role and other assignments will be considered in the annual review.

A written annual review by the chair based on these expectations is required. The written annual review will be placed in the personnel file of the faculty member. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review and the department chair may respond in writing if warranted.

The chair or chair's designee will be available to meet with the faculty member.

#### **D Teaching and Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

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

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

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 contract. 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 that faculty member's 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 multiple year 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 annually according to the process established on that campus, with a focus on teaching and service. Following the review by the regional campus, the regional campus dean meets with the department chair for evaluation of the faculty member's research and creative activity during the review period. The regional campus dean provides an annual performance and merit review letter. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice. For probationary tenure-track faculty, in the event that the regional campus dean

recommends renewal and the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the case shall be reviewed by the college dean or their designee, with the college dean's or their designee's judgment prevailing.

The annual performance and merit review of regional campus teaching and professional practice faculty is conducted on the regional campus. The dean/director will provide the department chair a copy of a teaching or professional practice faculty member's annual performance and merit review letter.

The annual performance and merit review of regional campus associated faculty is conducted entirely on the regional campus, with the review focusing on teaching and service, as applicable.

## **G Salary Recommendations**

The department chair makes annual salary recommendations to the dean, who may modify them. 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 assuring, to the extent possible given financial constraints, 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. The time frame for assessing performance will be the 12 previous months for teaching and service and the previous 36 months for research and scholarly activities, with attention to patterns of increasing or decreasing productivity in the context of longer time frames. Faculty with high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

In formulating recommendations, the department chair consults with the department Executive Advisory Committee. As a general approach to formulating merit-based salary recommendations, the department chair divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory). Salary recommendations should generally be informed by productivity group, but faculty in the same group need not receive the same recommended percentage or dollar increase.

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.

The department chair should proactively engage in equity audits of faculty salary to evaluate whether faculty salaries are commensurate both within the department and across the field. The department chair should advocate with the Divisional Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences for salary adjustments based upon these considerations.

The department recognizes that the value a faculty member brings to the department, college and university, involves career-long contributions. These contributions may not be reflected in the ability of the faculty member to attract an external offer or in the terms of such an offer. This is especially true for service at the departmental level, for collegiality, and for dedication to teaching. At the same time, the department understands that the premium in salaries at research universities (compared to universities with lesser research orientation) flows from their position as a research university and the continuing research contributions of their faculty. Salaries should reflect the entirety of a faculty member's contributions while respecting The Ohio State University's role as the flagship research university in the state.

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. It is recognized that these positive attributes characterize the ability of a faculty member to effectively contribute to exemplary scholarship, teaching and service. A commitment to these values and principles can be demonstrated by constructive responses to and participation in department affairs. Examples include participation in faculty governance, activities related to the University's [Shared Values](#), outreach and service, ethical behavior, adherence to principles of responsible conduct of research, constructive conduct and behavior during the discharge of duties, responsibilities and authority, and the exercise of rights and privileges of a member of the faculty as reflected in the "Statement on Professional Ethics" of the American Association of University Professors.

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

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

The content below is provided to demonstrate the types of criteria and evidence that may support promotion to associate professor with tenure in this department.

TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met Include
Candidates must demonstrate their skill as a teacher and their effectiveness as an educator. They must also meet all other criteria in teaching listed in this table. Excellence in teaching cannot, by itself, merit departmental approval for tenure candidacy, tenure, promotion, or promotion and tenure, without achievement in research and scholarly work and service. Poor teaching may provide a basis for denial of tenure.	<p>Candidates may be asked to submit documentation of their teaching and educational efforts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer evaluation of teaching by colleagues in the department. All formal evaluative letters received must be submitted. Formative assessments are not to be submitted.</li> <li>• Formal instruments that measure student satisfaction with teaching, such as the numerical scores on the SEI. The department notes its concurrence with the 2023 ASC Senate Report on Evaluation of Teaching in the College of Arts and Sciences conclusions that the SEI format at that time does not provide an accurate, unbiased assessment of the quality of many aspects of teaching.</li> <li>• A listing of awards and special recognition received for teaching. Teaching awards will be viewed as strong evidence of quality.</li> </ul>
Demonstrated a commitment to continual improvement of teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documented participation in programming of the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning.</li> <li>• Awarded "Endorsement" from Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning.</li> <li>• Documented development of professional competence through activities connected to the Statistical Education and Data Science community.</li> <li>• Demonstrated engagement with and response to peer evaluators within the department, as documented in teaching narratives, annual review letters, or other internal evaluations solicited by the chair at the candidate's request and included in the dossier for which a candidate has had an opportunity to provide a written response.</li> <li>• Demonstrated engagement with and response to in-depth consultation with staff at the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning, Office of Technology and Digital Innovation, College of Arts and Sciences Office of Distance Education, or similar instruction-oriented units at Ohio State.</li> </ul>

