Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures for The Ohio State University Department of Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies

Revision OAA Approved October 14, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PREAMBLE 3
II. DEPARTMENT MISSION 3
III. DEFINITIONS 3
A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty 3
1. Tenure Track Faculty 4
2. Teaching Faculty 4
3. Associated Faculty 4
4. Conflict of Interest 5
5. Minimum Composition 5
B. Promotion and Tenure Committee 6
C. Quorum 6
D. Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty 6
1. Appointment 6
2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion 6
IV. APPOINTMENTS 6
A. Criteria 6
1. Tenure Track Faculty 7
2. Teaching Faculty 8
3. Associated Faculty 9
4. Emeritus Faculty 9
5. Joint Appointments 9
6. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty 10
B. Procedures 10
1. Tenure Track Faculty 10
2. Teaching Faculty 12
3. Transfer from the Tenure Track 12
4. TIU Transfer 12
5. Associated Faculty 12
6. Joint Appointments 13
7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty 13
V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW 13
A. Documentation 14

B. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty 15
1. Fourth Year Review 15
2. Extension of the Tenure Clock 15
C. Tenured Faculty 16
D. Teaching Faculty 16
E. Associated Faculty 16
F. Salary Recommendations 17
VI. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS 17
A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion 18
1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure 18
2. Promotion to Professor 23
3. Teaching Faculty 24
4. Associated Faculty 24
B. Procedures 24
1. Tenure Track and Teaching Faculty 25
a. Candidate Responsibilities 25
b. Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities 28
c. Eligible Faculty Responsibilities 30
d. Department Chair Responsibilities 30
2. Procedures for Associated Faculty 31
3. External Evaluations 31
VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS 33
VIII. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS 33
IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING 33
A. Student Evaluation of Teaching 34
B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching 34
APPENDICES 36
A. Appendix A: Annual Review Template 36
B. Appendix B: Activity List for Faculty on Courtesy Appointments 40

I. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty; the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in 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 TIU 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 Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies (WGSS) is to generate new interdisciplinary forms of knowledge about the complex, globalized interplay of power and difference, especially as inflected by categories such as gender, sexuality, race, class, age, ability, nationality, and citizenship, across a vast array of contemporary and historical cultures. We foster multiple modes of intellectual inquiry, transformative pedagogies, public engagement and activism. We strive to enhance the Department's national and international leadership role in the growing field of women's, gender and sexuality studies through continued excellence in research, teaching and service.

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

III. DEFINITIONS

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

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.

- Letters regarding scholarship may be obtained from faculty jointly appointed in WGSS with the other department serving as TIU if a candidate for promotion and/or tenure asks that the department solicit such input. Chapter 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook Section 3.4.1.1.6 stipulates that any such letters are to be placed in the Additional Letters section of the dossier, noting that "Such letters may be particularly helpful in the case of candidates who are engaged in significant inter- or trans-disciplinary scholarship."

2. Teaching Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

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

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

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

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

3. Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- For the initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all teaching faculty in the department. Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by the eligible faculty (all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and all non-probationary teaching faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college dean

- For reappointments, the eligible faculty are all those with non-probationary teaching faculty titles and tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank than the candidate.

Promotion Reviews

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

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

4. Conflict of Interest

Search Committee Conflict of Interest

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

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

Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest

A member of the eligible faculty has a conflict of interest when the member is or has been to the candidate:

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

Such faculty members will be expected to withdraw from an appointment or promotion review of that candidate.

5. Minimum Composition

If 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 number of three faculty members can be reached.

B. Promotion and Tenure Committee

The department has a Promotion and Tenure Committee that assists the eligible faculty in managing the personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The committee consists of two tenured faculty members, with at least one professor. The committee's chair and membership are appointed by the department chair. The term of service is three years, with reappointment possible.

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

C. Quorum

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

D. Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters only "yes" and "no" votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to consider whether they are participating fully in the review process when abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter. Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted but participating fully in discussions and voting via remote two-way electronic connection are allowed.

1. Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive. If the top candidate receives more than half but less than two-thirds of the votes, the Chair in consultation with the Dean will decide whether to make an offer to the top- ranked candidate based on a simple majority. In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment TIU prior to his or her appointment.

2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast are positive. In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment department prior to his or her reappointment, promotion and/or tenure.

IV. APPOINTMENTS

A. Criteria

The WGSS 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 WGSS Department. Across all levels of appointment, the WGSS Department recognizes and values engaged scholarship and pedagogy across a range of community settings. No offer will be extended if the search process does not yield one or more candidates who would enhance the quality of the department. The search is either cancelled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

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

All faculty positions must be posted in Workday, the university's system of record for faculty and staff. A formal review and selection process, including interviews using pre-designed 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 that of assistant professor. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. Promotion to assistant professor occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year, or the appointment will not be renewed, and the third year is the terminal year of employment.

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

Assistant Professor: Minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of assistant professor include an earned terminal degree in an appropriate field of study, evidence of potential for scholarly productivity and the 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 manner. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the 7th year will be the final year of employment.

Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Promotion and Tenure Committee 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 or Professor and offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

Appointment at the rank of associate professor normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at the rank of associate professor is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of

the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

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

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

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

2. Teaching Faculty

Teaching faculty are fixed-term contract appointments that do not entail tenure but provide a career path for our best non-tenure track faculty that enhances the ability of the college to attract and retain the most qualified individuals for these positions. Teaching faculty may apply for M status to serve on MA exam committees when a relevant situation arises. However, they should not be asked to serve regularly on exam committees as this is not part of their appointment workload. Teaching faculty will not serve as advisors to doctoral students.

Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all other teaching faculty members must be for a period of five years. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for assistant and associate teaching professors must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for teaching professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. These extended appointments are not probationary, and the individual may only be terminated for cause (see rule 3335-5-04 of the Administrative Code) or financial exigency (see rule 3335-5-02.1 of the Administrative Code).

Tenure is not granted to teaching faculty. 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 WGSS department supports Teaching Faculty. These appointments exist for faculty members who focus principally on the education needs of students in WGSS. Teaching Faculty members are expected to contribute to the department's research and education mission as reflected in undergraduate and graduate program development and teaching. Teaching Faculty appointments are made in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-7. Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the department.

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

Assistant Teaching Professor: An earned terminal degree or equivalent experience is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor of teaching. Evidence of ability to teach is required.

Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor: Appointment at the rank of associate professor of teaching or professor of teaching requires that the individual have an earned terminal degree or equivalent experience, evidence of excellent teaching, and requires production and dissemination of scholarly materials

pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. Such an individual must meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria—in teaching, service, and scholarship—for promotion to these ranks.

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.

a. 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 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.

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

c. 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. Emeritus Faculty

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

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the department chair 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. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule 3335-5-04, emeritus status will not be considered.

5. Joint Appointments

Joint appointments are created to leverage a faculty member's unique expertise to advance the mission areas of the academic units involved and promote cross-disciplinary collaboration. To establish a joint faculty appointment, a memorandum of understanding (MOU) is developed by all affected TIUs, centers, and/or institutes. The MOU will clearly define the distribution of the faculty member's time commitment to the different units. The MOU will also state the sources of compensation directed to the faculty member, distribution of resources, the planned acknowledgement of the academic units in publications, the manner in

which credit for any grant funding will be attributed to the different units, and the distribution of grant funds among the appointing units. Unless other arrangements are specified in the MOU, the TIU in which the faculty member's FTE is greater than 50% will be considered that faculty member's TIU. Joint-appointed faculty may vote on promotion and tenure cases only in their TIU.

6. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

The active academic involvement in this department by a tenure-track or teaching faculty member from another unit at Ohio State may warrant the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in this department. Faculty with a courtesy appointment are expected to contribute substantially to the Department's mission by directly supporting the various scholarly, pedagogical, and service commitments of WGSS. (See Appendix B for detailed examples and process for review.) A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized. The department unofficially refers to faculty with courtesy appointments as affiliated faculty.

B. Procedures

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, teaching and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the SHIFT Framework for faculty recruitment. All faculty positions must be posted in Workday, the university's system of record for faculty and staff. A formal review and selection process, including interviews using pre-designed evaluation rubrics, is required for all positions is required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in Workday to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

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

- recruitment of tenure-track, teaching, 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

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

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

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

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

a. "**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 engagement. This section also includes ideas and resources for developing qualified, talent pools to ensure alignment with Equal Employment Opportunity requirements and advance the eminence of the institution.

b. "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.

c. "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.

d. "**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.

e. "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.

f. "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.

The search committee presents its recommendation concerning which of the viable candidates (assuming there are more than one) should be offered the position first; which, second; and so on. The faculty then votes on whether it would like to offer the position to the search committee's first choice. A simple majority decides the question. If a majority of the faculty supports this first candidate, the faculty then votes on whether it would like to extend the offer to the search committee's second choice if the first candidate declines; and so on.

If a majority of the faculty does not support offering the position first to the search committee's first choice, it then votes on whether it would like to extend the offer first to the second viable candidate (if there is one) instead. The procedure is repeated a third time if a majority does not support making the offer to the second candidate and there is a third viable candidate. The results of these votes will inform the search committee's

recommendations to the department chair, and the chair decides which candidate to approach first. If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank for each viable candidate. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The search committee reports the results of these votes 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 or professor and/or offers of prior service credit require approval of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs.

The department chair must discuss the details of the offer, including compensation with the divisional dean and receive approval before extending an offer. The Department will discuss potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status with the Office of International Affairs. An MOU must be signed by faculty eligible for tenured positions who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees.

2. Teaching Faculty

Searches for teaching faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the interviews will prioritize issues in teaching or professional practice.

3. Transfer from the Tenure Track

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

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

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

4. TIU Transfer

Tenure-track 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

The appointment of compensated associated faculty members follows a formal search following the SHIFT Framework, which includes a job posting in Workday (see Section IV.B above) and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the department chair based on a recommendation from the search committee.

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. Joint Appointments

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

Approval of the joint appointment by the Office of Academic Affairs and the College of Arts and Sciences 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.

7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Tenure-track faculty from other units who wish to have a courtesy appointment in WGSS must apply or be nominated by WGSS faculty or by the Graduate Studies Committee for their formalized relationship to the Department. The Graduate Studies Committee screens candidates for courtesy appointments and presents their nominations to the core faculty for a vote. A two-thirds vote of the faculty constitutes approval of the nominee for membership. The department chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW

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

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

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

The department chair may designate the responsibility for annual performance and merit reviews to appropriate unit administrators. The designee or a subcommittee of the eligible faculty may provide a written assessment to the department chair. However, unless the Office of Academic Affairs has granted an exception to a large unit, 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 a faculty member's appointment type, the review is based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and 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. Engaged scholarship and teaching with communities beyond campus are recognized and valued aspects of the faculty member's dossier.
- The review of faculty with budgeted joint appointments must include input from the joint appointment TIU head for every annual evaluation cycle. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on goals specific to the individual in the joint unit.
- Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.
- The 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.

