

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

.

Approved by the English Department Council 1/30/2018; 12/05/2022

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 5/17/23

Table of Contents

I Preamble	4
II English Department Mission	4
III Definitions.....	4
A Committee of the Eligible Faculty	4
1 Tenure-track Faculty	5
2 Associated Faculty	5
3 Conflict of Interest.....	6
4 Minimum Composition.....	6
B Promotion and Tenure Committee.....	6
C Quorum	7
D Recommendations from the Eligible Faculty.....	7
1 Appointment.....	7
2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion	7
IV Appointments	7
A Criteria	8
1 Tenure-track Faculty	8
2 Associated Faculty	9
3 Regional Campus Faculty	10
4 Emeritus Faculty.....	10
5 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	11
B Procedures	11
1 Tenure-track Faculty, Columbus Campus	11
2 Associated Faculty, Columbus Campus	13
3 Regional Campus Faculty.....	14
4 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	14
V Annual Performance and Merit Review	15
A Documentation	15
B Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus	15
1 Fourth-Year Review	16

2 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period	17
C Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus	17
D Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	18
E Regional Campus Faculty	18
F Salary Recommendations	19
VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	19
A Criteria and Documentation that Support Promotion	20
1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure on the Columbus Campus	20
2 Promotion to Professor on the Columbus Campus	23
3 Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	26
4 Regional Campus Faculty	26
B Procedures	27
1 Tenure-Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus	27
2 Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	35
3 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty	35
4 External Evaluations	35
VII Appeals	377
VIII Seventh-Year Reviews	37
IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching	37
A Student Evaluation of Teaching	37
B Peer Evaluation of Teaching	38
Appendix: Guidelines for Annual Review Ratings, Columbus Campus	41

I Preamble

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

Should those rules and policies change, the Department of English 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 of Arts and Sciences 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 the department's 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 eligible 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 the College of Arts and Sciences; 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 affirmative action and equal employment opportunity](#).

II English Department Mission

The Department of English creates and teaches knowledge about literature, poetics, writing, media, language, and cultures in the English-speaking world. The department serves constituents both inside and outside the university (including interdisciplinary programs, service learning projects, and the discipline at large) and prepares students for careers inside and outside of academia. We believe that the analytical study of our sub-disciplines helps develop logical thought, awareness of the complexity of texts and of value judgments, apprehension of others' points of view, and imagination. English studies can expand creative, communicative and cognitive capacities; can sharpen the ability to make difficult judgments; and can help us understand societies, times, and cultures different from our own.

III Definitions

A Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

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

1 Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an assistant professor, associate professor, or professor on the Columbus campus, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the department on all campuses.
- **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 fourth-year reappointment and promotion and tenure reviews of assistant professors on all campuses, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors.
- For the promotion reviews of associate professors on all campuses, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors.

2 Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment, Reappointment, and Contract Renewal

- Initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type), of associated faculty members is decided by the department chair in consultation with the hiring committee. Reappointment and contract renewal of associated faculty members are decided by the department chair in consultation with the relevant member(s) of the directors committee.

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

Promotion Reviews

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

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

The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the chair in consultation with the Vice Chairs and/or the Writing Program Directors Committee.

3 Conflict of Interest

A conflict of interest exists when an eligible faculty member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, 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 (dissertation advisor), or has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an objective review of the candidate's work is not possible. Generally, faculty members who have collaborated with a candidate on at least 50% of the candidate's published work will be expected to withdraw from an appointment or promotion review of that candidate.

When there is a question about potential conflicts, the P&T Chair in consultation with the Procedures Oversight Designee shall determine whether it is appropriate for the faculty member to recuse himself or herself from a particular review. The faculty member with a conflict may submit a letter detailing the candidate's contributions to joint work, but the faculty member should not be present at the review of the candidate.

4 Minimum Composition

In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the chair, after consulting with the dean, will appoint a faculty member from another tenure-initiating unit within the college.

B Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Department of English has a Promotion and Tenure Committee that consists of faculty chosen from the ranks of associate professors and professors. Its primary duty is to gather relevant information on associate professors being considered for promotion, and for assistant professors being considered for tenure and promotion to associate professor, in order to aid the eligible faculty in making decisions concerning tenure and promotion. The committee typically consists of at least two professors and two associate professors, including whenever possible faculty from multiple campuses. The committee's chair and membership are appointed by the chair on an annual basis, with the option of reappointment.

One member of the Committee is designated the Procedures Oversight Designee (the "junior POD") for assistant professors being hired as or coming up for promotion to associate; another member is designated the "senior POD" for associate professors being hired as or coming up for promotion to professor. Both positions are dedicated to seeing that the department fairly and appropriately carries out its own promotion and tenure procedures and those of the college and OAA. In addition, the junior POD participates in annual reviews of assistant professors and the senior POD assists the chair in organizing the annual reviews of associate professors.

The Chair of the P&T Committee (the P&T Chair) oversees the committee, ensures the proper execution of the department's P&T policies and procedures, and assists the department chair in coordinating and conducting annual reviews of assistant professors.

The P&T Committee also makes recommendations regarding P&T policies and procedures in order to advise the department chair, who is responsible for updating the Department's Appointments, Promotion, & Tenure (APT) document. In addition, the P&T Committee may serve in other capacities as required by Department, OAA, and College guidelines, such as making recommendations to the

department chair regarding requests from untenured faculty for unpaid leaves of absence or exclusions of time from the tenure clock.

All tenured faculty in the department serve at the request of the P&T Chair for particular duties related to promotion and tenure, including but not limited to identifying and assisting with recruiting external reviewers.

C Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is three-fifths of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence, including a Faculty Professional Leave or external fellowship. 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. Faculty who are assigned to teach during the time of the meeting of the eligible faculty are also excused from the meeting and not counted in the quorum. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the chair has approved an off-campus assignment that precludes virtual participation.

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

D Recommendations from the Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters only “yes” and “no” votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. They will be entered in the record but not counted in the vote total. 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 (67%) of the votes cast are positive. See Section IV.B.1 for what happens when the positive appointment vote is more than half but less than two-thirds of the votes.
- In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate’s joint-appointment unit prior to his/her/their appointment.

2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion

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

IV Appointments

A Criteria

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 (Ph.D., M.F.A, or equivalent) have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. Procedures for appointment are identical to that of assistant professor. 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 eligible faculty, the 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 exclude time from the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor. A person appointed as Assistant Professor is expected to hold the Ph.D., M.F.A., or equivalent. An appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service, except in cases of approved exclusions of time on the tenure clock. 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 upon the candidate's request, if the candidate passes a screening by the eligible faculty (see VI.B). 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 exclude time from 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.

A person appointed as Associate Professor or Professor is expected to hold the Ph.D., M.F.A., or equivalent, to have successful teaching experience, and to be capable of distinguished scholarship on the evidence of work already accomplished, in line with the criteria for promotion to associate professor below. A person appointed as Professor should have demonstrated a distinguished record of teaching, scholarship and professional service, in line with the criteria for promotion below.

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 relevant teaching experience. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

Appointments at the rank of professor without tenure should not occur.

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

2 Associated Faculty

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a few weeks to assist with a focused assignment (as when another faculty member's illness or resignation requires hiring a substitute), 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.

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct appointments in the department are typically uncompensated positions given to individuals who give academic service to the department for which a faculty title is appropriate. Whether uncompensated or compensated, appointments to these positions require the Ph.D., M.F.A., or the equivalent as well as the scholarly and teaching profile suitable for the specified rank. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty. Expected contributions to the department include work with graduate students, participation in the scholarly life of the department, and, in some cases, teaching in the department.

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

Lecturer. Appointment as lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a Master's degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, though in most cases the Department prefers the Ph.D., M.F.A., or the equivalent. Lecturer appointments are typically made on a semester-by-semester basis to fill short-term undergraduate teaching needs, though appointments for two semesters may also be made when resources allow. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is desirable. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure, but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer should generally not exceed one year.

Senior Lecturer. As resources allow, the department hires senior lecturers to teach three or more courses per semester on benefits-eligible appointments (75-100% FTE). Appointments to this position require the Ph.D., M.F.A., or the equivalent (e.g., an M.A. and five or more years of teaching experience). Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The initial appointment for a senior lecturer should generally not exceed one year. Senior Lecturer appointments may be renewed for terms of up to three years. The department, however, may limit terms of some Senior Lecturers for programmatic or budgetary reasons. Expected contributions to the department include undergraduate teaching and, only when specifically assigned as part of the position, administrative work related to undergraduate teaching. Participation in committee work or in the scholarly life of the Department is welcomed but not expected, given that it is not compensated.

