

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE (APT) CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Criteria and
Procedures for The Ohio State University (APT)

Office of Academic Affairs

The Ohio State University

Reviewed by Department Faculty: May 6, 2022

Reviewed by The College of Arts and Sciences: July 7, 2022

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: July 27, 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I	PREAMBLE.....	1
II	DEPARTMENT MISSION.....	1
III	DEFINITIONS.....	1
	A. COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY.....	1
	1. <i>Tenure-track Faculty</i>	2
	2. <i>Research Faculty</i>	2
	3. <i>Associated Faculty</i>	3
	4. <i>Conflict of Interest</i>	3
	5. <i>Minimum Composition</i>	3
	6. <i>Reading Committee(s)</i>	3
	B. QUORUM.....	3
	C. RECOMMENDATION FROM THE COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY.....	3
IV	APPOINTMENTS.....	4
	A. CRITERIA.....	4
	1. <i>Tenure-track Faculty</i>	4
	2. <i>Research Faculty</i>	6
	3. <i>Associated Faculty</i>	6
	4. <i>Regional Campus Faculty</i>	7
	5. <i>Emeritus Faculty</i>	7
	6. <i>Courtesy Appointments for Faculty</i>	8
	B. PROCEDURES.....	8
	1. <i>Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus</i>	8
	2. <i>Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus</i>	9
	3. <i>Transfer from the Tenure-track</i>	10
	4. <i>Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus</i>	10
	5. <i>Regional Campus Faculty</i>	10
	6. <i>Courtesy Appointments for Faculty</i>	10
V	ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW.....	11
	A. DOCUMENTATION.....	11
	B. PROBATIONARY TENURE-TRACK FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS.....	12
	1. <i>Fourth-Year Review</i>	12
	2. <i>Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period</i>	13
	C. TENURED FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS.....	13
	D. RESEARCH FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS.....	13
	E. ASSOCIATED FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS.....	14
	F. REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY.....	14

G.	SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS	15
VI	PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS.....	15
A.	CRITERIA AND DOCUMENTATION THAT SUPPORT PROMOTION	15
1.	<i>Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure</i>	16
2.	<i>Promotion to Professor</i>	20
3.	<i>Promotion of Research Faculty</i>	21
4.	<i>Associated Faculty</i>	21
5.	<i>Regional Campus Faculty</i>	22
B.	PROCEDURES.....	22
1.	<i>Tenure-Track and Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus</i>	22
2.	<i>Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus</i>	26
3.	<i>Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty</i>	26
4.	<i>External Evaluations</i>	27
VII	APPEALS	28
VIII	SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS	28
IX	PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING	28
A.	STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING.....	28
B.	PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING	29

I PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to [Chapters 6](#) and [7](#) of the University Faculty Rules; the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in [Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook](#); and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the department and its faculty are subject. Should those rules and policies change, the department 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 College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs before it may be implemented. It sets forth the department's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the college and university, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the dean and the Office of Academic Affairs accept the mission and criteria of the department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to the department's mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335- 6-01 of the Administrative Code. In particular, all faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 and other standards specific to this department and the college; 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 Ohio State University Department of Sociology is to achieve excellence in scholarly research, teaching, and service commensurate with its standing as one of the nation's leading departments of sociology and with its goal of maintaining and continually improving its quality. Research and contributions to the scientific and scholarly literature are fundamental components of this mission, with research inspiring and informing our teaching, engagement, and service. Our undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral programs train succeeding generations of sociologists to critically evaluate, apply, and create knowledge. Faculty further use their professional expertise to inform and serve scientific and scholarly bodies and public agencies and citizen groups at the local, state, national and international levels. In all efforts, we embrace the university's core principles of inclusion and equity (i.e., upholding equal rights and advancing institutional equity and fairness) and diversity and innovation (i.e., welcoming differences and making connections among people and ideas).

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

Faculty on approved leave (unpaid leave, faculty professional leave, parental leave) are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for all candidates they are eligible to review.

1. Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews. For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an assistant professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the department.

For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review at senior rank (associate professor or professor), the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the department. 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. Research Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews. For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a research assistant professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all research faculty in the department.

For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review at senior rank (research associate professor or research professor), the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track and all research faculty in the department. 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 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 non-probationary 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 non-probationary research professors.