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

A. Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to the department chair no later than March 15:

- Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, (required for probationary faculty) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (non-probationary faculty)

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

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

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

B. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

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

For annual review, the Department Chair will ask the Promotion and Tenure Committee to evaluate all members of the probationary faculty and make a recommendation regarding reappointment. If the Department Chair then 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 divisional dean and to the dean of the college. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the written comments, if provided).

If the Department Chair recommends nonrenewal, the dean, in consultation with the divisional dean makes the final decision about the appointment by invoking the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-03). Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

1. Fourth Year Review

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

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

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

The eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department chair, who conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the departmental 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 exclude time from the probationary period. Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (E) does likewise for reducing the probationary period. A faculty member remains on duty regardless of extensions or reductions to the probationary period, and annual reviews are conducted in every probationary year regardless of time extended or reduced. Approved extensions or reductions do not limit the department's right to recommend nonrenewal of an appointment during an annual review.

C. Tenured Faculty

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the department chair or designee who meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review and the department chair may reply in writing if warranted.

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

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

D. Teaching Faculty

The annual performance and merit review process for teaching probationary and non-probationary faculty is identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty respectively, except that non-probationary teaching faculty may participate in the review of teaching faculty of lower rank. In the penultimate contract year of a teaching faculty member's appointment, the department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 must be observed.

E. Associated Faculty

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals.

The department chair's 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 or her performance, future plans, and goals. No later than October 15 of the final year of the appointment, the department chair will decide whether to reappoint. The department chair's decision on reappointment is

final.

F. Salary Recommendations

The department chair makes annual salary recommendations to the divisional dean, who may modify them. 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 recommendations are based on the current annual performance and merit review as well as on the performance and merit reviews of the preceding 36 months. 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 Chair of the Promotion & Tenure Committee. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the department chair divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) and considers market and internal equity issues. The WGSS Department has developed a document, Criteria for Allocation of Salary Increases (see Appendix A), which is used by the P&T Committee and the Department Chair to provide a numerical score for each faculty member annually. The Department Chair will use this tool to make recommendations regarding salary increases. Faculty members may request to see the final score of their annual report, as determined by the Chair in consultation with the Chair of the P&T Committee. The department chair should also proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in it. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

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

Faculty who fails 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.

One of the primary objectives of the WGSS Department is to generate and communicate new knowledges, practices, and creative endeavors. Publication of articles in refereed journals and of books with reputable academic presses remains one route for tenure and promotion. New forms of scholarly research, new forms of publication and distribution of knowledge, and new understandings of the complex interactions among scholars and publics require that departments begin to expand criteria for promotion. Public-facing, digital,

community engaged, and practice-based scholarship and creative expression, as well as advocacy and activist projects, are among the innovations that have become increasingly important means of producing new knowledge.

The department recognizes that research, teaching, and service are often complementary and overlapping with one another, and that different kinds of scholarly and interdisciplinary engagement with various audiences should become part of any assessment of tenure and promotion.

A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

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

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

This department is committed to assessing the practice of these values and principles as part of all performance evaluations. Except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increase, all funds for annual salary increases will be directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and the active promotion of an enriching working and learning environment through collegiality, civility, and openness to diverse ideas and opinions.

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.*

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

Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Excellence in both research and teaching constitutes the most important criterion for promotion and tenure. While it is recognized that some faculty are stronger in one area than the other, there nonetheless must be a balance between the two areas. Extraordinary teaching cannot compensate for a poor record in publication and extraordinary research cannot compensate for poor teaching.

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.

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

Consistent with these guidelines, promotion to associate professor with tenure in the College of Arts and Sciences requires excellence in both research/creative work and teaching. Evidence of service to the unit and the promise of excellence in service beyond the unit are desirable. Excellence in research/creative work means attainment of measurable national or international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of high-quality published research and/or other relevant creative endeavors. A successful candidate will have an emerging national reputation as a scholar or creative artist. Excellence in teaching means the provision to all students of the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning and, to the most capable and motivated students, an enhanced learning experience. Excellence in service means the provision of a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more publics – including the university, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations. The service contribution during the probationary period of assistant professors is limited by design. The most important judgment is that the candidate will achieve excellence in service in the future.

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

a. Scholarship

The candidate must show significant achievements that will have an impact on scholarly discussion and the ability to undertake sustained and continuing original work. The department has no quantitative measure which either bars or guarantees promotion to associate professor with tenure. In evaluating scholarship, considerations of quality and consistency of production will take precedence over those of quantity.

Scholarly excellence entails significant and original contributions to the field of Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies. This typically includes one or more of the following: contributions that offer new knowledge, contributions to feminist theory and epistemology; invention or exploration of new fields of inquiry; application of new concepts to traditional areas of research; and in general, any application or interpretation of concepts that advance understanding and knowledge in the study of women, gender and/or sexuality in a particular field.

Scholarship based on original research has primary importance as evidence of excellence.

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates must have:	Candidates may be asked to submit:
Candidate must have made significant and original contributions to the field of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies	• Books published or under board-approved final contract and in production at a university press or a press with a strong academic reputation that uses a rigorous peer review process. • Articles in leading refereed journals contributing, broadly, to women's, gender and sexuality studies scholarship. • Essays in collected volumes published by a university press or a press with a strong academic reputation that uses a rigorous peer review process.