In establishing priority among Senior Lecturers wishing to be reappointed, the Department follows this order:

- o Dual-career-accommodation appointments, where the partner has a record of excellent teaching and meets demonstrated teaching needs within the Department
- o Senior Lecturers qualified to meet specific instructional needs such as on-line or hybrid courses, creative writing classes, or other subspecialties in the undergraduate curriculum
- o Senior Lecturers who, all other things being equal, have seniority.

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated (0% FTE). 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.

3 Regional Campus Faculty

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

Criteria for appointing Associated Faculty on the regional campuses are determined by the regional campus deans and department coordinators.

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 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 written request for emeritus faculty status to the chair (regional campus dean for associated faculty on regional campuses), providing their retirement date. The chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit a request and justification for formal approval to the dean and OAA via [Form 207](#). The chair may consult with colleagues in the retiring faculty member's field for assistance in summarizing their contributions to the department. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered.

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

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

5 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

The department may extend courtesy (0% FTE) appointments to tenure-track Ohio State faculty from other tenure initiating units (TIUs) whose teaching and scholarship have ties to the work of the department.

Expected contributions include advising of graduate students, participation in the scholarly life of the department, and, in some cases and with the approval of the home TIU, occasional teaching in the department. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

B Procedures

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process. All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university's system of record for faculty and staff. Formal interviews are required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in Workday to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

See the [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#) and the [Policy on Faculty Appointments](#) for information on the following topics:

- recruitment of tenure-track 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, Columbus Campus

A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

The dean of the college 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 chair, in consultation with the department's Executive Committee, will appoint a Search Committee for each position the Department seeks to fill. Each Search Committee will consist of 3 or 4 people, including the department's Diversity Officer or designee (who serves as Diversity Advocate), at least one faculty member in the field of the prospective hiring and at least one in a different but related field within the Department or from another Department. The Diversity Officer is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants. Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo inclusive hiring practices training available through the college with resources from the [Office of Diversity and Inclusion](#). In addition, all employees/faculty involved

in the hiring and selection process must review and acknowledge the AA/EEO Recruitment and Selection Guidelines in the BuckeyeLearn system.

In consultation with the Executive Committee, the Chair will designate one person on each Search Committee to serve as Committee Chair. The Department Chair or their designee (typically one of the vice chairs) will be a voting member of each Search Committee. Faculty not on the Search Committee are invited to read letters of recommendation, CVs, and writing samples and to make comments, but the Search Committee will select the list of interviewees. A typical search for a tenure-track faculty member proceeds as follows:

The search committee develops a search announcement for internal posting in the university Job Postings through the Office of Human Resources and external advertising, subject to the chair's and divisional dean's approval. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search. The committee also develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications.

The search committee screen applications and letters of recommendations and selects approximately eight to ten candidates to interview at the appropriate conference (usually MLA) or by a web conferencing platform (such as Zoom or Teams). As soon as possible after the interviews (typically before or during the first week of Spring semester), each Search Committee will determine which two (or sometimes three) candidates to bring to campus—at least one of whom should contribute to the diversity of the department. If the search committee judges that in the pool of candidates there is no person who can contribute in this way, the Committee's report will explain to the faculty its efforts to attract a diverse pool of applicants and the reasons why those efforts did not produce diversity among the finalists. Shortly after the finalists are selected, the Search Committee(s) will present these candidates to the department in the form of a written narrative about the search process so far and the strengths of the candidates selected for campus visits. The presentation of this narrative is the first stage of a "hand-off" of the hiring process from the Search Committee(s) to the eligible faculty (i.e., the tenure-track faculty). The slate of finalists must be approved by the divisional dean; the approval process includes submission of the [Faculty Search Diversity Report Form](#).

During a virtual or on-campus interview, the candidate will typically meet with graduate students, tenure-track faculty, the chair, and the divisional dean or his/her/their designee. In addition, the candidate will be asked to present a "job talk." The session will last for about an hour and will have two parts: (1) the candidate's presentation of scholarship; and (2) a question-and-answer session devoted to the candidate's presentation, to the candidate's scholarship more generally, and to teaching. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format, and relevant accommodations for disability/impairment should be provided.

After the virtual/on-campus interviews, the Search Committee will solicit advice from all who met the candidate, were at the talk, or were otherwise involved in the visit, as well as those who read the candidates' materials. The Committee will then meet to decide which candidate to recommend to the eligible faculty to receive the first offer, which the second offer, or, indeed, any other way of proceeding. This recommendation constitutes the final stage of the hand-off from the Committee to the larger body. The Chair of the Committee will present in a meeting of the eligible faculty not only the Committee's recommendation but also a narrative of how the

recommendation was arrived at, a narrative that includes a précis of debates within the committee. If a two-thirds majority of the eligible faculty present vote in favor of the Committee's recommendation, and if the dean of arts and humanities approves the decision, the chair and dean will work together to determine salary, start up package, and other details of the appointment. The chair will then extend the formal offer.

If the top candidate receives more than half but less than two-thirds of the votes, the faculty will vote again on the top candidate, separate from the rest of the slate of candidates. If this candidate still receives less than two-thirds of the votes, the Chair in consultation with the dean of arts and humanities will decide whether to make an offer to the Committee's top-ranked candidate on the basis of a simple majority, to move to the second candidate, or to end the search and begin again.

If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit.

For appointments to the rank of Associate Professor, immediately following a positive vote by the tenure-track faculty, the Associate Professors and Professors will vote to determine whether the candidate meets the department's criteria for appointment at that rank with tenure. For appointments to the rank of Professor, immediately following a positive vote by the tenure-track faculty, the Professors will vote to make a preliminary determination as to whether the candidate meets the Department's criteria for appointment at that rank with tenure. A two-thirds majority of those voting Yes or No by secret ballot is required.

Following a positive vote from the eligible faculty and the relevant body of Associate Professors and Professors, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will arrange an expedited tenure process, soliciting evaluations of the candidate's scholarship by at least two scholars whose names are not given to the Department by the candidate. The Chair will give the eligible faculty access to the new external review letters and ask whether they would change anyone's vote from "yes" to "no." If one person says their vote would change, the eligible faculty will meet again to discuss and take a new vote on the tenure case; a two-thirds majority of "yes" votes is required for the tenure decision to move forward. Once the expedited tenure process is completed, the Chair will secure the approval of the Dean, and the chair and dean will work together to determine salary, start up package, and other details of the appointment. The chair will then extend the formal offer.

All offers at the rank of Associate Professor, with or without tenure, all offers at the rank of Professor, and all offers of prior service credit require the prior approval of OAA.

The department chair discusses 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 Associated Faculty, Columbus Campus

The appointment of compensated associated faculty is decided by the Chair after a review and ranking of candidates by a three-member hiring committee that includes the Chair and, depending on the position, the Vice Chair for Rhetoric, Composition, and Literacy; the Vice Chair; the Director of Creative Writing; or the Director of Writing, Information and Literacy (English 1110). Initial interviews are typically held virtually through a video conference platform, with appointments for visiting assistant professors typically also including a campus visit for 1-2 finalists. Reappointment, and contract renewal of all compensated associated faculty are decided

by the department chair in consultation with the relevant member(s) of the directors committee. Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department and are also decided by the chair in consultation with the Executive Committee.

Associated Faculty appointed as lecturers in English generally teach less than a 75% FTE load; Senior Lecturers generally teach 75% FTE or more and are therefore benefits-eligible. However, Senior Lecturers who wish to teach less than a 75% load may opt to do so.

Associated appointments are generally made for a period of one to three years, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances. Visiting appointments may be made for one non-renewable term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three years. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued.

3 Regional Campus Faculty

Tenure Track Faculty: The regional campus has primary responsibility for determining the need for and the position description for a tenure-track faculty search, but the regional campus dean or designee consults with the chair to reach agreement on the description before the search begins. The department chair and the regional campus dean/director will agree on a single search committee for the position consisting of members of both units, with at least one tenure track faculty member from the Columbus campus.

