

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

Approved by the Faculty: 12/13/2021

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 7/12/23

Table of Contents

I Preamble	4
II Department Mission	4
III Definitions.....	4
A Committee of the Eligible Faculty	4
1 Tenure-track Faculty	5
2 Teaching Faculty.....	5
3 Research Faculty	6
4 Associated Faculty	6
B Conflict of Interest	7
C Minimum Composition	7
D Promotion and Tenure Committee	7
E Quorum.....	7
F Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.....	8
1 Appointment	8
2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal.....	8
IV Appointments.....	8
A Criteria	8
1 Tenure-track Faculty	8
2 Teaching Faculty.....	9
3 Research Faculty	10
4 Associated Faculty	10
5 Regional Campus Faculty	11
6 Emeritus Faculty	11
7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty.....	12
B Procedures	12
1 Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus	12
2 Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus	14
3 Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus	14
4 Transfer from the Tenure-track.....	14
5 Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	14
6 Regional Campus Faculty	15
7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty.....	15
V Annual Performance and Merit Review.....	15
A Documentation	16

B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus	16
1 Fourth-Year Review	18
2 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period	18
C Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus	19
D Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus	19
E Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus	20
F Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	20
G Regional Campus Faculty	20
H Salary Recommendations.....	21
1 Criteria	21
2 Procedures.....	21
VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews.....	21
A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion	21
1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	22
2 Promotion to Professor	26
3 Teaching Faculty.....	27
4 Research Faculty	29
5 Associated Faculty	30
6 Regional Campus Faculty	30
B Procedures	30
1 Tenure-Track, Teaching Faculty, and Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus	30
a Candidate Responsibilities	30
b Responsibilities of the Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty	33
c Eligible Faculty Responsibilities.....	34
d Department Chair Responsibilities	34
2 Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	36
3 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty.....	36
4 External Evaluations	36
VII Appeals.....	37
VIII Seventh-Year Reviews	38
IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching	38
A Student Evaluation of Teaching	38
B Peer Evaluation of Teaching	38

I Preamble

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

Should those rules and policies change, the Department of Microbiology 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 Executive Dean of the Arts and Sciences or their designee and the OAA before it may be implemented. It sets forth the Department of Microbiology'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 OAA accept the mission and criteria of the Department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to Departmental mission and criteria.

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

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

II Department Mission

The mission of the Department is to provide a comprehensive education in microbiology and to extend, through investigative research, the body of knowledge that forms the discipline of microbiology. Student education is accomplished through formal lectures, laboratory exercises, tutorials and one-on-one discussions and demonstrations. Microbiology is an experimental science and an education in microbiology requires extensive exposure of undergraduate and graduate students to laboratory experiences. The Department's mission therefore includes maximizing student access to appropriate laboratory facilities, research equipment and financial support. The research interests and teaching activities of the faculty in the Department are varied. Faculty members disseminate knowledge and research expertise over a wide range of topics within the discipline of microbiology to students enrolled at OSU and, as a service, also to government, private organizations and to individuals. The multiple missions of the Department of Microbiology, expected by the University of all Departments, are formally designated as teaching, research, and service.

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 or primary appointment in the Department.

The Department Chair, the Divisional Dean and Assistant, Associate, and Executive Deans of the College, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President may not participate as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, promotion and tenure, or contract renewal.

1 Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring) review of an Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the Department.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

- For the reappointment and promotion and tenure reviews of Assistant Professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured Associate Professors and Professors.
- For the promotion reviews of Associate Professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured Professors.

2 Teaching Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review: Assistant Teaching Professor.** For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an Assistant Teaching Professor, the Chair will form a search committee made up of a minimum of three members of the eligible faculty who have demonstrated success in pedagogical research or instructional performance. This committee will evaluate applicants and recommend a hiring decision to the Chair.
- **Appointment Review: Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor.** For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review at senior rank (Associate Teaching Professors and Teaching Professors), the committee of the eligible faculty will evaluate applicants and recommend a hiring decision to the Chair. The committee of eligible faculty for a senior teaching faculty appointment consists of all tenure-track and all teaching faculty in the Department.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all non-probationary teaching faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews

- For the reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of Assistant Teaching Professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured Associate Professors and Professors, all nonprobationary Associate Teaching Professors, and all nonprobationary Teaching Professors.
- For the reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of Associate Teaching Professors and the reappointment and contract renewal reviews of Teaching Professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured Professors and all non-probationary Teaching Professors.

3 Research Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research Professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all research faculty in the Department. Appointments at the Research Assistant Professor level shall be made by the Chair, with support of the majority of all of the Department's tenure-track faculty and all research faculty whose primary appointment is in the Department. Appointments at the Research Associate Professor and Research Professor level shall require a full review and recommendation in writing by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty to the Chair of the Department, who is ultimately responsible for making the decision at the departmental level.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and all nonprobationary research faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews

- For the reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of Research Assistant Professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured Associate Professors and Professors and all nonprobationary Research Associate Professors and Professors.
- For the reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of Research Associate Professors and the reappointment and contract renewal reviews of Research Professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured Professors and all nonprobationary Research Professors.