Demonstrated engagement with teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developed new courses or curricula, if appropriate.</li> <li>Developed novel and effective techniques of instruction and new instructional materials.</li> <li>Published research on pedagogy. (Note this may in some cases also be evidence of scholarship.)</li> <li>Coordinated courses and/or improved courses.</li> <li>Supervised research experiences for undergraduates.</li> <li>Participated in the development of new degree programs within the department or the revision of existing degree programs.</li> <li>Participated in the development or revision of degree programs at Ohio State but outside the department.</li> <li>Had a positive impact on others' teaching, as described in annual review letters or in other internal evaluations solicited by the chair at the candidate's request and included in the dossier for which a candidate has had an opportunity to provide a written response.</li> </ul>
Demonstrated engagement with graduate students outside of traditional courses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Directed reading courses for graduate students.</li> <li>Served as a committee member on PhD candidacy examinations.</li> <li>Served as a committee member (distinct from external representative) on PhD defenses.</li> <li>Provided high quality advising of thesis or dissertation research. (The department welcomes but does not expect a candidate to have advised or be advising a PhD student for a successful tenure case).</li> </ul>

<b>SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met Include</b>
Candidates must have produced a substantial body of high-quality work that has appeared in reputable journals and high-quality refereed conference proceedings to establish their reputation as a productive scholar in the field of Statistics and to place them on the path toward becoming a leading scholar in the field. They must also meet all other criteria in scholarship listed in this table. Excellence in scholarship cannot, by itself, merit departmental approval for tenure candidacy, tenure, promotion, or promotion and tenure, without achievement in teaching and service. Not meeting criteria in research/scholarship may provide a basis for denial of tenure.	<p>Candidates may be asked to submit a copy of publications and unpublished manuscripts. For joint work, they may be asked to provide a very brief narrative description of their contributions. The committee and the chair will consider both published and as-yet-unpublished work in their assessment of scholarship. Because of the wide range of applications in statistics, research papers may appear in very diverse journals that may not be formally categorized as "statistics". The kind, scope, and quality of published and unpublished work is considered, with emphasis on the statistical contributions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Publication of research-based manuscripts.</li> <li>Publication of books and review manuscripts provided that a scholarly synthesis of information has been accomplished.</li> <li>Creation and dissemination of innovative algorithms and software.</li> <li>For joint work, the contributions of the candidate will be considered. Consideration will not be limited to a "percent contribution".</li> <li>The first-hand judgement of committee members and chair on the kind, scope and quality of published and unpublished work.</li> <li>The expert opinions of external reviewers on the candidate and their work, as evidenced by their letters.</li> </ul>

Demonstrated a burgeoning national / international reputation in the field	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Invitations to present original research at colloquia or seminars at colleges and universities (Ohio State excluded).</li> <li>Oral presentations and participation in panels or symposia at research conventions.</li> <li>Prizes and awards for the candidate's scholarship.</li> <li>Grants and fellowships from academic, governmental, non-profit or corporate research groups (obtaining grants and contracts for funded research is considered evidence of innovative research and good professional standing, but having obtained funding for research is not an expected part of a successful tenure case).</li> <li>Engagement with business entrepreneurship, including invention disclosures, patents, startup companies, and other business ventures.</li> </ul>
Demonstrated a high degree of ethics in the conduct of research and ethical treatment of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The first-hand judgement of members of the eligible faculty and/or the chair as documented in annual review letters or other internal evaluations solicited by the chair at the candidate's request and included in the dossier for which the candidate has had an opportunity to respond.</li> <li>A finding of research misconduct or abusive behavior would constitute evidence in conflict with this criterion.</li> </ul>