Candidates should, at the minimum, be interviewed by the regional campus dean/director, the department chair, the search committee, and representatives of both faculties. Candidates will be evaluated on both campuses, with the faculty on the Columbus campus (particularly those in the field) serving in an advisory role to the hiring campus. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. A decision to hire requires agreement on the part of the department chair and of the regional campus dean/director. Negotiations with a candidate should not begin without such agreement, and a letter of offer must be signed by the department chair and the dean/director of the regional campus.

Associated faculty are appointed by the regional campus associate dean, in consultation with the English program coordinator on the relevant campus and, as needed, the dean/director, chair, and writing program directors. In cases where a particular associated faculty member is teaching on both campuses, the Dean/Director and the chair will work together to transfer funds between units or to create coordinated separate appointments in such a way that best supports the needs of the units and of the faculty member.

4 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track faculty member from another Ohio State tenure-initiating unit. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to the department justifying the appointment is considered at an English Department Council meeting. If the proposal is approved by the eligible faculty, the chair extends an offer of appointment. The chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the eligible faculty for a vote.

V Annual Performance and Merit Review

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

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

The annual reviews of every faculty member are based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties and responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.

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

A. Documentation: The documentation required for the annual performance review consists of the Annual Activity Report. Assistant Professors must also submit a sample of work in progress, and Associate Professors have the option to do so, if they would like feedback from their Professor review partners or the Chair. See below for more details about materials required of Assistant Professors. This material must be submitted to the Department Chair's assistant in spring semester following the calendar year under review; specific dates will be communicated annually.

At the request of the faculty member, the chair may solicit letters from internal or external collaborators or others familiar with annual teaching, research, or service. Faculty should not directly solicit such letters or other evaluations.

B. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

All probationary faculty are reviewed annually by the Department Chair and an ad-hoc review team for the first three years, and the entire eligible faculty participates in the fourth-year review. During the fourth academic year, a review at the college level is also required; an appointment cannot be renewed for the fifth year without the approval of the Dean of Arts and Sciences.

Annual reviews of probationary faculty are conducted during the spring semester and are coordinated by the P and T chair. The Assistant Professor submits to the Department Chair an Annual Activity Report and CV, and to the P and T chair a report of activities in the format of the OAA dossier outline; discursive student evaluations of teaching and syllabi for the past year; a selection of scholarship in progress or completed; and any relevant evidence concerning service. The Department Chair may also solicit such other information and consult with colleagues as necessary to ensure a fair and thorough review. The P and T chair, in consultation with the department chair, appoints a tenured faculty

member in the Assistant Professor's field or a related field to serve with the Department Chair, the P&T Chair, and the junior POD on the Assistant Professor's annual review team. The four members of the team review the material and meet with the Assistant Professor to discuss strengths and weaknesses of the performance, to offer advice about preparing for the fourth-year and sixth-year reviews, and to respond to any concerns the Assistant Professor might wish to raise. The P and T chair produces a summary of the discussion of the meeting to be included in the Assistant Professor's annual review letter; copies of the annual review letter also go to each member of the team and to the college. The Assistant Professor may respond in writing. The Department Chair's annual review letters (and any responses from the candidate, if the candidate so chooses) become part of the faculty member's cumulative file for promotion and tenure. The annual review letter must inform the faculty member of the right to review his or her personnel file.

If the Department Chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. If an annual review during the first three years suggests that the Assistant Professor might be terminated prior to the fourth-year review or as a result of the fifth-year annual review, the Department Chair will convene the eligible faculty to conduct a formal review following the procedures for fourth-year review (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)). If, following this review by the eligible faculty, the Department Chair recommends nonrenewal of the appointment, the comments process will be invoked and, on completion of that process the complete dossier will be forwarded to the Arts and Humanities Dean for College-level review. As in the case of fourth-year reviews, the Dean's decision shall be final.

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 chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

External evaluations are solicited only when either the 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 purpose of the fourth-year review is to determine whether, in the view of the eligible faculty, an Assistant Professor is making satisfactory progress toward establishing a record of teaching, scholarship, and service that is likely to meet the Department's expectations in time for the sixth-year promotion and tenure review.

In assessing whether or not a colleague at fourth year is making satisfactory progress in teaching, the eligible faculty will consider all of the information in the dossier, including peer observations, summaries of discursive evaluations, SEI reports, and annual review letters. In assessing satisfactory progress in scholarship, the senior faculty will use measures appropriate to the candidate's field as defined in section VI.A below.

The Department's expectations with regard to scholarship should be established early and reiterated both verbally in the annual review meetings and in writing in the department chair's letters that result from those meetings. In assessing the satisfactoriness of a candidate's service by fourth year, senior faculty will consider the record of annual review letters and other relevant evidence, such as feedback from the chairs of committees on which the candidate has served.

Before or at the mid-point of Spring semester of the fourth year of service as a member of the tenure-track faculty, the candidate submits to the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee all relevant evidence concerning teaching, scholarship, and service. For each candidate the committee assembles and distributes to the eligible faculty materials that include: (a) the OAA-designed dossier for reporting teaching, scholarship, and service activities; (b) the candidate's cumulative SEI report and summaries

of student evaluations of teaching, made by the committee and approved (or else rebutted in writing) by the candidate; (c) reports of classroom visitation by senior colleagues; (d) evaluations by senior colleagues of the candidate's scholarly writing (if available), and (e) the candidate's annual review letters. The Department Chair may also solicit such other information and consult with colleagues as necessary to ensure a fair and thorough review. Such information will be included in the dossier that goes forward to the college for review.

The Department Chair, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the candidate should pay careful attention to the guidelines and materials—and the format of their presentation—specified by the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs. The P&T Chair and the Procedures Oversight Designee will be responsible for verifying the accuracy of the candidates' citations and other aspects of the candidates' dossiers. The Procedures Oversight Designee will also check the dossiers to ensure the appropriateness of their contents.

At its spring semester meeting, the eligible faculty (that is, all Associate Professors and Professors with tenure from all campuses) discusses each candidate separately. After all candidates have been discussed, a straw vote is taken on those candidates by secret ballot; the results are announced to the meeting, and those results determine the order of final discussion. The candidate with the highest total in the straw vote is considered first, and each consideration begins with the introduction of a formal motion that the candidate pass the review. Once the formal motion has been made, discussion of the case is resumed. At the conclusion of this discussion, a final vote by secret ballot will be conducted.

For fourth-year review, the department forwards the complete dossier to the college, including its recommendations to the dean via two letters: one from the P&T Chair, summarizing the case and the eligible faculty's discussion, and one from the department chair expressing the chair's view of the case. The College Promotion and Tenure Committee reviews the case before the Dean makes a decision about a reappointment. The Dean's decision in the fourth year is final and is not forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost. If the outcome of the review is negative, the fifth year is the terminal appointment.

The Department Chair will inform candidates promptly when recommendations have been reached at each level of review. They will be given copies of the letters from the Department Chair and from the P&T Chair stating the recommendations and the reasons for them. Candidates will be informed that they have ten calendar days after receipt of these letters to submit comments in writing. If a candidate does submit comments, the Department Chair and the P&T Chair may, in turn, provide written responses to the candidate's comments. Similarly, candidates will be invited to examine letters from the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and from the Dean and to comment in writing on these letters. The Dean and the College P&T Committee may, in turn, provide written responses to a candidate's comments.

2 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

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. Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

C Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus

All tenured faculty receive an annual evaluation of their performances. For the Associate Professors, the Department Chair consults with the Professors, who help with the process. During early spring semester, the chair, in consultation with the senior POD, arranges review partners, ensuring that the

workload is distributed as fairly as possible and that, ideally, the same person is not reviewing the same colleague repeatedly.

The Department Chair is responsible for conducting annual review of Professors, in conjunction with the Vice Chair. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the department, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the college, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty. If a professor has an administrative role, the impact of that role and other assignments will be considered in the annual review.

All Associate Professors and Professors receive an annual review letter based on their Annual Activity Report. The annual review letter is separate from the salary letter. The letters aids individual faculty in their on-going self-assessments and future planning of their teaching, scholarship, and service and provides fuller information to the department chair and the salary committees for their deliberations about merit raises. For Associate Professors, the letter becomes part of their official Promotion and Tenure file. Faculty members may provide written comments on their review.

All associate professors are encouraged to take advantage of the annual review process as an opportunity to discuss with the annual review partner and, if requested, the department chair, the department's expectations regarding appropriate measures of quality, quantity, and impact in particular fields.

D. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The Department Chair, or designee, meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and prepares a written evaluation. The Department Chair's recommendation on renewal of the appointment is final. If the recommendation is to renew, the Department Chair may extend a multiple-year appointment of up to three years, when resources allow.

Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple-year appointment are reviewed annually by the Department Chair, or designee. The Department Chair, or designee, meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals and prepares a written evaluation. The Department Chair's recommendation on reappointment is final.

E. Regional Campus Faculty

The annual performance and merit review of a regional campus probationary tenure-track or tenured faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The dean/director's report of that review and a copy of the faculty member's annual report will be forwarded to the department chair. The review then moves to the department and proceeds as described above for probationary tenure-track and tenured faculty, respectively, on the Columbus campus. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the

divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice. Annually, the Regional Campus Director/Deans and the Department Chair meet to review faculty and to recommend a rating for each faculty member.

For probationary faculty reviews, in the event that the regional campus Dean/Director recommends renewal and the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the case shall be reviewed by the college dean. The disagreement shall be considered during that review, with the college dean's judgment prevailing. If the Dean/Director recommends nonrenewal, and the department chair recommends renewal, the case will be reviewed by the college dean. All non-renewals must proceed with a review using the Fourth-Year review process. The college dean's decision is final.

The annual performance and merit review of regional campus associated faculty is conducted entirely on the regional campus.

F Salary Recommendations

The Department Chair annually presents to the Dean recommendations about merit salary increases. The Dean makes the final decision about whether to approve or amend these recommendations. In preparing those recommendations, the Department Chair seeks the advice of the Associate Professors and Professors through the establishment of a Committee on Merit Salary Increases. This Salary Committee consists of the Department Chair and the elected Professors and Associate Professors on the Executive Committee. Any faculty member is entitled to confer on an individual basis with the Department Chair on merit and equity issues.

Upon review of the Annual Activity Report and (when available) the Chair's Annual Review letter, the Salary Committee will assign a rating for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service, as well as an overall rating for each faculty member, according to the following scale: Outstanding (5), Excellent (4), Very Good (3), Good (2), Satisfactory (1), Unsatisfactory (0). A faculty member who receives an Unsatisfactory overall rating will not be recommended for a merit increase. (See Appendix for the rating criteria.)

Faculty members who wish to discuss dissatisfaction with their salary increase with the 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.

See also the "Faculty Salary Appeals" section of the College of Arts and Sciences Pattern of Administration (POA) for the procedures governing a formal salary appeal.

Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation (see Sections V-A and V-B 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.

The following guidelines are supplementary to the University and College documents and set forth procedures applicable particularly to the Department of English. In formulating its judgments on promotion and tenure, the Department takes into account the candidate's accomplishment in (1) teaching; (2) scholarship; and (3) service to the Department, the University, the community, and the profession. The Department is aware that no one of these criteria can or should be applied mechanically.

A Criteria and Documentation that Support Promotion

1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure on the Columbus Campus

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.

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.

Teaching

The Department considers excellence in teaching to be as important as excellence in scholarship, and it takes into consideration the candidate's effectiveness, in exciting interest, cultivating independent thought, and imparting demonstrable knowledge and skill to the variety of students enrolled in our classes. Candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to serve on advising-meeting, candidacy-exam, and dissertation committees. Assistant Professors are not expected to direct dissertations. Faculty in Creative Writing are expected to direct MFA theses and serve on thesis committees.

Documentation of these criteria are outlined below:

TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidates must have:	Candidates may be asked to submit:
<p>Developed effective instructional techniques and materials appropriate for the objectives and level of the course</p> <p>Cultivated students' independent thought through assignments and class activities and advising/mentoring activities</p> <p>Imparted demonstrable knowledge and skill to the variety of students enrolled in our classes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Syllabi that demonstrate content, assignments, and activities in line with learning outcomes • Summary of discursive student comments from a variety of classes demonstrates engagement with the material • Written reports of class visits from senior colleagues, as described in peer evaluation of teaching • Evidence of student advising at the undergraduate and graduate level • Information about curriculum development • Information about endorsements or other activities with the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning • Information about other relevant professional development activities for teaching (e.g., attending workshop at a professional conference)

Scholarship

The Department expects all candidates for promotion and tenure to have demonstrated excellence in scholarship by producing original work and disseminating its results in peer-reviewed venues; by participating in the activities of professional scholarly organizations nationally or internationally; and by seeking, as appropriate, outside funding to support their scholarly activity. The most important measure of scholarly excellence, however, will be a candidate's record of publications, creative projects, or other products by which his or her expertise makes a demonstrable national or international impact. The Department recognizes that scholarly and creative activities occur in diverse media (e.g., print and digital format), and the same standard—clear excellence—applies regardless of the medium. Scholarship should normally be reviewed in the medium in which it was published (e.g., web publications should be read online).

In assessing a candidate's scholarship, the Department considers both quality and quantity. The Department values especially the quality of a candidate's scholarship: its originality, its lucidity, its intellectual depth, and its importance in terms of contributing meaningfully to the relevant field(s) of inquiry. We weigh as additional evidence of quality such indicators as the reputation of publishers, the receipt of awards and prizes, published reviews, and the assessments that we solicit from external evaluators of a case. But members of the eligible faculty of the Department will also judge quality on the basis of their own reading and discussion of the evidence of scholarship submitted.

No single quantitative standard for scholarship will suffice for a Department as large and diverse as English. We therefore accept that different subfields should establish clear expectations and specify (through the annual review process and, when appropriate, through a memorandum of understanding) what form(s) and quantity of evidence are appropriate for a candidate in a given area. For many subfields in English, the principal evidence of scholarly achievement remains a

book, singly or collaboratively authored, published by a press with a strong reputation or an emerging series in the candidate’s field. If the book is not yet published by the time of the Department’s formal vote in the Fall, the manuscript should be under final contract. (Here and afterwards, having a “final contract,” as opposed to an advance contract, means that the work has received final board approval from the press and that the author has completed revisions in response to all levels of review at the press.)

For candidates who have been hired to teach in the Creative Writing MFA Program, the principal evidence of scholarly contribution will typically take the form of two published books (one published before or under contract at the time of hire), or of a published book and a second book under final contract by the time of the tenure vote. For any candidate who works in a subfield of English Studies where a monograph is not necessarily the norm for tenure and first promotion (e.g., Linguistics; Folklore; Digital Media Studies; Rhetoric, Composition and Literacy), the Department will establish standards of evidence for scholarship appropriate to his/her field. In such cases, the Department Chair and the P&T Chair will work together with the candidate and his/her senior area-colleagues to determine suitable, field-specific guidelines, which will then be documented in the candidate’s annual review letters and, if appropriate, in a memorandum of understanding.

Whatever subfield a candidate works in, the Department will expect to see a range of evidence indicating breadth and the promise of future achievement; such additional evidence includes, but is not limited to, singly or collaboratively authored publications in refereed journals and essay collections, external grant funding, edited or co-edited collections, invited lectures, conference papers, book reviews or review essays, and professional reports.

Documentation of these criteria are summarized below:

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
<p>Demonstrated excellence in scholarship and creative activity by producing original work and disseminating its results in peer-reviewed venues, by participating in the activities of professional scholarly organizations nationally or internationally, and by seeking, as appropriate, outside funding to support their scholarly activity.</p> <p>Contributed meaningfully to the relevant field(s) of inquiry</p> <p>Demonstrated breadth and the promise of future achievement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A record of publications, creative projects, or other products by which the candidate’s expertise makes a demonstrable national or international impact. For many subfields in English, the principal evidence of scholarly achievement will be a book, singly or collaboratively authored, published by or under final contract with a press with a strong reputation or an emerging series in the candidate’s field. For candidates hired to teach in the creative writing MFA program, the principal evidence will typically take the form of two published books. For candidates in subfields where a monograph is not necessarily the norm, the Department will establish standards of evidence for scholarship appropriate to his/her field. In such cases, the Department Chair and the P&T Chair will work together with the candidate and his/her senior area-colleagues to determine suitable, field-specific guidelines, which will then be documented in the candidate’s annual review letters and, if appropriate, in a memorandum of understanding.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete publication record including books, peer-reviewed and editor-reviewed articles and chapters, textbooks based on scholarship, graphs, books, book chapters, textbooks based on scholarship, and magazine articles and on-line publications • Evidence of applying to and/or receiving internal grants from the college or university or external grants from state or federal agencies or foundations. • Evidence of invited lectures or readings and conference presentations/papers • Creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus including artwork, choreography, collections, compositions, curated exhibits, moving images, multimedia, performances, radio, recitals, recordings, television, and websites
--	--

Service

Service is considered by the College and the Department to include service to one or more of several publics: The University, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations. Although Assistant Professors' service loads are limited by design, candidates for promotion and tenure are expected to assume committee responsibilities when called upon by the Department, the College, the University, or the profession, and to participate where appropriate in activities that support the academic mission of the University in the community. Evidence of service should consist of a record of service activities, along with the testimony of those served where appropriate.