4 Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment, Reappointment, and Contract Renewal

- Initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of associated faculty follows a job posting in Workday (see Section IV.B), a formal search, and candidate interviews. The reappointment and contract renewal of associated faculty members are decided by the Department Chair in consultation with the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.

Initial appointments at senior rank, which likewise follow a job posting in Workday, a formal search, and candidate interviews, also require a vote by the eligible faculty (all non-probationary teaching faculty and tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college dean.

Promotion Reviews

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

For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track, teaching, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Sections III.A.1, 2 or 3 above.

The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the Department Chair in consultation with the Committee of Eligible Faculty.

B 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 (e.g., 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 since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion or appointment review.

C Minimum Composition

In the event that the Department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the Department Chair, after consulting with the Dean of the Division of Natural and Mathematical Sciences, will appoint a faculty member from another Department within the college.

D Promotion and Tenure Committee

In the Department of Microbiology, the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee is composed of the Committee of Eligible Faculty.

E Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty, not including faculty who are on an approved leave of absence or Faculty Professional Leave. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining a quorum only if the Department Chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

F Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters, only “yes” and “no” votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to consider whether they are participating fully in the review process when abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter.

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

1 Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

In the case of a joint appointment, the Department must seek input from a candidate’s joint-appointment TIU prior to his/her/their appointment.

2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast are positive.

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

IV Appointments

A Criteria

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

1 Tenure-track Faculty

Instructor. Appointment at the rank of Instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of Assistant Professor, but requirements for the terminal degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. Procedures for appointment are identical to that of Assistant Professor. The Department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the Instructor level is limited to three years. Promotion to Assistant Professor occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. When an Instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor by the end of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to Assistant Professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an Instructor. This request must be approved by the Department's eligible faculty, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the OAA. 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. An earned doctoral degree is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor. Appointments at the rank of Assistant Professor will be made to individuals who have strong prior research accomplishments, the potential for sustained research productivity at OSU, a high probability of securing outside funding to support their research, and strong teaching capabilities. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the Department and the profession is highly desirable. Appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the 7th year will be the final year of employment. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Committee of Eligible Faculty determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the OAA, 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 with or without tenure, Professor with tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the Department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at senior rank normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at senior rank is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the OAA, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

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

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

2 Teaching Faculty

Except for those appointed at the rank of Instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all teaching faculty must be for a period of five years. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually by the eligible faculty. Second and subsequent contracts for Assistant and Associate Teaching Professors must be for a period of at least three and no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for teaching professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. There is no presumption that subsequent appointments will be offered, regardless of performance. The terms of a contract may be re-negotiated at the time of reappointment. These extended appointments are not probationary, and the individual may only be terminated for cause (see rule [3335-5-04](#) of the Administrative Code) or financial exigency (see rule [3335-5-02.1](#) of the Administrative Code). Tenure is not granted to teaching faculty.

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

Assistant Teaching Professor. An earned doctorate is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of Assistant Teaching Professor. Evidence of ability to teach is highly desirable.

Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor. Appointment at the rank of Associate Teaching Professor or Teaching Professor requires that the individual have an earned doctorate and meet, at a minimum, the Department's criteria—in teaching, service, and scholarship—for promotion to these ranks.

3 Research Faculty

Appointment of research faculty entails one- to five-year appointments. The initial appointment is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to research faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent appointments will be offered, regardless of performance.

The appointment of research faculty must be based on a clear and sound plan for the programmatic future of the Department and college and on a realistic determination of the availability of resources to support the appointment.

It is expected that 100% of the individual's salary will come from extramural research grants for which typically either the research faculty member or their Sponsor will be Principal Investigator. The Sponsor must certify that sufficient research grant funds exist to cover the salary over the period of the contract.

Research faculty will not be assigned research space, but will work in specifically designated space assigned to a Sponsor, a tenure-track faculty member in the Department of Microbiology. Space designation will be made in writing, in the form of a letter from the Sponsor to the Department Chair.

While continued collaboration with the Sponsor is likely, research faculty are expected to begin to publish a body of work independent of the Sponsor. Peer-reviewed publications independent of the Sponsor and independent grant support are expected within three years of appointment.

External appointees at the Research Associate Professor or Research Professor level will demonstrate the same accomplishments in research and service as persons promoted within the Department.

Research Assistant Professor. Appointment at the rank of Research Assistant Professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and a record of high-quality publications that strongly indicate the ability to sustain an independent, externally funded research program.