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met Include
Candidates must demonstrate a commitment to service to the department and to the profession. They must also meet all other criteria in service listed in this table. Excellence in service cannot, by itself, merit departmental approval for tenure candidacy, tenure, promotion, or promotion and tenure, without achievement in teaching and scholarship. Not meeting criteria in service may provide a basis for denial of tenure.	<p>Candidates may be asked to submit evidence of their participation in service activities. Expectations for service for promotion to associate professor with tenure are modest, as visibility in the profession comes with time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The primary assessment of effectiveness of service on departmental committees will be the judgement of colleagues.</li> <li>The quality of service may be judged through solicited or unsolicited letters from those who have been served.</li> <li>Long-term, quality service in a difficult, time-consuming post, and unusual or difficult administrative or other services assignments carried out with distinction may indicate extraordinary impact of service.</li> <li>Voluntary activities that bring tangible benefits to the students, the faculty, the department, or the university in general.</li> <li>Activities recognized by service awards or honors</li> </ul>
Demonstrated effective service to the department / college / university	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective service on department committees or in other tasks to which the candidate has been assigned</li> <li>Coordination of departmental and/or interdisciplinary programs and courses</li> <li>Advising undergraduate and master's students. Note that depending on the nature of the advising relationship, this may also be considered as evidence in meeting teaching criteria.</li> <li>Effective service on college and university committees, including ad-hoc committees as documented in annual review letters or other letters of internal evaluation solicited by the chair at the candidate's request to which the candidate has had an opportunity to respond and which are included in the dossier.</li> </ul>

Demonstrated professional service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serving as a referee for papers submitted to reputable journals or as a reviewer of grant proposals.</li> <li>• Serving as a reviewer for refereed conference presentations and/or proceedings.</li> <li>• Serving on an editorial board for a reputable journal.</li> <li>• Serving as an elected or appointed officer in a professional organization, or on a committee in such an organization.</li> <li>• Service to government, corporate, or non-profit organizations for advice on professional matters or as a member of a scientific committee.</li> <li>• Organization of conferences or symposia.</li> <li>• Engagement in consulting with academic, corporate, governmental, or non-profit organizations.</li> </ul>
-----------------------------------	---

## **2 Tenure of Probationary Associate Professor without Tenure**

Evaluation of teaching, research, and service are based on the criteria described for use in evaluating probationary assistant professors, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered. Outside letters are solicited as part of the evaluation. As this decision is made after only a brief probationary period, the evaluations will be in part based on research and professional service completed before the candidate joined the department. The candidate may speak about prior teaching experience in his/her/their teaching statement, but the teaching record put forward in the dossier should be based on experience at Ohio State.

## **3 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. An essential criterion for promotion to the rank of professor in the Department of Statistics is a distinguished record that convinces the eligible faculty that such activity shall continue.

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.*

Evaluation of teaching, research and service is based on the criteria described for use in evaluating probationary tenure-track assistant and associate professors. Performance in these areas is, however, required to reflect a mature status with documented excellence in teaching, and an established international reputation in research. Active direction of Ph.D. theses will be considered as an important factor in determining whether criteria in teaching have been met at this level. Attracting and graduating an above average number of Ph.D. students may indicate that a faculty member has a special talent in training students. The case would further be strengthened by the extent to which these students complete degrees in a timely manner. Of special importance is the quality of the positions these students obtain and the impact they have on the profession. Scholarly contributions will be evaluated by leading national and international experts in the appropriate fields.

In addition, a department faculty member who is ready for promotion to professor should serve as a role model for fellow faculty, for students, and for the profession.

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

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. In reviewing promotion from associate professor to professor, the department will be receptive to cases in which the faculty member has demonstrated excellence in teaching or in areas of scholarship outside traditional original research. Correspondingly less weight will be placed on original research. For a faculty member to be promoted under such conditions, the contributions in other areas must be substantial, sustained, and of high quality, as demonstrated, for example, by recognitions at the university and/or national levels. For promotion based on excellence in teaching, development and implementation of innovative and more effective approaches to instruction would be helpful in making the case, as well as evidence for above average contributions to the department's teaching mission. Positive contributions in original research will play a more limited, but not negligible, role in the evaluation.

#### **4 Teaching and Professional Practice Faculty**

Decisions regarding promotion of teaching and professional practice faculty will reflect differences in their assigned workload distribution and duties. As examples, the evaluation of a faculty member whose duties emphasize consulting will give heavier weight to success as a consultant, to training our graduate students, and to administrative duties associated with the consulting service. The evaluation of a faculty member whose duties emphasize teaching will give heavier weight to performance in the classroom and to creative work that makes contributions to education in statistics and data science.