3. Associated Faculty

Initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type), reappointment, and contract renewal of associated faculty members are decided by the department chair in consultation with the vice chair. For associated faculty with adjunct or tenure-track titles, initial appointments require a vote by the eligible faculty (all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the dean of the college or designee. Initial appointments of lecturers and visiting faculty at the senior level are decided by the department chair in consultation with the department vice chair.

Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have adjunct titles, tenure-track titles with service at 49% FTE or below, or lecturer titles. For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct or tenure-track titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section III.A.1 above. The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the department chair in consultation with the department vice chair.

4. Conflict of Interest

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

5. Minimum Composition

If the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the department chair, after consulting with the dean, will appoint a faculty member from another department within the college.

6. Reading Committee(s)

The department chair appoints a reading committee for each promotion and tenure case to assist the eligible faculty in managing individual promotion and tenure reviews. Each reading committee typically consists of two members of the eligible faculty who serve a one-year term.

B. QUORUM

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is 50 percent of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they choose to attend the full meeting in which the personnel decision(s) are made. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-campus assignment. Faculty members who recuse themselves because of a conflict of interest are not counted when determining quorum.

C. 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.

Appointment: A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment 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 appointment.

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 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 reappointment, promotion and/or tenure, or contract renewal.

IV APPOINTMENTS

A. CRITERIA

The department is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the department. Important considerations include the individual's record to date in teaching, scholarship, and service; the potential for professional growth in each of these areas; and the potential for interacting with colleagues and students in a way that will enhance their academic work and attract other outstanding faculty and students to the department. No offer will be extended 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. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. Promotion to assistant professor occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year, or the appointment will not be renewed, and the third year is 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 Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked without a formal request for an extension of the probationary period. All probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor. An earned doctorate in a relevant field of study is the minimum requirement for appointment to the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-

quality teaching, and high-quality service to the department 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 the Eligible Faculty determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs at the time the offer of appointment is made, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted without a formal approval of an exclusion of time.

Associate Professor and Professor. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor or professor and offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Appointment at the rank of associate professor normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at the rank of associate professor without tenure is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered. Appointments at the rank of professor without tenure should not occur.

The department is cognizant of the expectations of the College for external hires at the associate professor or professor level with tenure. These hires will demonstrate the same accomplishments in research, teaching and service as persons promoted within the university. Consistent with The Ohio State University's mission as a research university and the mission statement of the College, the candidate's contributions to scholarship are central to the hiring decision. An external hire for the rank of tenured associate professor will have an emerging national reputation as a scholar. An external candidate for the rank of tenured professor will have achieved national distinction as a scholar and have an emerging international reputation, have been an effective teacher, and have provided substantial service to the profession and to previous employers. A candidate equivalent to a newly promoted tenured professor should have an emerging international reputation while more senior candidates should have an established internationally recognized and distinguished scholarly record.

Various measures are used in the evaluation of scholarship, teaching, and service. The measures for judging scholarship include the quality of publications as revealed by placement, citations, external reviewer comments, and faculty judgment; the quantity of publications; the record of grant applications, success, and amounts; and scholarly contributions through media other than publications. Criteria used in evaluation of teaching include the success of graduate students advised by the candidate, prior contributions to graduate and undergraduate programs, reports of teaching ability, observation of the ability to present scholarly materials in professional settings, and the attainment of national and international recognition, as evidenced by pedagogical publications, awards, honors, and/or other critical student outcomes. Criteria used in evaluation of service include service to the profession, discipline, and larger academy; intramural service in prior university or professional settings; and service to the public. The expectation is that examples of service will be consistent with the candidate having a national reputation in the discipline.

For all, the substantial probability that a high rate of quality scholarship and/or excellence in teaching and service will continue must be established. A fundamental criterion in evaluating the scholarship of an

external candidate is whether the addition of the candidate to the Ohio State faculty will improve the level of scholarship of the faculty and improve the unit's national visibility.

2. Research Faculty

Research faculty are comprised of all persons with the title of Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor. Appointments to the research faculty are fixed one- to five-year contract appointments that are not eligible for tenure. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Research faculty members are researchers with PhDs who are engaged in externally funded research related to the mission and goals of the department. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the department wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see [Faculty Rule 3335-7](#).

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.

3. Associated Faculty

The Associated Faculty is comprised of all persons with titles of Adjunct, Visiting Faculty, Lecturer and part time (less than 50 percent appointments to the department or university) faculty with the title of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor.