	• Invited or juried group or solo exhibitions or performances in respected venues. • Individual, joint or collaborative curatorial projects; film productions; multimedia projects; or other forms of creative practice. • Publication of creative activities in peer reviewed venues. • New forms of publication and distribution of knowledge that may reflect new understandings of the complex interactions among scholars and publics including, but not limited to digital scholarship, community engaged scholarship, practice-based research, and initiatives in the area of public humanities. • Research awards and grants (internal and external) • Editorial work on special issues of journals or anthologies • Book reviews • Conference presentations • Other instances of scholarly achievement as listed in the core dossier
Candidate must have attained national or international recognition for their scholarship	• Recognition by external reviewers that the scholarship and/or creative activity has made a substantial contribution to the field of Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies, broadly defined • Quality (reputation) of venues where creative scholarship is performed, published, exhibited, or projected. • Impact and reception of projects across relevant professions and communities. • Invited talks or keynote presentations at symposia, conferences, research institutes, museums, or other venues relevant to the candidate's research and/or creative activity

b. Teaching

The candidate must have demonstrated excellence as a teacher of graduates and undergraduates.

Evaluation of a candidate's performance as a teacher will be based on the widest possible range of evidence. It will include (1) evidence solicited by the Department Chair or by the Chair of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure, and (2) evidence offered by the candidate.

TEACHING	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates must have:	Candidates may be asked to submit:

Demonstrated excellence as a teacher of graduates and undergraduates	• Student evaluations for all courses for all the probationary years or, in the case of promotion from associate to full professor, student evaluations for courses taught since the last promotion or the previous five years, whichever is less. For all courses taught, both SEIs and discursive student evaluations are required. • Detailed written evaluations of teaching based on classroom visitations by colleagues, including senior faculty members. These peer evaluations should also include a review of syllabi, exams, assignments, and other course material. • Awards and formal recognition of teaching • Publication of teaching materials and articles on teaching techniques • Award of "Endorsement" from Drake Institute of Teaching and Learning • Presentations on pedagogy and teaching at institutions beyond Ohio State. • Teaching activities as listed in the core dossier including: graduate advising; involvement in graduate exams, theses, and dissertations; supervising undergraduate research • Mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers
Demonstrated continuing growth in pedagogical methods and practices	• Syllabi, exams, and course assignments for a representative selection of courses for the probationary years or, in the case of promotion from associate to full professor, for a representative sample of courses taught since the last promotion or in the last five years (whichever is less). The candidate may want to call attention to innovations, improvements, and adjustments made in courses over time. • Explanations or demonstrations of especially successful or innovative teaching techniques, including techniques that meet the needs of students from groups that are under-represented. • Descriptions of technical innovations and use of new technology in preparing course material, delivering information, setting learning tasks and evaluating performance • Completed Foundations, Impact Teaching through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning. • Completed Teaching at Ohio State through the Drake Institute for Teaching and

	Learning. • Participation in continuing education on pedagogical practices or subject content • Creation of new courses or substantial revision to existing courses • Teaching activities listed in the core dossier that document continued growth in teaching practices

c. Service

A member of the WGSS Department at The Ohio State University has an obligation to use her/his/their talents to collaborate effectively with colleagues for the betterment of the Department, the University, and the larger community. A faculty member's profile of service may vary over time.

While the service contribution during the probationary period of assistant professors is limited by design, recognition should be given to scholarly service that a faculty member has been asked to perform or that which she/he/they initiated on behalf of scholarly organizations, the department, college, the university, or other forms of community service.

In evaluating service, the department considers the nature, extent, and impact of the faculty member's activities. Consideration is given to activities that enhance the department's mission to foster cooperation in research and teaching among Arts and Sciences faculty at the university. Strong consideration is also given to commitments that seek to promote and sustain initiatives related to the university's Shared Values, especially with regard to diversity, innovation, equity, and inclusion, whether inside the university or in community contexts. The WGSS Department also recognizes that some forms of community engaged scholarship may also appear as "service;" we strive to remain sufficiently flexible to account for these activities in both categories of endeavor. Overall, candidates are expected, at a minimum, to have demonstrated the potential for contributing service to the profession.

Types of documentation of service may include the number of committee meetings attended, specific projects undertaken, administrative responsibilities assumed, and individual, community or professional contributions. The Department Chair, the Committee or the candidate may solicit written assessments of a candidate's service from those who are in a position to provide them.

SERVICE	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidates must have:	Candidates may be asked to submit:
Demonstrated excellence in service to the WGSS department	• Documentation of committee service, which may include number of committee meetings attended, administrative responsibilities assumed, and specific projects undertaken • Written assessments of the candidate's service from those who are in a position to provide them • Annual evaluations that document excellent service to the department • Recognition (awards and prizes) for service to the department • Documentation of commitments to promote and

	sustain initiatives related to the university's Shared Values, especially with regard to diversity, innovation, equity, and inclusion. • Documentation of service activities in the core dossier
Potential to contribute service to the university at any level and to the profession	• Criteria listed above that demonstrates excellence in service to the department is also used to demonstrate potential to contribute service to the university and the profession

2. Promotion to Professor

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

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

The College of Arts and Sciences establishes the following criteria for promotion to 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.*
>
> *In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another. Promotion should reflect the reality that (a) not all faculty members have the same distribution of assignments (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence equally in all evaluation dimensions; and (c) there is a multi-faceted institutional responsibility that must be achieved by the skills of the faculty collectively. Promotion to professor should be awarded not only to those faculty who have demonstrated impact in their research/creative work, teaching, and service, but also to those who have exhibited excellence in leadership to make a demonstrable impact on the mission of the TIU,*

college and university.

The criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. The following paragraphs are supplemental to those guidelines.

Candidates for promotion to professor are expected to demonstrate sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national or international reputation in the field. There is no single or quantitative measure that either guarantees or bars promotion to full professor rank. A successful candidate for promotion to full professor will have a second body of original scholarship beyond that required for tenure.

It is further required that the scholar's work has made an original contribution to the field. There must be evidence not only of continuous past accomplishment, but also of a strong ongoing scholarly agenda that predicts continued eminence in the field.