**Promotion to Assistant Teaching Professor or Professional Practice Assistant Professor.** Promotion to assistant teaching professor or professional practice assistant professor requires that a faculty member has completed his/her/their doctoral degree in statistics or a related field or has equivalent experience and is performing satisfactorily in teaching, professional practice, and service. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

**Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor or Professional Practice Associate Professor.** Promotion to associate teaching professor or professional practice associate professor requires that a faculty member has completed their doctoral degree in statistics or a related field or has equivalent experience, shows convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service; has a documented high level of competence in professional practice; and displays the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of this department. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to associate teaching professor or professional practice associate 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 or Professional Practice Professor.** Promotion to teaching professor or professional practice professor requires that a faculty member has a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching and/or practicum supervision 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.

## 5 Associated Faculty

**Promotion to Adjunct Associate Professor and Adjunct Professor.** The relevant criteria for the promotion of adjunct faculty members shall be the same as those for the promotion of tenure-track, teaching, or professional practice faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, above. The weight given to specific criteria may vary depending on differences in duties, as explained below.

**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. The weight given to specific criteria may vary depending on differences in duties, as explained below.

**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.3.

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

Decisions regarding promotion of associated faculty will reflect differences in their duties. As examples, the evaluation of associated faculty whose duties emphasize consulting will give heavier weight to success as a consultant, to training our graduate students, and to administrative duties associated with the consulting service. The evaluation of associated faculty whose duties emphasize teaching will give heavier weight to performance in the classroom and to creative work that makes contributions to statistical education.

## 6 Regional Campus Faculty

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

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

## B Procedures

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

### 1 Tenure-Track, Teaching, and Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus

#### Initiation of the promotion review procedure.

- **Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty.** Ordinarily, preparations for a mandatory review begin in the spring semester of the year prior to the review (e.g., the spring semester prior to an assistant professor's fifth year of service).

Review for tenure and promotion prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Committee of Eligible Faculty determines such a review to be appropriate. A faculty member may ask to be considered for nonmandatory tenure and promotion at any time. Alternatively, the faculty member's mentors may request a nonmandatory promotion and tenure review and the Committee of Eligible Faculty may consider such a request if the candidate agrees. The decision as to whether a nonmandatory promotion review will be initiated is made on the basis of a vote by the eligible faculty. If 2/3 or more votes are in favor of a promotion review, then the promotion review will commence. However, the departmental eligible faculty may decline to forward a faculty member for non-mandatory promotion and tenure review or promotion review if the candidate's accomplishments are judged not to warrant such review. If no more than 2/3 of the eligible faculty votes are in favor of a promotion review, then no nonmandatory promotion review will take place.

- **Tenured and Nonprobationary and Teaching/Professional Practice Faculty.** Consideration for the initiation of a promotion review for a tenured or nonprobationary teaching/professional practice faculty member ('the candidate') begins in one of the following ways. (1) At the annual review meeting in which the candidate's record is discussed. (2) At the written request of the candidate. A faculty member may ask to be considered for a promotion review at any time, up to once per year. The eligible faculty may decline to put forward a faculty member if the candidate's accomplishments are judged not to warrant a promotion review; however, the eligible faculty may

deny a tenured or nonprobationary teaching/professional practice faculty member a promotion review only once.

## **a Candidate Responsibilities**

Candidates are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with the Office of Academic Affairs guidelines. Candidates are to submit 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 providing a short list of potential evaluators. 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 eligible faculty makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by him/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 nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion 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 if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

Teaching documentation may include:

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

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 (for tenured or nonprobationary faculty) 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.