Research Associate Professor and Research Professor. Appointment at the rank of Research Associate Professor or Research Professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and meet, at a minimum, the Department's criteria for promotion to these ranks.

4 Associated Faculty

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

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

Lecturer. Appointment as Lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a Master's degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is desirable. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure but may be promoted to Senior Lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a Lecturer should generally not exceed one year.

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

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

5 Regional Campus Faculty

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

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

6 Emeritus Faculty

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

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the Department Chair (regional campus dean for associated faculty on regional campuses) outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-4) will review the application and make a recommendation to the Department Chair, who will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the executive dean or designee. 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.

7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

B Procedures

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, teaching, research, 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, teaching and research and associated faculty
- Appointments at senior rank or with prior service credit
- Hiring faculty from other institutions after April 30
- Appointment of foreign nationals
- Letters of offer

1 Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

A national search is required to ensure a 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 be consistent with the OAA Policy on [Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

The Divisional Dean for Natural and Mathematical Sciences provides approval for the Department to commence a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise.

The Department Chair will appoint a Search Committee of three or more faculty that will consist primarily of faculty members from the Department of Microbiology, but may include faculty from other Departments.

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](#). Implicit bias training, such as that available through the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity, is also required of all search committee members prior to any search. 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.

The Search Committee:

- Follows the recommendations and training of the Office of Academic Affairs on best practices for creating an inclusive hiring process
- Develops a search announcement for internal posting in the university Job Postings through the [Office of Human Resources](#) and external advertising, subject to the Department Chair'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.
- Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications.
- Screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents to the full faculty a summary of those applicants (usually two to four) judged worthy of interview. If the faculty agrees with this judgment, virtual or on-campus interviews are arranged by the Search Committee Chair, assisted by the Department office. If the faculty does not agree, the Department Chair in consultation with the faculty determines the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, cancel the search for the time being).

Virtual or on-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the Search Committee; graduate students; the Department Chair; and the Dean or designee. In addition, all candidates make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their scholarship. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format and relevant accommodations for disability/impairment should be provided.

Following completion of virtual or on-campus interviews, the eligible faculty meet to discuss qualifications and expertise, and to vote on each candidate. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on each candidate to the Department Chair.

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the Department Chair. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the Department Chair, after consultation with the eligible faculty, decides which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the Department Chair.

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

2 Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Searches for teaching faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the virtual or on-campus interview is on teaching practice and/or philosophy rather than scholarship, and exceptions to a national search require approval of the executive dean of the college.

3 Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that during the virtual or on-campus interview the candidate is not asked to teach a class, and exceptions to a national search require approval only by the college dean.

4 Transfer from the Tenure-track

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a teaching or research appointment if appropriate circumstances exist. Tenure is lost upon transfer, and transfers must be approved by the Department Chair, the College Dean, and the Executive Vice President and Provost.

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

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

5 Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

The appointment of all compensated associated faculty members follows a job posting in Workday (see Section IV.B), a formal search, and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the Department Chair in consultation with the Department Committee of the Eligible Faculty. The review and reappointment of all compensated associated faculty are decided by the Department Chair in consultation with the Department Committee of the Eligible Faculty.

Exceptions to a national search require approval only by the college dean.

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

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer appointments are usually made on a semester-by-semester or annual basis. After the initial appointment, and if the Department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment may be offered.

6 Regional Campus Faculty

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

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus Dean, Department Chair, Department eligible faculty, and regional campus search committee. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. A decision to make an offer requires agreement by the Department Chair and regional campus Dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the Department Chair and the regional campus Dean.

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

Associated faculty are appointed by the regional campus associate dean, in consultation with the dean/director, Department Chair, program coordinators, and other relevant faculty members.

7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

V Annual Performance and Merit Review

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

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

Depending on their appointment type, the performance and merit annual review of faculty members is based on expected performance in teaching and/or scholarship and/or 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. Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.

The Department Chair is required (per Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#)) to include a reminder in the annual 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

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to the Department Chair no later than the first Monday of February:

- Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), Volume 3 (*required for probationary faculty*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (*non-probationary faculty*)
- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)

Other documentation for the annual performance and merit review will be the same as that for consideration for promotion and/or tenure, including:

- A list of all scholarly papers submitted, published, or accepted for publication since the previous year's report.
- SEI reports for every class taught since the previous Annual Performance and Merit Review, and other relevant documentation of teaching, such as student narrative evaluations, as appropriate.
- A list of current grants and contracts, including project title, role of the faculty member (e.g., PI or Co-PI), funding agency, grant identifier used by the funding agency, funded period, dollar amount, and OSP project number.
- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate, e.g., grants and contract proposals that have been submitted, telescope time awarded, etc.
- A list of service contributions, including committees at the international, national, state, university, college, and department levels, membership on scientific organizing committees, participation in reviews (as a referee of research papers or TAC member, for example), etc.