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidates must have:	Candidates may be asked to submit
Effective participation in committees or other department jobs as assigned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record of service activities • Testimony of those served where appropriate • Contributions and quality indicators of the outcomes of the contributions • Evaluation of service in annual reviews
Effective participation in college, university, or professional committees as appropriate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributions and quality indicators of the outcomes of the contributions including positive change
Participation where appropriate in activities that support the academic mission of the university in the community.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities and quality indicators within the community setting

2 Promotion to Professor on the Columbus Campus

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.

In addition, the rule further specifies that 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. While acknowledging that a typical case for promotion to professor will emphasize a candidate's scholarly or creative achievements, especially as measured through publication and/or (inter)national reputation, the College of Arts and Sciences also recognizes that, "[w]here 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 scholarship." In screening candidates for promotion, the Department of English honors this principle of exception as described in the College's APT document, with an understanding that such contributions—whether within or beyond the university—must be documentable in ways that can be reviewed by external evaluators as well as by the eligible faculty.

The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure (see charts in Section VI.A.1), with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national or international reputation in the field, as described below. When assessing a candidate's reputation in the field, a national or international reputation for the scholarship of teaching may be counted as either teaching or scholarship.

Teaching:

Typically, candidates for promotion are expected to have been consistently strong to excellent teachers, judged by their effectiveness in exciting interest, cultivating independent thought, and imparting demonstrable knowledge and skills among the variety of students enrolled in our courses. Distinction in teaching can also be measured by national or international recognition in the form of awards or honors, and/or by documentation of successful student outcomes. Promotion candidates on the Columbus campus will usually demonstrate, in addition to a strong record of undergraduate pedagogy, evidence of extensive graduate teaching and graduate advising in their fields.

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

Scholarship:

The Department places particular emphasis on candidates' demonstration of excellence in scholarship. Typically, a candidate for promotion to Professor will have a post-tenure scholarly record of national and/or international distinction judged by its quality, quantity, and impact on the pertinent field(s). The Department acknowledges, however, that flexibility in assessing excellence and impact at this level is appropriate.

In many instances, the centerpiece of a candidate's post-tenure scholarly record will take the form of an additional published book or a set of scholarly or creative projects, comparable in their collective substance and impact to a major, book-length work. Such projects may be singly or

collaboratively authored and disseminated in peer-reviewed venues or other media as appropriate to the candidate's specialty. In some subfields of English studies, including Folklore, Linguistics, and Rhetoric, Composition, & Literacy, the centerpiece of the case is commonly a set of projects, typically a collection of strong articles and/or book chapters, individually or collaboratively authored.

All candidates are additionally expected to demonstrate some degree of breadth and promise of continuing scholarly achievement. This breadth and promise can be demonstrated in a variety of forms:

- Additional articles in peer-reviewed journals or book chapters (for those using a strong collection as the centerpiece of the case for promotion, these essays should address one or more lines of research not reflected in the collection);
- scholarly editions;
- edited or co-edited collections;
- textbooks that incorporate substantial original research;
- digital/database/website productions;
- translations;
- conference papers and invited presentations;
- readings of original creative work;
- curation of exhibits;
- book reviews and review essays;
- editing of a journal and/or book series (where editorial work has made, in the view of senior colleagues in the field, a significant scholarly contribution);
- professional reports on research or pedagogical activity.

In addition, breadth and promise in scholarship can be demonstrated through the following activities when they are substantially informed by one's research:

- the development of pedagogical resources or learning tools (print or digital);
- the direction of institutes that have documentable impact on teaching and/or scholarship in a given field;
- the creation of major new scholarly tools (print or digital);
- The development and implementation of public-facing projects that contribute to the advancement of public humanities as an area of inquiry and that interact with current disciplinary conversations;
- The development and implementation of projects with community partners that contribute to the community's agency, well-being, knowledge of itself, experiences, and/or resources;
- the performance of extra-departmental administrative roles that relate directly to a candidate's field of scholarly expertise and produce new knowledge or other kinds of impact that can be assessed by peer review.

The preceding list is not meant to be exhaustive. Furthermore, the Department is open to considering cases in which the relationship between "centerpiece" and "breadth and promise" (as defined in the previous two paragraphs) is reversed. Whatever form a scholarship profile may take, the Department will be most concerned to verify its quality and impact, as measured by peer reviews, the prestige of its venues, the receipt of awards, evidence of citations, and other measures of quality appropriate to the candidate's specialty.

Service:

In the area of service, candidates are expected to have built a record of significant, effective contributions at the College, University, and national levels, while also continuing to provide high-quality service to the Department at the appropriate campus. Although not required, evidence of professionally- related public service at the local, national, or international levels is also valued.

3 Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

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

Promotion to Senior Lecturer. Lecturers may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank as described in Section IV.A.2.

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

4 Regional Campus Faculty

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Teaching

In the area of teaching, the Department will look for sustained excellence in undergraduate teaching and mentoring and will not require regional campus candidates for promotion to have a record of graduate teaching or advising.

Scholarship

As members of the Department of English, regional campus faculty are expected to contribute to scholarship in their discipline. These contributions will be evaluated by the same means and according to the same criteria as described above. In recognition of the mission of the regional campuses, however, the Department makes adjustments in quantitative scholarship expectations. Because the primary mission of the regional campuses is to provide high-quality undergraduate instruction and serve the academic needs of their communities, the Department will give greater weight to the performances in undergraduate teaching and service of regional campus faculty. For promotion to Associate Professor, regional campus candidates will be expected to meet the same qualitative scholarship requirement as Columbus faculty—a published book (or a finished and fully revised book manuscript under final, board-approved contract and ready to go to press) or a sustained, original scholarly project appropriate to the field. We adjust the quantitative standard for regional campus tenure candidates, however, by allowing that additional published work beyond the book (or book equivalent) is not, as it is for Columbus faculty, the standard expectation. Similarly, in evaluating the breadth of a candidate for promotion to professor, the heavier course load and scarcity of leave opportunities at regional campuses will be taken into consideration in evaluating the quantity, though not the quality, of a regional faculty member's case for promotion.

Service

Because the responsibility for maintaining strong ties with the local community falls more directly on the regional campus faculty than is the case on the Columbus campus, service for regional campus candidates may be understood to include not only active participation on campus committees and in professional organizations but also participation in those activities that support the academic mission of the University in the community.

In formulating its judgment on regional campus candidates, the Department pays close attention to the recommendations of the campus's Peer Review Committee and the campus Dean/Director.

Promotion to Professor

The heavier course load and scarcity of Faculty Professional Leave opportunities at regional campuses will be taken into consideration in evaluation of the quantity, though not the quality, of a regional faculty member's case for promotion.

Associated Faculty promotions

In evaluating regional campus associated faculty for promotion, the department will use the same criteria as described in Section VI.A.3.

B Procedures

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

1 Tenure-Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

a. Candidate responsibilities

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

- **Dossier**

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

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

The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the

last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

For scholarship documentation, a full history of publications and creative work should be included, as this information provides context to the more recent and relevant research record and/or demonstrates scholarly independence. Information about scholarship produced prior to the start date (for probationary faculty) or date of last promotion (for tenured or nonprobationary faculty) may be provided. Any such material should be clearly indicated. However, it is the scholarly record 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 or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

All entries in the core dossier should be presented in reverse chronological order.