Scholarship documentation might include:

- copies of all books, articles, and scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions beyond copyediting needed.
- documentation of grants and contracts received
- other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably or unfavorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted)
- scholarship activities as listed in the core dossier including
  - documentation of creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus including artwork, choreography, collections, compositions, curated exhibits, moving images, multimedia, performances, radio, recitals, recordings, television, and websites
  - documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options and commercial licenses
  - list of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work

The time period for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or 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 if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

Service documentation might include:

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

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

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

Candidates must indicate the APT 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 and professional practice 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, a list of potential external evaluators is created with the following process. The candidate provides a short list of potential evaluators (typically four to eight names) to the department chair in a sealed envelope. The names are not revealed until later in the process. If the candidate is concerned about a potential lack of objectivity of certain potential evaluators, he/she/they may convey the names of up to two individuals to the mentors. These conflicted individuals will not be asked to provide evaluations. The department chair and the eligible faculty then meet and develop a list of potential external evaluators. Once this list is developed, the candidate's envelope is opened. The department's list may be supplemented with no more than three names from the candidate's list.

During the summer prior to the year of promotion review with external evaluations, candidates are asked to submit a current version of their curriculum vitae and samples of scholarly documents, both published and in formal preprint form (either submitted for consideration for publication or publicly available on a preprint repository). These documents are provided to external evaluators for their review and convenience, typically in electronic format.

## **b Eligible Faculty Responsibilities**

The responsibilities of the eligible faculty are as follows:

- To review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
  - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
  - A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)(3) only once. Faculty Rules [3335-7-08](#) and [3335-7-36](#) make the same provision for nonprobationary teaching and professional practice 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 eligible faculty to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
  - **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee, nor should it be one of the candidate's mentors. 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.
  - 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.
  - Review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
  - Attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance or when recusing oneself due to conflict of interest; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote. The recommendation of eligible faculty to the chair will be made by secret ballot at or shortly after its decision-making meeting. Members of the eligible faculty who have been present for the entirety of the decision-making meeting may vote. A member of the eligible faculty who has not been present for the entirety of the meeting may not vote.

Following the meeting of the eligible faculty, prepare a written report of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship, and service, including a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting and a report of the faculty vote. The report, when approved by the eligible faculty, constitutes the recommendation of the eligible faculty, and is delivered as a letter to the department chair.

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

- The committee chair has the following additional responsibilities:
  - To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty, ideally at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed. It is acceptable to make the dossier available in electronic form.
  - 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. A faculty member from the department with a conflict of interest in the case of a particular candidate (see Section III.A.4), even though otherwise a member of the eligible faculty, is not eligible to participate in the faculty deliberations on promotion and tenure for that case.

### **c Department Chair Responsibilities**

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. For tenure-track assistant professors, the department chair is 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/Early Summer:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the eligible faculty, the department chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- **Late Summer/Early Autumn:** 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 and from other appropriate sources outside the department identified in consultation with the committee of eligible faculty. 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 charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To call meetings of the eligible faculty at which reappointment, promotion and tenure decisions are discussed, announcing the date, time and location at least one week in advance. Faculty attendance by teleconference or videoconference is permitted. The meeting should be scheduled at a time when the candidate's mentors or their designated representatives (with approval of the candidate) can be present. If a mentor is unexpectedly unable to attend, the chair may choose to reschedule the meeting at their discretion.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the

department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.

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

To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations that depart from the recommendation of the committee. The chair departs from the recommendation of the eligible faculty by (1) recommending for promotion or tenure a candidate receiving a less than 2/3 favorable vote or by (2) failing to recommend for promotion or tenure a candidate receiving at least a 2/3 favorable vote. The 2/3 requirement is met when the number of favorable votes meets or exceeds twice the total of opposition votes.

- To, in a timely manner, 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;
  - of the availability for review of letters from the external evaluators, should the candidate choose to review the letters; and
  - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten calendar days from the 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 the candidate with access to any part of the dossier compiled prior to submission to the college, including external evaluator letters. The candidate may waive the right to a copy of the completed dossier; alternatively, the candidate may exercise this right without prejudice.
- 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, following the process outlined in the [Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, Chapter 3 Section 5](#), reconvene the eligible faculty to consider significant new information or address procedural errors.
- To receive the eligible faculty's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the head of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

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

Adjunct faculty and associated faculty with tenure-track titles for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed in Section VI.B.1 above, with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is negative (a

negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases), and does not proceed to the executive vice president and provost if the dean's recommendation is negative.

The department may or may not request letters of evaluation from persons outside the university. The decision to seek external evaluations for an associated faculty member will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the eligible faculty.

### **3 Regional Campus Faculty**

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

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

Regional campus teaching and professional practice faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. Following the review, the dean/director 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/director. The decision of the regional campus dean/director is final.