The documentation for promotion and/or tenure is described in full in Section VI of this document.

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

B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

At the time of appointment, probationary faculty members shall be provided with all pertinent documents detailing Department, College, and University promotion and tenure policies and criteria. If these documents are revised during the probationary period, probationary faculty members will be provided with copies of the revised documents.

During the probationary period, each faculty member will be reviewed annually in accordance with the policies of the Department, College, and University. The annual review will encompass the faculty member's performance in teaching, research, and service as well as evidence of continuing development. The purposes of the annual review are: to determine if the recommendation to be made is that the probationary appointment be renewed; to evaluate the professional performance of the non-tenured faculty member in the areas of teaching, research and service, with regard to expectations for continued employment; to recognize and address areas in which the non-tenured faculty member needs advice and help with professional development. Two senior faculty colleagues are assigned as mentors. The Department will use the review process as a means to be supportive and helpful to untenured faculty as well as to candidly and clearly communicate aspects of performance that need improvement if the candidate is to make acceptable progress. However, if it is apparent that the candidate's likelihood of meeting expectations for promotion and tenure is poor, the appointment of the candidate may not be renewed. A nonrenewal decision must be based on the results of a formal performance review conducted in accord with Fourth-Year Review procedures.

Annual reviews are conducted during Spring semester. The Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty shall inform probationary faculty in writing at least forty-five days in advance of the time that their activities and accomplishments are to be reviewed. The OAA shall develop and promulgate procedural guidelines that include a dossier outline to be used for the documentation of accomplishments by all probationary faculty for annual reviews. These guidelines will also include general information about review processes undertaken at the College and University level, information about any legal considerations affecting faculty evaluations, examples of criteria by which candidates for promotion and tenure are evaluated, and other information intended to assist academic units in carrying out annual reviews. The faculty member is required to submit a completed dossier, prepared as instructed by OAA, for evaluation during the review process. Letters of evaluation from scholars external to OSU are routinely sought only for inclusion in a review for promotion but may be obtained for an annual review if judged appropriate by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty or Department Chair. 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. A copy of the portfolio, the request for the material, and the notice of time of the review are included in the faculty member's personnel file.

The Committee of the Eligible Faculty is notified in writing of the pending review at least seven days in advance and is provided access to the faculty member's dossier for evaluation prior to the formal review meeting. The meeting is convened and led by the Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. The Chair of the Committee provides a report of the committee deliberations and recommendations to the Chair of the Department.

At the completion of the review, the Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty will provide the faculty member, and the Department Chair, with a candid and constructive written report that documents the Committee's evaluation of the faculty member's performance and professional development. The report will assess both strengths and weaknesses, and include recommendations as appropriate to help the faculty member meet the Department's requirements for promotion and tenure.

The Department Chair conducts an independent written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The Department Chair's decision on reappointment of a probationary faculty member may be contrary to that of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, although the reasons for the contrary decision must be communicated to the Committee.

The Department Chair will inform probationary faculty of their right to review their primary personnel file, maintained by their Department, and to place in that file a response to any report, evaluation, comment or other material contained in the file. The faculty member shall also be given an opportunity to

discuss the results of the annual review with the Department Chair and with the Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. All annual review letters and reports shall become a part of the faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure. All correspondence related to annual reviews is placed in the faculty member's personnel file and copies of all correspondence related to non-renewal are also provided to the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences, and to the OAA.

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

1 Fourth-Year Review

In the Spring of the fourth year of the probationary period, the Fourth-Year Review is conducted. This annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exceptions that external evaluations are optional and the Dean makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

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

The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the Fourth-Year Review, evidence of significant progress in establishing an independent research program must be documented. The results of research conducted at The Ohio State University should be proceeding through the publication process. Success in obtaining a competitive extramural research grant is expected by the end of the third year. If grant support is lacking, the candidate must submit a written statement to the Department Chair that identifies the reasons for the lack of extramural research grant support, efforts made by the candidate to obtain research grant support and an estimate of additional resources that could be provided by the Department to help ensure the success of the candidate's research program.

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

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](#).

Probationary tenure-track faculty members on less than full-time service for part or all of their probationary period may request an exclusion of time from the probationary period on the basis that they are less than-full time. Such requests require approval of the tenure initiating unit Chair, Dean, and

Executive Vice President and Provost. The exclusion shall be for an integral number of years based on the principle that the usual probationary period represents full-time service. The maximum permissible exclusion of a probationary period under this paragraph is one year for a probationary Instructor, three years for a probationary Assistant Professor and two years for a probationary Associate Professor or Professor.

C Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Associate Professors are reviewed annually by the Committee of Eligible Faculty, who write a detailed performance review that includes advice on the faculty member's progress toward promotion. This letter is addressed to the faculty member and provided to the Department Chair. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The Department Chair conducts an independent assessment. Both the CEF Chair and Department Chair provide the faculty member an opportunity to meet and discuss the review, future plans, and goals.

Professors are reviewed annually by the Department Chair. The Department Chair meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance, future plans, and goals. The annual review of Professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the Department, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the Department, the College, the University, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of Assistant and Associate Professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, 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. The Department Chair prepares a written evaluation of performance against these expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

D Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

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

If the position is to continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. For probationary teaching faculty, this review follows Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty, including review at the college level. For teaching faculty in their second or later appointment, the review is carried out only in the Department and reappointment does not require college approval. There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

E Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

In the penultimate contract year of a research faculty member's appointment, the Department Chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If it will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed.

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

F Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

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

G 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 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 Department Chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

The annual performance and merit review of regional campus teaching faculty is conducted on the regional campus. The dean/director will provide the Department Chair a copy of a teaching faculty member's annual performance and merit review letter.

The annual performance and merit review of regional campus research faculty is conducted by the Department and proceeds as described above for Columbus campus research faculty. The Department

Chair will provide the regional campus dean/director a copy of the faculty member's annual performance and merit review letter.

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

H Salary Recommendations

1 Criteria

Except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increase, all funds for annual salary increases are directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and assuring, to the extent possible given financial constraints, that salaries reflect the market and are internally equitable.

On occasion, one-time cash payments or other rewards, such as extra travel funds, are made to recognize non-continuing contributions that justify reward but do not justify permanent salary increases. Such payments/rewards are considered at the time of annual salary recommendations.

Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity. Faculty with high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation 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.

2 Procedures

The Department Chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the Dean, who may modify these recommendations. Salary increases are formulated in dollar amounts rather than percentage increases, with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the Department Chair divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) and considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate.

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

VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

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

1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

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

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

Tenure is not awarded below the rank of Associate Professor at The Ohio State University.

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

Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Accepting weakness in any aspect of performance in making a tenure decision is tantamount to deliberately handicapping the Department's ability to perform and to progress academically. Above all, candidates are held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. If a candidate's primary teaching role is and will continue to be undergraduate teaching, then excellence in undergraduate teaching is required. A mediocre performance in this area would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another aspect of teaching that is a significantly smaller part of the individual's responsibilities.

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

The accomplishments listed in the charts below in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service are expected of faculty for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. In the evaluation of untenured Associate Professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

The tables below list the criteria and evidence that support promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer evaluators determine that syllabi and class materials are up-to-date and appropriate for topic and audience • Positive peer evaluation on mode of instruction • Positive peer evaluation on treatment of and interactions with students • Peer evaluation demonstrate positive trajectory during review period • Positive evaluations from Continuing Education Programs, both internal and external to the university • Attended continuing education on topic or focus area and adopted new materials in class • Use of multimodal techniques or approaches to stimulate class participation and learning – discuss in teaching narrative • eSEI item 10 scores equal or greater than average for TIU or university • Positive qualitative student comments
Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm	
Demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment	
Engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process	
Treated students with respect and courtesy.	
Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive student comments on SEI on feedback to students throughout the instructional process
Improved and or developed curriculum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revising existing courses and academic programs • Developing new courses and academic programs • Changing or developing of syllabi, examinations, laboratory exercises, and problem sets, to demonstrate up-to-date thought on subject content
Mentored graduate students and/or postdocs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serving as advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the Department's graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise • Serving on thesis, dissertation, and graduate examination committees • Timely completion of degree by graduate mentees • Publishing with graduate students and postdocs • Promoting student/postdoc participation in research conferences • Promoting student/postdoc applications for research funding and mentoring them throughout the process • Students and/or postdocs receive awards and fellowships for their research efforts
Mentored undergraduate students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentoring of undergraduate research students in their laboratory • Promoting student participation in research presentations (e.g., Denman) • Serving as mentor or committee member for honors research theses • Students receive awards for their research efforts

Engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attending continuing education on topic or focus area and adopting new materials in class • Completing Foundations, Impact Teaching through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning • Completing Teaching at Ohio State through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning • Awarding of “Endorsement” from Drake Institute of Teaching and Learning
---	--