The candidate must also have demonstrated continued excellence as a teacher of graduates and undergraduates, as evidenced by SEIs, peer evaluation, course development, and advising. In addition, the candidate must have an excellent record of service to the Department, the University, the scholarly community, and possibly also beyond campus.

3. Teaching Faculty

Promotion to Assistant Teaching Professor: For promotion to assistant teaching professor, a faculty member must complete his/her/their terminal degree or hold a Master's degree along with equivalent experience and be performing satisfactorily in teaching and service. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor: For promotion to associate teaching professor, a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service; have a documented high level of competence in professional practice; display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of the department; and evidence of scholarly activity pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to associate teaching professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Teaching Professor: For promotion to teaching professor, a faculty member must have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching; leadership in service to the department and to the profession; a sustained high level of competence in professional practice; and evidence of scholarly activity pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

4. Associated Faculty

Promotion to 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.

B. Procedures

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

for promotion and tenure reviews found in Chapter 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook.

1. Tenure Track and Teaching Faculty

a. Candidate Responsibilities

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

- Dossier

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

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

The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated. In the case of a faculty member who has a joint appointment and whose tenure- initiating unit is the WGSS Department, the dossier will include the teaching evaluations for courses taught in each unit.

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

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

Documentation of every promotion and tenure or promotion case will, where appropriate, include the following:

Excellence as a teacher

It is not enough that a teacher conscientiously meets her/his obligations and successfully conveys knowledge. The WGSS Department expects clear evidence of an effective interest in students, stimulation of student interest in the subject matter, high standards of intellectual performance, and the continuous updating of scholarship used in teaching. Evaluation of a candidate's performance as a teacher will be based on the widest

possible range of evidence. It will include (1) evidence solicited by the Department Chair or by the Chair of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure, and (2) evidence offered by the candidate.

Evidence submitted to the Committee on Promotion and Tenure regarding teaching will normally include the following:

a) Student evaluations for all courses for the appropriate time period as stated above. For all courses taught, both SEIs and discursive student evaluations are required. Student evaluations for all faculty members must be administered and collected by someone other than the faculty member her/himself.

b) Syllabi, exams, and course assignments for a representative selection of courses for the probationary years or, in the case of promotion from associate to full professor, for a representative sample of courses taught since the last promotion or in the last five years (whichever is less). The candidate may want to call attention to innovations, improvements, and adjustments made in courses over time.

c) Detailed written evaluations of teaching based on classroom visitations by colleagues, including senior faculty members. These peer evaluations should also include a review of syllabi, exams, assignments, and other course material.

d) Other data that the Department Chair, the Committee on Promotion and Tenure, or the candidate may judge pertinent to an evaluation of the candidate's performance in the area of teaching might include:

- Explanations or demonstrations of especially successful or innovative teaching techniques;
- Explanations of special teaching accomplishments, awards, and the like;
- Information regarding publication of teaching materials and articles on teaching techniques;
- Descriptions of technical innovations and use of new technology in preparing course material, delivering information, setting learning tasks and evaluating performance.

Excellence as a scholar

Scholarly excellence entails significant and original contributions to published scholarship. In the field of Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies, such published scholarship typically includes the following: contributions that offer new knowledge; contributions to feminist theory, epistemology, and pedagogy; contributions to the research mission of Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies as a field; invention or exploration of new fields of inquiry; application of new concepts to traditional areas of research; and in general any application or interpretation of concepts that advance understanding and knowledge in the field or in the study of women, gender and/or sexuality in a particular field.

The typical media for scholarly contributions are books (published or in production); articles in recognized, refereed journals; essays solicited prestigious invitations to contribute to edited books and publications that advance, rather than summarize, knowledge and understanding; presentations at scholarly meetings; scholarly materials designed for use with new technologies; and other demonstrations of scholarly work appropriate to a faculty member's particular field.

The candidate's achievement and the likelihood of further long-term scholarly accomplishments will be evaluated on the basis of the widest possible range of evidence, including both evidence offered by the candidate and that solicited by the Department Chair and the Chair of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure. Such evidence will normally include:

a) Publications. In evaluating publications and manuscripts, considerations of quality and consistency of production will take precedence over those of quantity. Quantity is only an appropriate measure of distinction when the individual publications are themselves distinguished. The committee will consider the nature of each publication, the type of refereeing, the reputation of a publisher or journal, and any other

external measure, but will not allow extrinsic concerns to modify their scholarly judgment regarding the intrinsic merit of the publication. Ordinarily, the Committee will consider monographic or interpretive publications based upon original research as providing primary evidence of scholarly development, rather than textbooks or source books conceived primarily for elementary undergraduate instruction. Collaborative work involving multiple authors will be judged by the same kinds of intellectual criteria and should not constitute the entirety of a scholar's production. The development of materials involving the use of new technologies (e.g., digital media) and online publications will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. The Department Chair or Chair of the Committee may solicit, and the candidate may present, published reviews from scholars in the field. The candidate may be asked to offer or may present the reports of anonymous referees.

b) Scholarly activity at professional meetings. The quality of the contributions will be the primary consideration in evaluating this activity. Papers, formal commentaries on the papers of others, and participation in colloquia will be evaluated. If possible, senior colleagues should attend the presentations of junior colleagues; their evaluations should be placed in writing in the candidate's file. Again, the Committee may seek and the candidate may present evaluations from scholars in the field.

c) Creative activity (e.g., art installations or photographic exhibitions) and scholarly reviews thereof. The quality of such activity as assessed by peer experts will be of primary consideration in its evaluation.

d) Reviews of scholarly works for journals. The scholarship of the reviews and the nature of the journals in which they appear will be appraised.

e) Scholarly recognition in the form of requests to serve on editorial boards of scholarly journals, to serve in leadership positions in professional organizations, to chair sessions at professional meetings and/or to serve on program committees for such meetings, to serve on award committees, to speak at other institutions or to assume the post of visiting professor at other universities.

f) Recognition in the form of prizes, awards, grants, or fellowships based on scholarly esteem and reputation.

g) Any other evidence which the candidate, the Department Chair or the senior faculty believe pertinent to the candidate's development as a scholar. The candidate may include in her/his dossier any manuscripts of articles or papers, whether they have been published.