In all cases, teaching and service on the Columbus Campus are evaluated by the department and the department chair.

### **4 External Evaluations**

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

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

employment in the same institution within the past 12 months, or those who are being considered for employment at that institution.

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

- Is written by a person at an appropriate peer or aspirational institution. In keeping with college guidelines, the department will generally obtain evaluations from faculty at R01 institutions that are members of the Association of American Universities (AAU) or the Big Ten Academic Alliance or from peer or near-peer institutions to include any institution listed among the top 50 statistics programs in the most recent Shanghai Ranking. Justification will be provided in each case in which a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists. Peer reviewers from other institutions, including universities outside of North America and liberal arts colleges, may be suggested in cases where the external reviewer is 1) a distinguished expert in the field, as indicated by publications; national and international awards; prominence in professional organizations; fellow of a major professional society; recipient of a major professional society award; or presence on editorial boards of major journals; 2) is nationally or internationally known in a field outside of statistical science 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 scholar whose primary appointment is not at 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, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will typically solicit evaluations only from professors with institutional affiliations predominately in the programs listed above. Occasionally, the department will solicit, with approval from the college, an evaluation from researchers who hold a position in industry, government, or another research environment.
- 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 summer 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 eligible faculty, the department chair, and the candidate. All potential evaluators must be approved by the College of Arts and Sciences through the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. No written justification is required for tenured professors at peer or near peer institutions as defined above. If the potential evaluator is from an academic institution that is not clearly a peer or aspirational peer for Ohio State, or if the potential evaluator is from a nonacademic institution (e.g., a public policy think tank, a 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 that none of the person(s) suggested by the candidate agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

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

Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit external evaluations or initiate contact in any way with external evaluators for any purpose related to the promotion review. If an external evaluator should initiate contact with the candidate regarding the review, the candidate must inform the evaluator that such communication is inappropriate and report the occurrence to the department chair, who will decide what, if any, action is warranted (e.g., 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.

If an external evaluator should initiate contact with a member of the eligible faculty regarding the review, the eligible faculty member 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.

The chair will supply the chosen external evaluators with materials for the case and provide specific instructions about objectivity of evaluation in the letter of request. In addition, the chair shall also be responsible for obtaining letters from other units in which the candidate has an appointment or substantial professional involvement, whether compensated or not. The eligible faculty shall assist the chair in identifying appropriate internal evaluators.

The chair shall keep a strict record of all solicitations made for external reviews, including, where applicable and possible, the reasons given for declining to write a letter of evaluation. All solicited letters that are received must be included in the dossier. Unsolicited letters of evaluation or letters of evaluation solicited by anyone other than the chair may not be included in the dossier. This does not preclude the candidate's right to append supporting material as appropriate. 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 clinical/teaching/professional practice or research faculty, for securing a reappointment.

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule [3335-5-05](#).

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.

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

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

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

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

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

Annually the department chair appoints a selection of faculty to serve as peer reviewers. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute this service among the 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 for the review of assistant and associate professors.

The responsibilities of the peer review process are as follows:

- to review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and teaching/professional practice faculty and all 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. These should be provided by a minimum of three distinct colleagues.
- to review the teaching of tenured associate professors and nonprobationary assistant teaching professors, nonprobationary associate teaching professors, nonprobationary professional practice assistant professors, and nonprobationary professional practice associate professors at least once per year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a six year period and of having at least four peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion review.
- to review the teaching of tenured professors and nonprobationary teaching professors and nonprobationary professional practice professors at least once every other year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a six year period.
- to review, upon the department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.
- to review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the [Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#).

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

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations (the first three situations listed above) are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instruction materials. Faculty under review should provide peer reviewers with the course syllabus and other materials well in advance of the classroom visit or visits. They should also provide reviewers with a list of preferred visitation dates. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, the class visitation is conducted by one or more senior peers identified by the department chair. The peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to understand the goals of the course, teaching philosophy, and any challenges related to instruction including feedback from previous evaluations of teaching.

In observing the class and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should focus on such issues as appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the class visits, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give feedback and submits a written report to the department chair, copied to the candidate by the end of the semester of review. Written reports of peer evaluation of teaching should focus not only on classroom performance but also on curricular choices, implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and engagement with current disciplinary knowledge. For probationary faculty, the reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if desired. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier. 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.