In addition to the core dossier, the Department requires the following documentation:

- Syllabi, SEI overview reports, and discursive student evaluations for each course taught during the most recent 5 years
- Peer observations of teaching (see section IX below)
- One (1) electronic copy of each unpublished book-length manuscript that will be considered as part of the record on research, with an attached prefatory note indicating if the work is still under review or has been accepted for publication; if accepted, then state when and with what press it is forthcoming
- One (1) electronic copy of each published article, chapter, essay, review, or other short publication
- One (1) electronic copy of contracts and reports by readers for scholarship (books, articles, book chapters etc.) as yet unpublished but under contract, along with responses to the reports by the candidate and any evidence of acceptance or contract
- One (1) electronic copy of already published books
- Electronic copies of any published reviews of the candidate's work
- Current CV

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

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

Candidates must indicate the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. A candidate may be reviewed using the department's current APT document, or they may elect to be reviewed under the document that was in effect on their start date or the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion, 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 section B4 below)**

If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed according to standards for peer review in college and OAA policies, as outlined in section B4 below. The candidate may add up to six additional names but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The P and T chair, in consultation with the department chair, decides whether removal is justified.

- **Comments**

After candidates receive copies of the completed letters from the P&T Chair and the department chair, they may submit comments on the letters up to ten calendar days after receiving them. If they are not submitting comments, they submit a form indicating that response. Only one iteration of comments on the Departmental review is permitted.

- **Stopping the Review**

Only the candidate may stop any review for promotion and tenure once external letters of evaluation have been sought. The candidate may withdraw from review at any stage of the process by so informing the Department Chair in writing. If the review process has moved beyond the Department, the Department Chair shall inform the Dean or the Executive Vice President and Provost, as relevant, of the candidate's withdrawal. Withdrawal from the mandatory tenure review during the final probationary year means that tenure shall not be granted.

- **Candidate responsibilities for receiving screening feedback for non-mandatory review**

In keeping with its commitment to offering clear and constructive feedback to assistant and associate professors, the department has developed specific guidelines for materials to submit as part of the screening process for non-mandatory tenure and/or promotion review. As part of the annual review process (see section V above), all assistant and associate professors receive the opportunity for a discussion with a peer review partner about a writing sample and annual activities. These discussions, along with other mentoring activities and opportunities to share work, are meant to provide formative feedback about preparing for tenure and/or promotion reviews. The screening process provides a more structured opportunity to receive feedback from all of the eligible faculty. The items described below 1) allow candidates to receive constructive, formative feedback about research, teaching and service statements that will be included in their dossiers; 2) create equitable reviews by providing candidates with clear guidelines about exactly what to submit and allowing eligible faculty to have documentation beyond the CV; and 3) provide a structured, scaffolded opportunity for candidates to begin the process of collecting materials, including peer teaching observations, that will be needed for the promotion review.

The screening of **assistant professors** who have just undergone fourth-year review will be based on the materials submitted for that review. The screening of all other candidates (i.e. those who have not yet passed a fourth-year review) will be based on the following materials submitted for the eligible faculty to review: (1) the candidate's current core dossier, including complete narrative sections on teaching, scholarship and service, plus a cumulative SEI report; (2) a current C.V.; (3) copies of all previous annual review letters and peer teaching observations; and (4) documentation confirming the publication schedule

of any book(s) or comparable major project(s) that will be central to the promotion and tenure case. The documentation mentioned under item (4) should include, in the case of books, a final board-approved contract or compelling evidence that such a contract will be in hand by the time the eligible faculty votes in the fall. In the case of articles or other works, the documentation required under item (4) may include letters of acceptance or other formal agreements to publish the work(s) in question.

During fall semester, **associate professors** who wish to be considered for promotion to Professor in the following academic year should make that request known to the Department Chair and/or P&T Chair. The Professors meet early in Spring semester to screen materials submitted in support of that request. Approval of the request will be based on a positive review of the following documentation:

- The candidate's up-to-date c.v.;
- Three statements—like those required for the core dossier—providing a narrative of the candidate's scholarship and accomplishments in teaching and in service going back five years or to last promotion, whichever is more recent; and
- A cumulative SEI report (this will figure in the College and OAA review of the case, and accordingly must be addressed at the screening meeting).

The Professors will also have access to the candidate's annual review letters going back five years or to last promotion, whichever is more recent. If a major research project such as a monograph is going to figure prominently in the promotion case but has not yet been published, the statement on scholarship should include a timeline for publication, with a copy of a final board-approved contract (or the equivalent) attached. If such a contract is not in hand by the date of the screening meeting, the candidate will need to present convincing evidence (such as recent correspondence from the press) that a final contract (as defined under VI.A.1) will be in hand by the time the eligible faculty votes in the Fall. Letters of acceptance for other major publications not yet in print should also be included. The statement on teaching for Columbus campus faculty should include an updated list of graduate student and honors student committees, if these are not included on the c.v.

b Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

The Chair of the P&T Committee oversees the Committee; ensures the proper execution of the Department's P&T policies and procedures; and participates with the Department Chair in coordinating and conducting annual reviews of Assistant Professors. For sixth-year reviews, and reviews regarding promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, the P&T Chair notifies candidates of deadlines; contacts external reviewers; ensures the timely distribution of all materials to the eligible faculty; schedules a meeting or meetings early enough to meet subsequent deadlines set by the College of Arts and Sciences; and otherwise oversees the process of the review.

When the Promotion and Tenure Committee is appointed, two members must be selected as the **Procedures Oversight Designee** (one POD, the "junior POD," is assigned for Assistant Professors coming up for promotion to Associate and another, the "senior POD" for Associate Professors coming up for promotion to Professor). The senior POD assists the chair with organizing the annual reviews of Associate Professors. Both positions are dedicated to seeing that the Department fairly and appropriately carries out its own procedures and those of the College and OAA. The PODs work to ensure that the eligible faculty follows written procedures governing the reviews, that the proceedings are carried out in an ethical, professional manner, and, in particular, that the proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions about members of underrepresented groups that could bias the review. The specific responsibilities of the POD and processes for addressing procedural difficulties are described in the Office of Academic Affairs' annual procedural guidelines.

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

- To review this APT document and to recommend proposed revisions to the chair and to the faculty.
- In late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process:
 - Spring/early summer:
 - Suggest names of external evaluators.
 - Present slates of potential evaluators to the College of Arts and Sciences for approval
 - Contact potential evaluators and send packets of materials to those who agree to serve
 - Summer/early fall
 - Prepare summaries of discursive teaching evaluations of each candidate, with at least two members of the committee reviewing the evaluations and summaries for accuracy
 - Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
 - Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and provide candidates an opportunity to comment on their dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
 - In consultation with the chair, ensure that all review materials are made available to the eligible faculty at least two weeks before any review meeting. If any external letters are received during this two-week period for reasons out of the control of the committee, they should be provided as soon as they are received.
 - The P&T Chair, acting for the eligible faculty, submits a letter reporting on each candidate to the Department Chair indicating the eligible faculty's vote and recommendation, and an explanation of that recommendation, including a summary of the discussion among those participating in the review meeting. That letter is included in the dossier forwarded to the college and OAA.
 - 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 chair in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit. The 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 TIU's cases.
- In fall semester, to send information to associate professors about the process for being screened for non-mandatory promotion review.
- When there is a question about potential conflicts, the P&T Chair in consultation with the Procedures Oversight Designee shall determine whether it is appropriate for the faculty member to recuse himself or herself from a particular review (see III.A.3).
- In spring semester, to ensure that candidate materials for screening meetings for non-mandatory review are provided to the eligible faculty at least one week before the meeting.
- In spring semester, to oversee the collection of materials and documentation for annual reviews of probationary tenure-track assistant professors, including those being considered for fourth year review.