Excellence in Service

A member of the WGSS Department at The Ohio State University has an obligation to use her/his talents to collaborate effectively with colleagues for the betterment of the Department, the University, and the larger community. A faculty member's profile of service may vary over time. The Committee on Promotion and Tenure may consider any information that the candidate, the Department Chair, or the Committee considers pertinent to a full evaluation of the candidate's ability to render effective service to these communities, including evidence relating to the quality and the quantity of such service. The information may include the number of committee meetings attended, specific projects undertaken, administrative responsibilities assumed, and individual, community or professional contributions. The Department Chair, the Committee or the candidate may solicit written assessments of a candidate's service from those who are in a position to provide them. Other information may include:

a) Service on Department, College, and University committees;

b) Service as an adviser to student groups and organizations;

c) Presentations made in the classes of others, contributions to University publications, lectures to the

Departmental faculty and similar activities;

d) Activities in the University community and in the community outside the University based on and related to one's professional training and professional concerns;

e) Activity in the national/international scholarly community and its institutions.

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 faculty), whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, for tenure-track faculty the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year.

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

- **External Evaluations** (see also External Evaluations below)

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

b. Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

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

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

- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.

    - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.

    - A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04A(3) only once. Faculty Rules 3335-7-08 makes the same provision for nonprobationary teaching faculty. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the

faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.

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

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

- **Late Spring**: Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described here.

- **Late Spring**: Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section VI.B.3 below). Justification will be provided in cases in which a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists. Once the department chair approves, seek approval of ASC Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs. Once approvals are secured, initiate and complete requests to external evaluators, including disseminating candidates' materials to external evaluators. In the case of a faculty member who has a joint appointment and whose TIU is the WGSS Department, the WGSS department and the other department will consult about the selection of external evaluators, with the WGSS Department responsible for recruiting the reviewers.

- **Late Summer/Early Autumn**: Ensure receipt of sufficient external evaluations.

- **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 to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on her/his/their dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.

- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the 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 or is a member of a Discovery Theme.

- Revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of eligible faculty to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair.

- Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.

- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure-initiating unit is another department. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the Department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating

unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this Department's cases.

c. Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the members of the eligible faculty are as follows:

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

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

d. Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Department Chair are as follows:

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

- **Late Spring Semester**: To approve external evaluators from a list suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.) In the case of a faculty member who has a joint appointment and whose TIU is the WGSS Department, the WGSS department chair will consult with the other department about the selection of external evaluators. In the case of a faculty member with a joint appointment whose TIU is not in WGSS, the department chair will consult with the other TIU about the selection of external evaluators.

- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose TIU is not in WGSS. The WGSS eligible faculty will review the dossier and provide an advisory vote to the chair on the question of whether the candidate should be tenured and/or promoted. The WGSS chair will then provide a letter of evaluation to the primary TIU head to be included in the candidate's dossier. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on the impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.

- In the case of a faculty member who has a joint appointment and whose TIU is the WGSS Department, to solicit an evaluation from the TIU head of the candidate's TIU. The WGSS Department will share the candidate's dossier with the chair of the other unit who will be asked to write a letter of evaluation for inclusion in the dossier.

- To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted upon.

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

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

- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to any questions during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department

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

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

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

- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the 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 opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the Department Chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether she/he/they expect to submit comments.

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

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

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

2. Procedures for Associated Faculty

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

3. External Evaluations

The department will generally obtain evaluations from faculty at R01 institutions that are members of the Association of American Universities (AAU) and the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA). Justification will be provided in each case in which a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists. Peer reviewers from other institutions, including universities outside of North America and liberal arts colleges, may be suggested in cases where the external reviewer is 1) a distinguished expert in the field, as indicated by publications; national and international awards; prominence in professional organizations; and presence on editorial boards of major journals; 2) is nationally or internationally known in a field outside of Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies related to a candidate's scholarship; 3) meets the standards for a peer reviewer in a TIU in which the candidate is joint-appointed; and/or 4) where relevant, is a distinguished, award winning (e.g., Pulitzer Prize or Guggenheim Fellowship) creative writer or artist who is not affiliated with an academic institution.

External evaluations of scholarly and creative activity are obtained for all promotion reviews in which

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

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

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. For promotion to professor, the WGSS department will only solicit evaluations from professors with institutional affiliations predominately in the programs listed above. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.

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

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

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. All potential evaluators must be approved by the College of Arts and Sciences through the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. No written justification is required for tenured professors at peer or near peer institutions as defined above. 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 if 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. If none of the person(s) suggested by the candidate agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

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

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

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

VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPONTMENT APPEALS

Faculty members who believe they have been evaluated improperly for tenure, promotion, or reappointment may appeal a negative decision to the University Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility. Performance that is adequate for annual reappointment may not be adequate for the granting of promotion or tenure with promotion for faculty on the tenure track or, in the case of teaching faculty, for securing a reappointment.

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions.

Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05.