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH

Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
<p>Published a body of work in high-quality peer-reviewed venues that is thematically focused, contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and is beginning to be favorably cited or otherwise show evidence of influence on the work of others.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A body of work in peer reviewed journals of high quality that clearly demonstrates creation of an independent research program and contributes substantively to knowledge/outcomes in the area of focus • Complete publication record including journal articles, reviews, conference papers and posters (both refereed and otherwise), books, book chapters, textbooks based on scholarship, magazine articles and on-line publications, patents and invention disclosures. • Quality and quantity of publications, with an emphasis on documented research accomplishments that have made a significant, internationally recognized, impact on the candidate’s field(s) of expertise • Unique contribution to a line of inquiry or repackaging of earlier work. While collaborative work is encouraged, and indeed is essential to some types of inquiry, the candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described to permit accurate assessment. Letters from research collaborators describing the candidate’s contribution can be included but must be solicited by the Department Chair • Rigor of the peer-review process and degree of dissemination of publication venues. Archival journal publications and monographs are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published scholarship more than unpublished scholarship, and original works more than edited works • Beginning to demonstrate a positive trend of citations in other researchers' publications • Creative works pertinent to the candidate’s professional focus including media appearances and websites • Empirical work, demonstrating the candidate's ability to conduct such work and to mentor future scholars, is preferred to synthetic work at this stage of career

<p>A demonstrated ability to obtain and potential to sustain research program funding</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtaining grants and awards to support their research program. Competitive peer-reviewed funding is weighted more favorably than other types, since it serves as a quality indicator of research programs, and grants requiring the exercise of intellectual creativity are weighted more heavily than those that largely dictate the work to be done. Research funding is a means to an end; funding that has not led to research productivity is disregarded in the review
<p>A developing national/international reputation in the candidate's field</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive external evaluations indicating candidate is developing reputation at the national/international level because of their research contributions to their field (reputation based on the quality of the research contribution is distinguished from one based mainly on familiarity through the faculty member's frequent attendance at national and international conferences) • Invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums • Invitations to review research papers and grant proposals • Beginning to demonstrate a positive trend of citations in other researchers' publications
<p>Demonstrated a high degree of ethics in the conduct of research including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators</p>	

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Made substantive contributions to the governance of the Department in a manner that facilitates positive contributions by others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serving as contributing member of departmental committees • Organizing the departmental annual symposium • Annual evaluations document excellence in service to the department
Demonstrated the potential for useful contributions to the profession	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serving as ad-hoc reviewer for journals • Serving on grant reviewing panels • Serving on committees and panels of professional societies • Contributing to the organization of conferences
Demonstrated community engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities and quality indicators within the community setting • Service to disadvantaged communities

2 Promotion to Professor

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

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

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

A faculty member must be recognized internationally as an established research scholar before promotion to Professor. A record of sustained and substantial extramural support from peer-reviewed, competitive grant sources is required, normally including renewals of grants initiated earlier. Professional recognition should include membership on editorial boards, invited research presentations at peer institutions, national and international symposia, invited reviews in professional publications, and membership on panels for state and federal granting agencies and advisory committees. Other important supporting activities might include obtaining patents, consulting for both profit and nonprofit organizations, the convening of research meetings and symposia, professional development as a result of research leave, research success of postdoctoral research advisees, and successful collaborative research with visiting scientists and sabbatical-leave colleagues.

A sustained record of effective teaching must be documented for promotion to Professor. The criteria listed for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure must be met and additional teaching competence must be documented.

A substantial record of active participation on appointed committees at the Department, College, University and extramural professional level is expected. However, outstanding service alone, even in a senior administrative role, will not be sufficient for promotion to Professor.

The Department will be receptive to cases with a heavier weighting on teaching performance and a correspondingly reduced weighting on research and scholarship. In order for a faculty member to be promoted under these conditions, it must be clear that the contributions to teaching are substantial and of high quality. Development and implementation of innovative and more effective approaches to instruction would be helpful in making such a case. In assessment of a candidate's national and international reputation in the field, a national and international reputation for the scholarship of teaching may be counted as either teaching or scholarship.

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

3 Teaching Faculty

Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor. For promotion to Associate Teaching Professor, a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and as a provider of effective service (if service is a component of the individual's assigned duties); must have a documented high level of competence in professional practice; and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service (if applicable) relevant to the mission of this Department. Specific criteria in teaching and service (if applicable) for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor are similar to those for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. Criteria and example activities for teaching faculty are listed in the tables below. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Teaching Professor. For promotion to Teaching Professor, a faculty member must have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching and professional practice; leadership in service to this Department and/or to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Teaching Faculty Criteria and Activities

TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer evaluators determine that syllabi and class materials are up-to-date and appropriate for topic and audience • Positive peer evaluation on mode of instruction

Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive peer evaluation on treatment of and interactions with students • Peer evaluation demonstrate positive trajectory during review period • Positive evaluations from Continuing Education Programs, both internal and external to the university • Attended continuing education on topic or focus area and adopted new materials in class • Use of multimodal techniques or approaches to stimulate class participation and learning – discuss in teaching narrative • eSEI item 10 scores equal or greater than average for TIU or university • Positive qualitative student comments • Incorporating new technologies to courses (e. g. on-line manuals, electronic notebooks) • Receiving teaching awards 	
Demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment		
Engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process		
Treated students with respect and courtesy		
Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process		
Improved and or developed curriculum		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revising existing courses • Developing new courses • Changing or developing of syllabi, examinations, laboratory exercises, and problem sets, to demonstrate up-to-date thought on subject content • Coordinating activities with regional campus faculty
Mentored students		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentoring high school and undergraduate students in research (pedagogical or scientific) • Serving on undergraduate thesis committees • Receiving mentoring awards
Engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attending continuing education on topic or focus area and adopting new materials in class • Completing Foundations, Impact Teaching through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning • Completing Teaching at Ohio State through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning • Awarding of “Endorsement” from Drake Institute of Teaching and Learning • Participating in professional development conferences (e. g. ASMCUE) 	

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH

Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Developed research on pedagogy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publication of articles, books, book chapters, and conferences papers on teaching and pedagogy in peer-reviewed journals • Performing research for publications and grants

Developed and published textbooks and other course materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing, revise, and edit textbooks and course materials
--	---

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Contributed to service at the Department, College, and University level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serving as contributing member of departmental (Curriculum, Awards, and DEI), college, and university committees • Participating in departmental recruiting/welcoming events • Developing and managing formal training of graduate and undergraduate laboratory TAs • Managing graduate and undergraduate TAs • Supervising laboratory prep staff • Performing informal student advising and support (e.g. writing recommendation letters, answering enrollment questions, grad school or career advice, tutoring matches) • Organizing and facilitating workshops on campus related to teaching and curriculum • Serving as advisors to departmental or OSU student organizations and clubs • Leading activities with the undergraduate Microbiology Club (e. g. agart art) • Writing letters of recommendation for students • Evaluating classes for transfer credit • Receiving awards for service
Contributed to service to the profession	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serving as ad-hoc reviewer for journals and textbooks • Serving on committees and panels of professional societies
Demonstrated community engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serve on advisory board for community/local school/organizations • Develop/participate in community programs for the department/OSU by working with local schools, COSI, science fairs, businesses • Service to disadvantaged communities

4 Research Faculty

Promotion to Research Associate Professor. For promotion to Research Associate Professor, a faculty member must have a substantial record of high-quality focused research consistent with an appointment devoted solely to research. Publications must appear in high-quality peer-reviewed venues and be judged by external evaluators as having substantial positive impact on the field. A record of continuous peer reviewed funding is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Research Professor. For promotion to Research Professor, a faculty member must have a national or international reputation built on an extensive body of high-quality publications and with demonstrated impact on the field. A record of continuous peer-reviewed funding is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

5 Associated Faculty

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

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

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

6 Regional Campus Faculty

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

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

B Procedures

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

1 Tenure-Track, Teaching Faculty, and Research 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 departmental guidelines. Each of these elements is described in detail below

- **Dossier**

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

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

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

Teaching documentation includes:

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

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

Scholarship documentation includes:

- a list of all books, articles, and scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Copies of all publications must be provided upon request. Papers accepted for publication but not yet

published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed beyond review of publisher-supplied proofs.

- documentation of grants and contracts submitted and received
- other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted)
- research activities as listed in the core dossier including
 - documentation of creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus including but not restricted to, for example, artwork, multimedia, radio, recordings, television, and websites
- documentation of invention disclosures, submitted and awarded patents, options and commercial licenses.
 - list of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work

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

Service documentation includes:

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

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

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

Candidates must submit a copy of the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed, if electing to be reviewed under an APT other than the current document available [here](#). Candidates may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion, whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, 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. The APT document must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the Department.

- **External Evaluations**

If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the Department Chair and the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The Department Chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

Under no circumstances should candidates solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

b Responsibilities of the Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty

The responsibilities of the Committee Chair, on behalf of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, are as follows:

- To review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in Spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only Professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of Professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
 - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (including student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
 - A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) for one year. Faculty Rules [3335-7-08](#) and [3335-7-36](#) make the same provision for nonprobationary teaching faculty and research faculty, respectively. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
 - A decision to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the Department Chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
 - **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the OAA [annual procedural guidelines](#).

- **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the Department Chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the list of peer/aspirational peer programs. Justification is provided in cases when the suggested reviewers are in programs not among the provided list.
- **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with OAA requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
- Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on their dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.
- Revise the draft analysis of each case following the eligible faculty meeting, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair.
- Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure-initiating unit is another Department. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the Department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this Department's cases.

c Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

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

- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.
- To participate in peer review of teaching of faculty in the Department of Microbiology.

d Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Department Chair are as follows:

- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. (The department must ensure that such questions are asked of all candidates in a non-

discriminatory manner.) For tenure-track Assistant Professors, the Department Chair will confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an [MOU](#) at the time of promotion with tenure.