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a few weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. Associated faculty may be reappointed given continued departmental needs and satisfactory performance. For more information see [Faculty Rule 3335-5-19](#).

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, 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 faculty.

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

Lecturer. Appointment as lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a master's degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught. 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, at a minimum, a doctorate in a field appropriate to the subject matter being 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 uncompensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for only three consecutive years.

4. Regional Campus Faculty

As the mission of the regional campuses emphasizes undergraduate instruction, regional campus criteria for appointment at the rank 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 research faculty and associated faculty are the same as those for Columbus campus faculty in each of these categories.

5. Emeritus Faculty

Emeritus faculty status is an honor given in recognition of sustained academic contributions to the university as described in Faculty Rule [3335-5-36](#). Full-time tenure track, clinical/teaching/practice, 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 Committee of the Eligible Faculty will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair. The department chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered.

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. They may be nominated for graduate faculty status at the discretion of the department chair and the director of graduate studies.

6. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

A courtesy appointment (0% FTE) is available to faculty from other tenure initiating units at the university. At a minimum, a courtesy appointment should be based on an expectation of the appointee's substantial involvement in the department (e.g., student mentoring and serving on student committees).

B. PROCEDURES

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

- recruitment of tenure-track, associated, and research 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 in advance by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection.

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

- The dean of the college or designee provides approval for the department to commence a search process. This approval may be accompanied by constraints regarding salary, rank, and field of expertise.
- The department chair appoints one or more recruitment committees. One member of the committee will be appointed by the chair to serve as the recruitment committee chair and another member will be appointed as the committee's representative on the department's Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee. Three or four tenure track faculty and one or two graduate students may be appointed to a committee. The department chair is an ex-officio member of all recruitment committees. Prior to any search, members of all recruitment 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.
- The department chair, working with the recruitment committee, prepares and place notices of the position announcement(s) in appropriate professional outlets such as the American Sociological Association Job Bank and in internal university job postings or other external postings as required by the university. 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, and salary. Timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the recruitment committee must advertise using at least one 30-day online ad in a national professional journal.

- The recruitment committee screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents to the eligible faculty a summary of those applicants (usually four to six) judged worthy of interview. In advance of the faculty meeting in which the Recruitment Committee makes its recommendation, faculty will be provided with the list of candidates and have ample opportunity to review their application materials. Faculty vote by secret ballot to recommend to the chair candidates to be invited to interview.
- Virtual or on-campus interviews are arranged by the chair of the recruitment committee assisted by the department office and in consultation with the department chair. Virtual or on-campus interviews with candidates include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, graduate students; the department chair; and the dean or designee. In addition, all candidates make a presentation to the department 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.
- The department chair will solicit comments and evaluations in writing regarding each candidate from faculty and other interested groups. These evaluations will be advisory to the chair and will be presented to the eligible faculty at a meeting soon after the completion of formal interviews. Following discussion of the candidates, the eligible faculty vote by secret ballots to recommend to the department chair candidates who are deemed eligible for receiving an offer and, among those, a rank ordering of preference.
- If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty 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.
- After assessing faculty sentiment, the department chair will make a recommendation to the dean and, upon receiving approval from the dean, will make the formal offer to the candidate(s). The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the department chair in consultation with the dean. 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. The university may award tenure only to faculty members who are: (1) U.S. citizens or nationals; (2) permanent residents ("green card" holders); (3) asylees or refugees; or (4) individuals otherwise described as "protected individuals" pursuant to Title 8 U.S. Code Section 1324b(a)(3)(b). The department will therefore be cautious in making such appointments and vigilant in seeking residency status for the appointee promptly and diligently.

2. 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.

3. Transfer from the Tenure-track

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a research faculty appointment if appropriate circumstances exist. Tenure or tenure eligibility is lost upon transfer, and transfers must be approved by the department chair, the college dean, and the executive vice president and provost. The request for transfer must be initiated by the faculty member in writing and must state clearly how the individual's career goals and activities have changed. Transfers from a research faculty appointment to the tenure-track are not permitted. Research faculty members may apply for tenure-track positions and compete in regular national searches for such positions.

4. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

The appointment, reappointment, and contract renewal of all compensated associated faculty are decided by the department chair in consultation with the department vice chair. 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. Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department and are decided by the department chair. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to continue. Visiting appointments may be made on an annual basis for up to three years.