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

VIII. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS

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

IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

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

Evaluation of teaching should be holistic, considering a variety of evidence of accomplishment in the classroom: for example, student evaluations (quantitative and narrative), peer evaluations, examples of

curricular or pedagogic innovation, and efforts to improve teaching by taking advantage of college or university resources.

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

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

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) is required in every course offered in this department. Faculty should choose a class meeting 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 encourage a high completion rate by explaining to the class the significance of the evaluation. The faculty member should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and for improvement in instruction.

The WGSS department also requires the use of discursive evaluations developed and administered by the department. Faculty should choose a class meeting late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high to distribute the form. The faculty member should encourage a high completion rate by explaining to the class the significance of the evaluation, which is also used for performance reviews and improvement in instruction. Someone other than the faculty member must distribute and collect the discursive evaluation while the instructor is out of the room, and completed evaluations should be held in the departmental office until the faculty member has submitted final course grades.

For all courses taught, both SEIs and discursive student evaluations are required. Student evaluations for all faculty members must be administered and collected by someone other than the faculty member her/himself.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The Department's P&T Committee oversees the Department's peer evaluation of teaching. The Committee chair assigns faculty members to observe classes of their peers and provide letters of review. 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 is followed to the extent possible. The P&T Committee and the Department Chair review the peer teaching evaluations along with student evaluations as part of the process of annual review.

The responsibilities of the P&T Committee and Department Chair regarding teaching reviews are as follows:

- to review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and teaching faculty and all associated faculty at least once per year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is. 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. No more than two evaluations should be prepared by the same colleague.

- to review the teaching of tenured 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 three-year period. When associate professors are reviewed for promotion to professor, they will be required to have a minimum of four peer evaluations of teaching.

- to review the teaching of nonprobationary assistant teaching professors and associate teaching

professors at least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned across a 6-year period.

- to review the teaching of tenured professors and nonprobationary teaching professors at least once every four years; university policy requires that a minimum of two peer reviews be conducted at each reappointment.

- to review the teaching of any faculty member who, in the department chair's judgement would benefit from review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.

- to review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning.

Reviews conducted upon the request of the Department Chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the chair or faculty member.

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations (the first four situations listed above) are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instruction materials. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, the class visitation is conducted by one or more senior peers whom the promotion and tenure chair has identified in consultation with the candidate. The peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to establish a time for the visit and to understand the goals of the course and the candidate's teaching philosophy. If possible, the peer reviewer should attend two different class sessions over the course of the semester.

In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should focus on such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. 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. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if she/he/they wish. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Annual Review Template

Department of Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies Annual Review Template

NOTE: The format and numbering may vary from what is listed below.

RESEARCH: **40% (tenured faculty); 45% (Assistant Professors)**

1. Books, Articles and Other Published Papers. If co-authored with students, indicate undergraduate students by underline, and graduate students by +.
   a) Books (Other than edited volumes) and monographs (credit for three years starting with book in production; indicate which year you are claiming for this period) (16)
   b) Co-authored books (credit for three years starting with book in production; indicate which year you are claiming for this period) (**12**)
   c) Edited or co-edited books (credit for one year) (**10**)
   d) Textbooks (credit for one year) (**10**)
   e) Translated editions: your book translated into another language (credit for one year) (**7**)
   f) Revised editions of your book (credit for one year) (**6**)
   g) List books in progress (provide a short description of what you have accomplished this year) (**0**)
   h) Chapters in edited books (**8**)
   i) Bulletins and technical reports (**2-4** depending on length and importance)
   j) Peer-reviewed journal articles (**8**)
   k) Editor-reviewed journal articles (**6**)
   l) Reviews (indicate whether peer reviewed) (2-4 depending on length and importance)
   m) Pieces published online (not peer-reviewed; for a general audience) (2-4)
   n) Abstracts and short entries (2-4 depending on length and importance)
   o) Papers in proceedings (4)
   p) Unpublished scholarly presentations
      i. Invited talks, seminar, and conference presentations (6)
      ii. Papers presented at professional meetings (4)
      iii. Service as chair, commentator or panelist at professional meetings and local events. Describe nature of your contribution (2)
      iv. Radio/tv/multimedia interview (2-4)
   q) Potential publications in review process (**4**)

2. Creative works (**8**) may include the following:
   a) Artwork (not listed in "f" below)
   b) Choreography
   c) Collections
   d) Compositions
   e) Curated exhibits
   f) Exhibited artwork
   g) Invention disclosures, licenses and patents
   h) Moving image
   i) Multimedia/databases/websites
   j) Radio and television production/programming
   k) Recitals and performances
   l) Recordings
   m) Other creative works

3. Research Funding

a) Funded research from external source as principal or co-investigator. Indicate dates, source, and total direct costs (**10)**
b) Funded research from internal source as investigator or co-investigator. Indicate dates, source, your percent contribution and share of total direct costs (**4**)
c) Proposals for research funding pending/submitted but not funded (**5** external**, 2** internal)
d) Funded training grants as principal investigator or equivalent (**8** external, **6** internal)
e) Proposals for training grants pending/submitted but not funded (**4** external, **2** internal)
f) Any other funding received for academic work (e.g. curricular or program development (**8** external, **6** internal)

4. Awards and Formal Recognition for research, scholarly or creative work
   a) National awards (book awards, fellowships, etc.) (**20**)
   b) Regional, state, or press awards (**10**)
   c) Departmental (4) or OSU awards (8)

5. Editorships for journal, university presses, etc.
   a) Journal editorship (**8**)
   b) Book series editorship (**8**)
   c) Editorial board chairship (**8**); membership (**6**)
   d) Book review editor (**6**)
   e) Guest editor of journal special issue (**6**)

RESEARCH Subtotal _____ X 0.45 or 0.40 = _____

TEACHING: 40%

1. Undergraduate, Graduate and Professional Courses taught
   a) List each course taught by semester, course number, title and number of credit hours, and final course enrollment. A course will be given 4 points unless it falls into one of the following categories:
      i. Newly developed course (**6**)
      ii. GTA supervision (**6**)
      iii. Course with 60 or more students (**6**)
   b) Independent studies: Undergraduate (**2**); Graduate **(4**)
   c) Teaching evaluations (**0-12**) [Excellent = 12; Good = 8; Fair = 4; Poor = 0]. Indicate whether evaluations (SEI/peer) and discursives were completed. List overall SEI for each course; attach SEI summaries and discursive summaries.