- **Summer Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Committee of Eligible Faculty, the Department Chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To solicit an evaluation from a TIU head of any TIU in which the candidate has a joint appointment. This evaluation should be shared at the TIU level of the review and incorporated with the Chair review.
- To make each candidate's dossier available 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 Committee of Eligible to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. The Department Chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the Department review process of the:
 - Recommendations by the eligible faculty and Department Chair
 - Availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and Department Chair
 - Opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the Department Chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the Department Chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the College office by that office's deadline.

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

2 Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Adjunct faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed in Section VI.B above, with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the Department Chair's recommendation is negative (a negative recommendation by the Department Chair is final in such cases), and does not proceed to the executive vice president and provost if the executive dean's recommendation is negative.

3 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

Regional campus tenure-track faculty are first reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus Dean/director. The regional campus review focuses on teaching and service.

The regional campus Dean/director forwards the written evaluation and recommendation of the regional campus review to the Department Chair, from which point the review follows the procedures described for the Columbus campus faculty. A request to promote requires agreement by the dean/director and the Chair.

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

The review of regional campus research faculty takes place on the Columbus campus and follows the same procedures as those described above for Columbus campus research faculty. Following the review, the Department Chair will consult with the regional campus dean/director. A request to promote requires agreement by the regional campus dean/director and the Department 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 activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These are mandatory for all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews. The decision to seek external evaluations for a research faculty member will be made by the Department Chair after consulting with the candidate and Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty. External evaluations are not required for promotion reviews for teaching faculty. The decision to seek external evaluations for an associated faculty member will be made by the Department Chair after consulting with the candidate and the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.

External evaluators should be from peer and aspirational peer institutions such as University of Wisconsin Madison, University of Michigan, Michigan State University, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, University of Georgia, and the University of California Berkeley.

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who can give an “arms’ length” evaluation of the research record and is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This Department will solicit evaluations only from Professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State. In the case of an Assistant Professor seeking promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from Associate Professors.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will “usefulness” be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the Department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters are sought than are required, and they are solicited at the beginning of summer semester prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

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

The Department follows the Office of Academic Affairs [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 OAA to exclude that letter from the dossier). It is in the candidate's self-interest to ensure 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 OAA for advice.

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

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (eSEI) is required for all classroom and laboratory courses. Faculty members should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if s/he is going to provide in-class time for students to complete the evaluation using a mobile application. The faculty member must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation. Alternatively, on-line evaluations can be solicited, but the response rates are typically lower. The faculty member should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and to provide feedback that can be taken into account in future teaching.

B Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The Department Chair, in consultation with the Vice Chair for Teaching and Undergraduate Affairs and the Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty, oversees the Department's peer evaluation of teaching process.

As noted in the OAA [Handbook](#), Volume 1, Chapter 1, Section 2.8.2

Peer evaluation should focus on those aspects of teaching that students cannot evaluate, such as appropriateness of curricular choices, implicit and explicit goals of instruction, choice of examination/evaluation materials by the faculty member, and consistency with the highest standards of disciplinary knowledge. Assessment of these aspects can be made by peers within the unit or external reviewers as determined by procedures established by the department.

Periodic peer evaluation is required for all tenure-track and clinical/teaching/practice faculty who deliver formal course instruction and recommended for any associated faculty with multiple-year appointments. In case of Professors, such evaluation can take the form of peer review without a formal written evaluation. In addition, peer evaluation for promotion should include at least two different evaluations, with the exact number to be determined by the TIU in line with college guidelines.

Tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank than the candidate should prepare written evaluations of lectures and/or laboratory sessions taught by the candidate; teaching faculty may be reviewed by other teaching faculty of equal or higher rank. Whenever possible, faculty who participate in teaching the same

course should perform the evaluation. Copies of the evaluation will be provided to the faculty member who is evaluated and to the Department Chair. A copy of the report will become part of the faculty member's permanent file. The report should include an evaluation of the use of handouts, the clarity and organization of the oral presentation, the use of teaching aids, and student interactions. The report should comment on strong and any weak points of the instruction and presentation and may provide suggestions for improvements.

The teaching of probationary tenure-track faculty and teaching faculty will be evaluated at least once per year during the first two years of service in teaching, and at least three times more during the remainder of the probationary period, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.

The teaching of tenured Associate Professors and non-probationary Associate Teaching Professors will be evaluated with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a three-year period. The teaching of tenured Associate Professors and nonprobationary Associate Teaching Professors must be evaluated a minimum of 3 times since the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, before promotion to Professor.

The teaching of tenured Professors and non-probationary Teaching Professors will be evaluated at least once every four years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.

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

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

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

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

In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should focus on such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the class visits, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give feedback and also submits a written report to the Department Chair, copied to the candidate. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if he/she wishes. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.