- To serve in other capacities as required by department, college, and OAA guidelines, such as making recommendations to the Chair regarding requests from untenured faculty for unpaid leaves of absence or exclusions of time from the tenure clock.

c Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the members of the Eligible Faculty Committee 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.
 - For sixth-year reviews and reviews for promotion to Professor, the voting procedure is as follows: after all candidates have been discussed, a straw vote is taken on those candidates by secret ballot; the results are announced to the meeting, and those results determine the order of final discussion. The candidate with the highest total of “yes” votes in the straw vote will be considered first. Each consideration will begin with the introduction of a formal motion that the candidate pass the review. Once the formal motion has been made, discussion of the case is resumed. At the conclusion of the discussion of each case, a separate final vote by secret ballot will be conducted for each candidate. A two-thirds majority is required for an affirmative recommendation. Proxy votes are not allowed, but those who have participated in the meeting via Zoom or the equivalent may vote.
 - For reviews of candidates for tenured Associate Professor or Professor positions: the same procedures apply, except that the straw vote may be omitted if any member of the eligible faculty proposes going straight to the final vote and everyone present agrees.
- If a candidate provides comments on the letter summarizing the recommendation of the Eligible Faculty, the faculty review the comments and determine if there is a need for a written response or a new vote.
- To meet during Spring semester or after a positive fourth-year review to decide whether to approve requests from Assistant Professors to undergo a non-mandatory review for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure in the Fall of that calendar year.
- Except in the cases of those who have just gone through fourth-year review, this screening meeting for candidates seeking non-mandatory P&T review should typically occur within the first six weeks of spring semester, and all the relevant materials for review should be available at least one week prior to the date of the screening meeting.
- A two-thirds majority of the eligible faculty is required for a promotion and tenure review to be conducted the following year, and the vote on this is to be conducted by secret ballot. If the decision is to move forward with the non-mandatory review, the Department Chair and the P&T Chair begin the same process as that followed for a mandatory sixth-year review. A decision to permit a review to take place in no way commits the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department Chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the promotion and tenure review itself. Nor does a decision to permit a non-mandatory review

obligate the candidate to go through with the review should he or she choose, on the basis of feedback from the screening meeting or other factors, to wait until the completion of the full probationary period before undergoing a mandatory sixth-year review. If the recommendation of the eligible faculty at the Spring semester or fourth-year review meeting is negative, the matter is considered closed for that year.

- Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor.
- The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented by the candidate (see faculty member responsibilities above) as well as on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
- A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04A\(3\)](#) only once. 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.

d Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the chair are as follows:

- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. (The department must ensure that such questions are asked of all candidates in a non-discriminatory manner.) For tenure-track assistant professors, the 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.
- To solicit an evaluation from a TIU head of any TIU in which the candidate has a joint appointment.
- To ensure that each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To charge each member of the eligible faculty 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 facilitate the meetings in which faculty discuss and vote on cases for fourth-year, sixth-year, and promotion review. This is a long-standing and highly valued practice in the department. Because the Department Chair writes and submits to the College an independent evaluation of the case and does not vote with the rest of the body, however, the Department Chair's participation in

these meetings remains as neutral as possible. The Department Chair will follow normal Rules of Order, refraining from calling twice on any speaker before all who wish to speak have been recognized, except when speakers are responding to questions directed to themselves from the floor. The Department Chair will not make evaluative comments on cases under discussion, although s/he may respond to requests from the floor for factual information.

- A Department Chair who decides for any reason to recuse him/herself from the duties of running all or part of a P&T meeting retains the right to be present in order to hear the full discussion. If the Department Chair is recused from running all or part of a P&T meeting, the chair's duties in that respect will fall to the P&T Chair.
- At the request of the eligible faculty, the 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. The Department Chair also writes a separate letter expressing the Chair's own recommendation and assessment of the case to be included in the dossier sent to the Dean. The purpose of this letter is to present an assessment from the Department Chair's perspective of the candidate's work in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. While the Department Chair's letter should not comment on evidence in the case not available to the eligible faculty, the letter may discuss at greater length items of which the Department Chair, by virtue of his/her/their position, has special knowledge. The Department Chair's letter may also comment on the relevant contextual features of the case such as the disciplinary standing of the external evaluators.
- If the Department Chair's individual view of a candidate's case may lead to a recommendation different from that of the relevant body of eligible faculty, the Department Chair will communicate in writing to that body the reasons for that 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 departmental review process:
 - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair;
 - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair; and
 - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten calendar days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he/she/they will submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline.
- To receive the eligible faculty's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the TIU head of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

2 Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

3 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

Except when the review is a mandatory review for tenure, the Department determines which faculty members will be reviewed for promotion and tenure or for promotion, using the screening process outlined above. If the eligible faculty determines that a regional campus faculty member is to be reviewed, the Department Chair will so notify the faculty member, with a copy to the Dean/Director of the regional campus.

The Dean/Director will initiate a review by the regional campus faculty according to the procedures established on the campus. This review focuses mainly on teaching and service. The Dean/Director forwards the report of this review, and a recommendation to the Department Chair, for inclusion in the candidate's dossier and for the use of the Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee. From this point, the review follows the same course as all promotion and tenure reviews.. A request to promote requires agreement by the dean/director and the chair.

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

4 External Evaluations

External evaluations of scholarly and creative activity and research are required for all promotion and tenure reviews as well as all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. 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 personal friend, research collaborator, former academic advisor, or postdoctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation.
- Is written by a person at an appropriate peer or aspirational institution. In keeping with college guidelines, the department will generally obtain evaluations from faculty at R01 institutions that are members of the [Association of American Universities \(AAU\)](#) and the [Big Ten Academic Alliance](#). It also may solicit evaluations from [top quartile departments in English](#) that are not in the AAU, which currently includes the CUNY Graduate Center and the University of Notre Dame. 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 English studies related to a candidate's interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary projects; 3) meets the standards for a peer reviewer in a TIU in which the candidate is joint-appointed; and/or 4) where relevant, is a distinguished, award winning (e.g., Pulitzer Prize or Guggenheim Fellowship) creative writer or artist who is not affiliated with an academic institution.

- Whenever possible, external reviewers will hold the rank of Professor. In the case of an Assistant Professor seeking promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from Associate Professors.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will usefulness be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

To ensure that the minimum of five letters is met, the department solicits more letters 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.

A list of potential evaluators will be assembled by the P&T Chair, in consultation with the P&T Committee, the candidate, and senior faculty, especially those with expertise in the candidate's field(s). The P&T Chair will also consult candidates about how to define their field(s). If there are no Associate Professors and Professors in the candidate's field(s) within the English Department, the P&T Chair and Committee will assemble a list of potential evaluators based on advice given by Associate Professors and Professors outside the Department in the relevant field(s).

The candidate is responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the Department and has the option of adding up to six additional names. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The P&T Chair decides whether removal is justified. The final list of potential evaluators will then be sent to the College for approval.

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

The P&T Chair is responsible for determining who will recruit the evaluators by phone or email, but typically this person will be the P&T Chair, a member of the P&T Committee, or a senior colleague in the candidate's field.

The Department will follow the College of Arts and Sciences' [suggested format](#) for letters requesting external evaluations.

Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit external evaluations or initiate contact in any way with external evaluators for any purpose related to the promotion review. If an external evaluator should initiate contact with the candidate regarding the review, the candidate must inform the evaluator that such communication is inappropriate and report the occurrence to the Department

Chair, who will decide what, if any, action is warranted (e.g., requesting permission from the Office of Academic Affairs to exclude that letter from the dossier). It is in the candidate's self-interest to assure that there is no ethical or procedural lapse, or the appearance of such a lapse, in the course of the review process.

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.

After the Department has voted and the P&T Chair and Department Chair have given their letters to the candidate, the candidate may read the external letters. The letters may be verbatim or redacted to mask the writers' identity, as the candidate chooses.

VII Appeals

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

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

VIII Seventh-Year Reviews

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

IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A Student Evaluation of Teaching

All members of the Department must allow students to evaluate their courses. University rules stipulate that all courses should be evaluated by students, and the [Student Evaluation of Instruction](#) (eSEI) form or an equivalent end-of-course teaching assessment survey/tool must be offered in every course offered in the departments and schools within the College of Arts and Sciences. For purposes of promotion and tenure decisions, Assistant Professors and Associate Professors are required to submit SEIs to satisfy the college policy; however, the Department gives more weight to other evaluative sources (such as discursive evaluations and peer observations) in reviewing an instructor's teaching.

In order to encourage participation, teachers may dedicate time during an in-person or synchronous on-line class for students to fill out the SEI using CarmenCanvas or the OSU mobile application as well as to write SEI comments or fill out discursive evaluations (see below). Teachers should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if students will be asked to complete the evaluation using a mobile application. Teachers must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation. Teachers should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and to provide feedback that can be taken into account in future teaching.

All teachers in the Department are also required to collect discursive commentary either through the SEI comments feature or through separate evaluation forms. Those teaching in person classes generally use evaluation forms, created by the instructor and distributed in class, that solicit information about both the quality of the course's content and the quality of the instructor's performance. The department's [Teaching Resources page](#) provides examples of such forms. Annual review discussions will address the appropriateness and effectiveness of the candidate's discursive evaluation form. Those using separate discursive forms are encouraged, but not required, to turn off the comments feature of the eSEI form to avoid duplication. Any comments received should be retained by the instructor and submitted when discursive comments are requested as part of the annual review and promotion and tenure process.