5. Regional Campus Faculty

The regional campus dean/director has primary responsibility for determining the position description for a tenure-track faculty search but should consult and seek agreement with the department chair on the position description before the search begins. The department chair and the regional campus dean/director will agree on a single search committee, consisting of members of both units. Candidates will be evaluated on both campuses, with the faculty on the Columbus campus taking primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's record and potential as a scholar. A decision to make an offer requires agreement on the part of the chair of the department, and the regional campus dean/director. Negotiations with a candidate should not begin without such agreement, and a letter of offer must be signed by both the department chair and the regional campus dean/director.

Searches for regional campus 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.

6. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track or research faculty member from another Ohio State tenure-initiating unit. Requests for courtesy appointments are evaluated at a meeting of the tenured and tenure-track faculty who make appointment recommendations to the chair. After considering the recommendation, the chair may extend an offer of appointment to a four-year term. Courtesy appointments do not require formal annual review. The

department chair reviews each courtesy appointment every four years and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the tenure-track faculty for an advisory vote at a regular faculty meeting.

V ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW

The department follows the requirements for annual performance and merit review as set forth in the [Policy on Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment](#), which stipulates that such reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a meeting with the department chair 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
- Document faculty performance in the achievement of stated goals to determine salary increases and other resource allocations, progress toward promotion, and, in the event of poor performance, the need for remedial steps.

Depending on their appointment type the annual performance and merit reviews of faculty members are based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the department's policy on faculty duties and responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.

The department chair is required (per Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#)) to include a reminder in the annual performance and merit review letter that all faculty have the right 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 by the date announced by the chair:

- Dossier completed using the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline in the [OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook, Volume 3](#) (required for probationary faculty) or Annual Contributions Report of performance and accomplishments (for non-probationary faculty) using the department's template and any required supporting documentation.
- An updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible location.
- Evidence of teaching effectiveness, including student evaluations of instruction and any peer reviews by members of the tenured faculty at equal or higher rank completed in the review year.

Faculty should not solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the annual performance and merit review, as such solicitation places its recipient in an awkward position and produces a result that is unlikely to be candid.

B. PROBATIONARY TENURE-TRACK FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the department chair. This review serves as the basis for salary recommendations and for assisting faculty in professional development and improving performance.

The eligible faculty meet annually in spring semester to review probationary tenure-track faculty and advise the department chair on their performance and renewal. The department chair prepares an annual review letter that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The chair's assessment is informed by the meeting with the eligible faculty and may include a summary of that evaluation.

If the department chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The department chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The department chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the dean of the college. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments, if submitted). The chair will also meet with each probationary faculty member each year, unless approved absence from campus makes such a meeting impractical, in which case alternative arrangements will be made for a discussion of performance.

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

1. Fourth-Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period, the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exceptions that external letters are optional, and the dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. External evaluations are solicited only when either the department chair or the eligible faculty determine that they are necessary to conduct the fourth-year review. This may occur when the candidate's research is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the research without outside input.

In preparation for the review by the eligible faculty, a reading committee provides a preliminary summary of each case but does not make a recommendation. The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate, judging whether there is a reasonable chance that the candidate, at the time of the mandatory tenure review, will meet the criteria for promotion and tenure. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty vote by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment. Abstentions are not votes. Absentee and proxy voting is not permitted. The chair of the committee of the eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department chair. The department chair 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](#).

C. TENURED FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS

Tenured faculty are reviewed annually by the department chair who is advised by the Faculty Annual Review Committee.

Members of the Faculty Annual Review Committee review all faculty annual reports and supporting materials and advise the department chair on the performance of each tenured faculty member. The department chair will conduct an independent assessment and provide written feedback annually to every tenured faculty member. The annual review letter will include a reminder that the faculty member may review her/his departmental personnel file and may place in that file a response to any evaluation, comment or other material contained in the file. The department chair will offer a tenured faculty member a scheduled opportunity to discuss the review.

The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the tenure initiating unit, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the 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.

D. RESEARCH FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS

The annual performance and merit 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 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 follows the review procedures for promotion of research faculty. There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

E. ASSOCIATED FACULTY ON THE COLUMBUS CAMPUS

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The department chair or designee (e.g., Instructional Development Committee and/or department vice chair) prepares a written evaluation and meets with the associated faculty member to discuss his or her 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 multiple year appointments are reviewed annually by the department chair or designee. The department chair or designee prepares a written evaluation and provides it to the faculty member with an invitation to meet to discuss their performance, plans, and goals. No later than April 15 of the final year of the appointment, the department chair will decide whether to reappoint. The department chair's recommendation on reappointment is final.

F. REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY

Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty. Annual reviews of probationary faculty members on regional campuses are first conducted by the regional campus dean/director, with a focus on teaching and service. The dean/director's report of that review is provided to the department chair and the review proceeds at the department level as described above. The department review will focus on the candidate's scholarly work and on the appropriateness of course content and course standards but will consider all aspects of the probationary faculty member's record. The department chair provides a written review to the dean/director and the faculty member. It is important that the department chair and the regional campus dean/director be alert to any developing discrepancy between the quality and quantity of teaching and service and the quality and quantity of scholarly work, to minimize the risk that the regional campus and the department might eventually disagree on a tenure recommendation. When such discrepancies become apparent, the regional campus dean/director should seek appropriate means of addressing this problem with the faculty member and the department chair. If the dean/director and the chair cannot agree on a recommendation about the renewal of a probationary faculty member, there should be consultation with the college dean.

Tenured Faculty. Annual reviews of a tenured faculty member are first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. A copy of the regional campus dean/director's review letter is provided to the department chair. The department chair will provide written feedback on scholarship. The faculty member, the dean/director, or the chair may request a meeting to discuss the review or any other concerns.

Research Faculty. 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.

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

G. SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS

The department chair makes annual salary recommendations to the dean, who may modify them. Scholarly performance in teaching, research, and service will be judged according to the department's mission and promotion and tenure criteria. Performance evaluation will consider the previous three years' performance in research and the previous year's performance in teaching and service. Faculty with high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. However, the chair may also consider the cumulative performance and/or the appropriateness of the salary level to the individual's overall record in making annual salary recommendations. A full set of all vitae and contribution reports is available to all faculty for examination.

Faculty who do not submit the required documentation for an annual performance and merit review at the required time will receive no salary increase in the year in which the review takes place, except in extenuating circumstances, and may not expect to recoup the foregone raise at a later time.

The Faculty Annual Review Committee will review each faculty member's annual contributions report. Committee members rate the contributions of each of their colleagues on a five-point scale. Those preliminary ratings form the basis for discussion when the committee meets with the department chair to discuss each case. Members absent themselves during the discussion of their own performance and from both rating and participating in the discussion of faculty with whom they have a familial or comparable relationship. If a close professional relationship gives rise to conflict of interest for any committee member, they will not participate in the evaluation of that case. A close professional relationship may include co-authorship on a significant portion of the candidate's publications, collaboration with the candidate on major grants supporting research, serving as the candidate's dissertation advisor, dependence in some way on the candidate's professional activities, or another relationship with the candidate that creates bias. Evaluations of the Faculty Annual Review Committee will be advisory to the department chair in evaluating annual performance and making salary recommendations.

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 DOCUMENTATION THAT SUPPORT PROMOTION

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

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

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

The following provides additional context for promotion and tenure reviews conducted in the Department of Sociology:

- No single type of publication is invariably a more significant reflection on a research program than another. Peer reviewed articles and monographs based on original research have primary importance as evidence of research accomplishment. Review articles often require significant investigation on the part of the author and pass a careful review. In these circumstances, such publications are treated as research output. The evaluation of book chapters, including a substantive editor's introduction and/or summary in a book of original papers, depends on the extent to which they are based on original research, subject to peer review, and placed in collections judged to have high quality and likely to have an impact on the field.
- Publications that are not peer-reviewed are generally accorded lesser weight.
- Textbooks, edited volumes, and other materials that are intended primarily to be tools for instruction are judged as research output only to the extent that they present new ideas or constitute conceptual or empirical innovation.
- Book reviews written for journals are primarily viewed as professional service to the field, rather than as research output. At any given time, manuscripts that are in review provide evidence of continuing research efforts.
- Manuscripts accepted for publication, documented by copies of correspondence from the publisher, will be treated as publications for the purpose of evaluating research performance.
- Much of the research completed by a faculty member may be done in collaboration with graduate and undergraduate students. To some extent, students' accomplishments reflect faculty members' teaching efforts. However, the quality of students' work (e.g., dissertation awards, citations of a dissertation, publication of results, etc.), recruitment of graduate students, and involvement with graduate and undergraduate students' research also reflect on a faculty member's research program.
- Research excellence may manifest itself in other ways, depending on field of expertise, how research problems are approached, and stage of professional development. Among other indicators of the quality of a faculty member's research program are the award of external and internal funds, and other awards and recognitions. Faculty members are expected to provide evidence of these activities and of their quality and usefulness to the department and to the profession.