## APPENDIX A: Faculty Mentoring

The Department of Statistics has a formal faculty mentoring system for all assistant professors, associate professors, assistant teaching professors, professional practice assistant professors, associate teaching professors, and professional practice associate professors.

Each year, the department chair assigns every such faculty member two mentors who hold a more senior rank at the time of the assignment. Mentors are to provide professional guidance regarding teaching, research, service and other professional development topics. All mentors are members of the eligible faculty for that faculty member's current role. Mentor assignments are typically loosely consistent from year to year so that mentors may become familiar with their mentees' goals and progress. However, mentors also change for several reasons such as a mentor or mentee's employment or rank change or faculty professional leave. Mentees may request a change of mentors at any time. In this case, the department chair will endeavor to assign mentors that are mutually amenable to the mentoring relationship.

Mentors have a responsibility for providing guidance to help junior faculty members understand how to thrive in their career, including building the skills needed for success and integrating into the professional community. As appropriate, mentors should provide advice about the development and refinement of effective research skills and strategies; learning the ropes of publishing and writing research proposals; developing and effectively delivering courses; training students in research as an advisor; becoming connected to professional societies and to research sub-communities; and finding a productive balance between research, teaching, and service. Newly hired faculty are encouraged to rely on their mentors as natural points of contact for any challenges, no matter how small or large. Mentors should initiate a synchronous meeting with their assistant rank and/or probationary tenure-track mentees at least twice every autumn and spring semester and with their other mentees at least once every autumn and spring semester. Mentors are also expected to respond to additional requests from their mentees as needed.

Mentors play a key formal role in the department's annual review process. Mentor responsibilities related to annual reviews include:

- Prior to the annual review meeting at which the mentee's case is discussed:
  - Reviewing the mentees' annual activity report materials (if they are provided by the mentee with sufficient lead time, ideally at least two weeks prior to the meeting).
  - Meeting with the mentee to discuss his/her/their annual activities, overall career progression relative to reappointment and/or promotion criteria, and annual activity report.
- At the annual review meeting at which the mentee's case is discussed:
  - Leading discussion about the mentee's teaching, service and scholarly activity relative to reappointment and/or promotion criteria.
- After the annual review meeting at which the mentee's case is discussed:
  - Meeting with the mentee to provide feedback from the committee relative to reappointment and/or promotion criteria.
  - Providing advice to mentees for setting priorities and/or goals for the following year.

Mentors also play a key role in the 4<sup>th</sup> year review and promotion processes for tenure-track faculty and the reappointment and promotion processes for teaching practice faculty. Mentor responsibilities related to these processes include:

- Prior to the discussion meeting:
  - Reviewing the candidate's dossier

- Meeting with the candidate to discuss his/her/their dossier and provide advice on revisions (if the dossier is provided by the mentee with sufficient lead time, ideally at least two weeks prior to the meeting)
- At the discussion meeting:
  - Presenting a prepared summary of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses relative to the reappointment and/or promotion criteria
- After the discussion meeting:
  - Providing the committee chair with draft language for the committee report to the chair

All faculty bear ultimate responsibility for their own productivity and career progression relative to reappointment and/or promotion criteria. Actual or perceived quality of mentoring does not alter the criteria for reappointment or promotion.

**APPENDIX B: Faculty Eligible to Vote on Appointment, Reappointment, Promotions, or Promotion and Tenure  
Reviews Definitions Visual Aid**

Position under consideration	TTF Assistant (and without tenure at other ranks)	TTF Associate (with tenure)	TTF Full (with tenure)	TPF Assistant (and probationary at other ranks)	TPF Associate (non-probationary)	TPF Full (non-probationary)
TTF - Initial Appointment*	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗
TTF – Associate Rank	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗
TTF – Full Rank	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗
TPF – Initial Appointment*	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
TPF – Associate Rank	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓
TPF – Full Rank	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓

\*Initial appointments are by default at Assistant rank. The eligible faculty for rank review for appointment as TTF or TPF associate professor or professor consists of the subset of the initial appointment faculty who are at or above the requested rank and who are non-probationary.

Key:

- TTF = Tenure Track Faculty
- TPF = Teaching and Professional Practice Faculty
- ✗ = Not a member of the eligible faculty
- ✓ = A member of the eligible faculty