2. Involvement in Graduate Exams, Theses, and Dissertation
   a) Graduate students. List completed/current in each category.
      i. Doctoral Students: dissertation advisor (**10**); dissertation co-chair (**8**); committee member (**6**)
      ii. Doctoral students: candidacy examination chair (**8**); committee member (**4**)
      iii. Doctoral students not listed above whom you advised or for whom you supervised dissertation hours (**8**)
      iv. Master's Students Plan A: thesis advisor (**6**); committee member (**4**)
      v. Master's Student's Plan B: examination advisor (**6**); reader (**2**)
   b) Noteworthy accomplishments of Graduate Students, including post-degree employment, as appropriate. (**4**)

3. Undergraduate Research Involvement:
   a) Undergraduate honors theses: director (**4**); reader (**2**)
   b) Undergraduate research supervised (**4**)
   c) Noteworthy accomplishments of Undergraduate Students (**2**)

4. Involvement (mentoring, advising) with Postdoctoral Scholars and Researchers (**4**)

5. Curriculum Development (innovative classroom methods or course design or redesign, program and development) (**4**)

6. Award and Formal Recognition for teaching (**10**)

7. Other Academic Advising (e.g. honors advising, student organizations, informal advising of students from other departments and programs, etc.) (**4**)

TEACHING Subtotal _____ X 0.40 = _____

SERVICE: 20% (tenured faculty), 15% (Assistant Professors)

1. Offices held and other service to professional societies (to receive full credit for service, describe the nature of our contribution to these committees and/or organizations)
   a) Committee service and offices held (**2-6**)
   b) Head of major professional organizations (**8**)

2. Consultation Activity (industry, education, government; include grant review activities) (**6**)

3. Manuscript reviewing
   a) Manuscript review for journals (4)
   a) Manuscript review for presses: prospectus (4); full manuscript (6)
   b) Multiple-book award reviews (6)

4. Other professional/public service
   a) OSU presentations (**2-4**)
   b) Local community; community outreach (**2-4**)
   c) National, including organizing national conferences or exhibits (**4-6**)
   d) International, including organizing international conferences or exhibits (**6-8**)
   e) External tenure review (6); external department or program review (**6**)
   f) Grant panel review (**6**)

5. Administrative Service
   a) Department committees: List department committees on which you have served. Indicate any that you have chaired
      i. Chair of Graduate Studies (**10**)
      ii. Chair of Undergraduate Studies or P&T committee (**8**)
      iii. Chair of minor committee (**6**)
      iv. Member of committee (**4**)
      v. Formal mentoring of a faculty member (**6**)
      vi. Informal mentoring of a faculty member (**4**)
   b) College or University committees:
      i. Chair of major committee (**8**)
      ii. Chair of minor committee (**4**)
      iii. Member of committee (**4**)
   c) Non-committee department, college, or university service **(4)**
   d) Service as a graduate faculty representative (**2**)
   e) Awards and Formal Recognition for Service (**8**)
   f) Formal supervision/mentoring/advising of Post-Doctoral Scholars **(4)**

SERVICE Subtotal _____ X 0.20 or 0.15 = _____

Other [optional category]

1. Anything else that the chair should know.
Additional specific questions relevant to department of discipline. Examples of areas that might be included are initiatives undertaken to enhance participation in student recruitment initiatives.

TOTAL _____

** Points for each section are added and then multiplied by the percentage of each section.

Appendix B: Activity List for Faculty on Courtesy Appointments

Department of Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies Activity List for Faculty on Courtesy Appointments

Established April 2022

To remain a WGSS Affiliated Faculty member, we would like to see at least one of the listed activities (below) every three years. One of our staff members will check in with you at the end of each academic year to tick which activities you have engaged. If you have not engaged any in a period of three years, then we hope we will come to a mutual recognition that the courtesy appointment in WGSS is no longer fitting.

We have developed the following list of possible activities that engage the broad labor (intellectual, pedagogical, administrative) of the WGSS department:

- Service on departmental committees (for example: Grad Studies, Undergrad Studies, search committees, FREE Center)
- Service on doctoral committees
- Service on Master's committees
- Enrollment of WGSS graduate students in seminar
- Teach undergraduate course cross-listed with WGSS
- Teach undergraduate course that contributes to LGBTQ+ Studies Minor
- Teach undergraduate course that contributes to WGSS/Public Policy Minor
- Curricular development of WGSS minor/major
- Advise WGSS Honors/Undergraduate Thesis
- Serve on WGSS Honors/Undergraduate Thesis
- Serving on WGSS Panel
- Organizing/co-organizing WGSS Event
- Engaging Faculty Research Workshops

Revised 10/30/01
Revised 12/04/01
Revised 02/16/04
Revised 05/25/07
Revised 11/28/07
Revised 01/03/08
Revised 05/31/13
Revised 11/12/13
Revised 08/03/17
Revised