In order for the students to feel free to express their opinions without fear of reprisal at grading time, the following procedures should be followed in distributing, collecting, and reading evaluations for in-person classes:

- the instructor should not be in the room when the evaluations are filled out.
- the evaluations should be collected by someone other than the instructor (it may be one of the students or a TA), who should then place them in a sealed envelope labeled with the course number and the instructor's name and bring them to the designated collection point.
- the instructor should not pick up and read the evaluations until after the final grades are posted to the Registrar.

B Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Tenure-track assistant professors, Columbus campus: For tenure-track assistant professors, by the time of the fourth-year review, the Department requires four peer evaluations of teaching, and by the time of the sixth-year review, the Department requires a minimum total of five such evaluations. The first peer evaluation must be done no later than a candidate's second year. All faculty at the Associate and Professor rank on all campuses are expected to do such evaluations, and the P&T Chair assists in these arrangements. At least one reviewer should be from another campus. Candidates' teaching at different levels of the curriculum should be evaluated. If a course is taught on-line, evaluations may be done of recorded synchronous classes held on Zoom or another web conferencing platform or of asynchronous materials posted on Carmen.

Tenure-track assistant professors, regional campuses: Tenure-track assistant professors on the regional campuses also follow the peer review process stipulated by the APT document on their campus. The department requires that at least three reviews be completed by English faculty, at least one of whom must be from the Columbus campus. The P and T chair and the regional campus English coordinators will work together to provide guidance for individual candidates, in consultation with the relevant campus dean. All evaluative peer reviews collected during the probationary period will be included in the materials submitted as part of the promotion and tenure dossier.

Tenured associate professors, Columbus campus: candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor should have a minimum of three peer reviews covering the five years preceding the promotion case. All Professors on all campuses are eligible and expected to do these evaluations, and the Department encourages faculty in Columbus to be reviewed by faculty on another campus when possible. Although there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible. Candidates' teaching at different levels of the curriculum should be evaluated, and (except for regional campus faculty) at least one graduate course should be evaluated, if taught.

Tenured associate professors, regional campuses: Associate professors on the regional campuses also follow the peer review process stipulated by the APT document on their campus. The department requires that at least two of the three reviews required for promotion be completed by English faculty, at least one of whom must be from the Columbus campus.

Tenured professors, all campuses: The chair may request a peer review of teaching for a professor or any other faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally initiated by 1) the desire to create a portfolio for a teaching award at the university or national level or another professional purpose; 2) faculty requests; or 3) evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching. Reviews conducted upon the request of the chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the chair or faculty member and may or may not include class visitations. They may, for example, focus on a review of syllabi and course materials.

Peer evaluators should visit at least one class meeting of a course. Peer reports should be thorough, detailed, honest, and fair. Effective peer reports are generally at least two pages long, single spaced, but may run longer if the observer attended more than one class.

The following guidelines are intended to assist peer evaluators in writing evaluative reports that will be useful to those who will review the candidate's record as well as to the candidate:

- Before attending the class, the peer evaluator should communicate with the candidate to establish a time for the visit and to understand the goals of the course and the candidate's teaching philosophy. The evaluator should also be given a copy of the syllabus and any relevant materials for the day of the visit, such as assignments, examinations, study guides, and handouts. If there are relevant materials posted on Carmen or pre-class discussions taking place there, the instructor should provide the peer evaluator with access to the Carmen site.
- As part of the peer evaluation report, the evaluator should describe the syllabus, including objectives, schedule, assignments, method/s of assessment, classroom policies and rules. The evaluator should also identify any stand-out strengths or potential weaknesses of overall course design, given the goals and levels of the course.
- The peer evaluation report should note the number of students in the class, the number who attended on the day (or days) of the visit, and, if relevant (i.e., in a discussion class), how many students contributed to class discussion. Other details—such as the course modality, room layout or student composition (e.g., an interdisciplinary class vs. a class of all or mostly English majors)—that may assist in explaining the effectiveness of the class should also be included in the report.
- The peer report should consist of an evaluative account of what the person observed. This will include a descriptive overview of how the class was structured and how each part unfolded over the allotted time. But the evaluator should also assess the success of the approach and might also cover topics such as the instructor's effectiveness as a lecturer and/or as a moderator of class discussion, the clarity of the class objectives for the day, how well the instructor meets the aims of the course as outlined in the syllabus, the instructor's command of the material and knowledge of the subject matter, and the instructor's engagement with the students and helpfulness in answering questions.

After the class, the peer evaluator should discuss his/her/their observations with the faculty member, and an account of this discussion may become part of the report.

The peer evaluator should share his/her/their report with the faculty member before submitting a signed copy to the Department Chair for inclusion in the faculty member's personnel file. The purpose of such sharing is to give the instructor a chance to point out any (and only) factual errors. Having a report in hand can also assist the faculty member in promptly acting on recommendations that will improve his/her/their teaching. The candidate may also provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if desired.

Peer reviewers should address letters to the chair, and the letters should be written using electronic letter head and include digital signature. Reviewers should send a copy of the letter both to the candidate and to the chair, who maintains them in departmental files. The chair will inform candidates about letters on file as part of the annual review process. Faculty members are allowed to view the peer evaluations in their personnel file at any time.

Informal peer reviews—ones that do not generate an official report for a faculty member's file but do elicit a conversation about that faculty member's teaching with a senior faculty observer—are also encouraged. Faculty seeking formative reviews should review the information available through the [Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#).

APPENDIX

GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW RATINGS, COLUMBUS CAMPUS (ENGLISH)*

N.B.: These guidelines are a general rubric and are not binding on the Salary Committee or the Chair, who may assign the ratings more, but not less, generously. Guidelines for evaluating regional campus faculty are determined by the regional deans.

5	Outstanding
4	Excellent
3	Very Good
2	Good
1	Satisfactory
0	Unsatisfactory

Teaching:

- *5 Outstanding:* Teaching award; strong undergraduate teaching and advising/mentoring supported by evidence in Annual Report; advisor or committee member to significant number of graduate students, inside or outside one's field of specialization; significant indication of pedagogical innovation (e.g., Drake Institute instructional redesign; ALX grant, inclusive pedagogy; course design or re-design)
- *4 Excellent:* Strong undergrad teaching supported by evidence in Annual Report; above average involvement with graduate students and/or undergraduate students (including independent studies, honors theses); some indication of pedagogical innovation
- *3 Very Good:* Evidence of acceptable undergrad teaching and some graduate advising
- *2 Good:* Evidence of acceptable undergrad teaching and minimal graduate advising
- *1 Satisfactory:* Evidence of adequate undergrad teaching and no involvement in graduate advising
- *0 Unsatisfactory:* Subpar teaching record

Scholarship:

- *5 Outstanding:* Book publication (or equivalent) and/or major research award (e.g. ASC Distinguished Professor or OSU Distinguished Scholar; national award in discipline)
- *4 Excellent:* Peer-reviewed journal article or essay in edited collection (or equivalent) plus additional scholarly activity (other publications and/or presentations at national and international conferences; submitting or contributing to a university or external grant proposal; developing a research project or program related to diversity and inclusion.)
- *3 Very Good:* Peer-reviewed journal article or essay in edited collection (or equivalent)

- *2 Good:* Conference presentation(s) and/or minor publications (e.g., reviews, notes, encyclopedia entries)
- *1 Satisfactory:* Active works in progress
- *0 Unsatisfactory:* Little evidence of scholarly activity

Service:

- *5 Outstanding:* Major award for service (Department, University, or national); present for EDC and APT meetings
- *4 Excellent:* Significant administrative position(s) inside and/or outside the Department; active committee work; significant work to promote diversity and inclusion; present for EDC and APT meetings
- *3 Very Good:* Active committee work; fulfilled requirements of secondary service assignment; present for EDC and APT meetings
- *2 Good:* Active committee work; fulfilled requirements of secondary service assignment
- *1 Satisfactory:* Attended committee meetings; fulfilled requirements of secondary service assignment
- *0 Unsatisfactory:* Failed to meet expectations; ignored assigned duties

*The Deans of the Regional Campuses use a 5-point system for annual evaluation of faculty performance and are not bound by this Columbus campus rubric. At the time of the AMCP process, the Department Chair has already recommended ratings for regional faculty members' research to the regional deans.