1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

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

The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a scholar, and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high-quality teaching,

scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the university.

The college views tenure and promotion to associate professor as a critically important evaluative process. There must be evidence that supports a claim that retention of the candidate will improve the overall quality and standing of the unit. Tenure and promotion to associate professor requires excellence in both scholarship and teaching. Good service is important, but the College recognizes that service provided during the probationary period of assistant professors is limited by design; thus, the most important judgment is that the candidate will achieve excellence in service in the future.

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

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](#).

Departmental requirements for promotion to associate professor with tenure are consistent with university and college guidelines and are described in greater detail below.

Scholarship. The department recognizes that scholarship may take many forms including research, theoretical innovation, the development of improved empirical techniques, and the creative application of existing concepts and empirical methods to problem solving. Each faculty member is expected to develop a research program, the focus and scope of which reflects important sociological problems, professional interests, and the departmental mission. Written accounts of research, particularly those that have been reviewed by peers, are the primary indicators of research productivity. However, publishing frequently is insufficient to prove that a research program is excellent. Publication quality and impact must also be assessed, employing indicators such as the reputation and average impact of the publication outlet, the Social Sciences Citation Index, and evidence that research has influenced the design of subsequent research activity, policy formulation, implementation, or evaluation. Departmental criteria for a positive evaluation and examples of documentation include the following:

SCHOLARSHIP	
Criteria	Examples of Documentation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A visible high-quality research program that consists of an established body of peer-reviewed work in the discipline’s major journals or leading specialty or interdisciplinary journals and/or research monographs published by major academic publishers. • Evidence that one has moved beyond their dissertation research • Demonstrated active efforts to seek intramural and extramural support from appropriate sources given one’s research specialties • Evidence that one’s research has influenced the design of subsequent research activity, policy formulation, implementation, or evaluation. • An emerging national reputation as a scholar. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copies of all books, articles, and scholarly papers published or accepted for publication and a description of the percentage effort contributed by the faculty member. • Impact factors of journals in which one has published • Citation record (Web of Science: Social Sciences Citation Index) • Evaluations of research in annual review letters. • Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the editor stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed. • Copies of all scholarly papers for which a revise and resubmit has been received. There should be an accompanying letter from the editor stating the nature of the requested revision. • Documentation of grants, patents, and contracts received. • Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate. • External evaluations of scholarship solicited by the department

Teaching: Teaching includes undergraduate and graduate instruction in formal courses, seminars, and individual studies. Directing student research is both a research and teaching activity. Advising students, and academic and career counseling (graduate and undergraduate) is a teaching activity. Departmental criteria for a positive evaluation and examples of documentation include the following:

TEACHING	
Criteria	Examples of Documentation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated strong performance in teaching • Command of substantive knowledge • Ability to organize and present class material with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught. Trends and/or patterns of responses in evaluations are as important or potentially

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributions to curricula development and/or creativity in course development, methods of presentation, and incorporation of new materials and ideas • Capacity to awaken students' awareness of the relationship between subjects studied, important problems, and other fields of knowledge. • Emerging evidence of undergraduate and/or graduate student mentoring and advising 	<p>more important than scores for any one course or year*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer evaluation of teaching reports as arranged by the department chair • Evaluations of teaching in annual review letters. • Description of the development of new and effective instructional techniques and materials, including syllabi, examinations, case studies, field trip agenda, computer software, problem sets, etc. • Evidence of recognition, honors, or awards for distinguished teaching • Instruction-related publications. These may include peer-evaluated publications designed primarily to communicate with other educators (e.g., journal articles on curricula, course innovations and student placement; textbooks, chapters in textbooks or peer-evaluated books of readings; articles, papers, reviews, and other non-reviewed class materials) • Descriptions of academic advising, mentoring, direction of undergraduate and graduate students in research papers, theses, and dissertations and/or service on such committees; counseling of graduate and undergraduate students in career development and related matters • Leadership in development of courses and curricula that goes beyond normal teaching and service expectations. • Documentation of participation in university teaching workshops and/or training.
---	---

* The department does not consider individual student comments from student evaluations of instruction in evaluating candidates for promotion and tenure.

Service: Candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure must demonstrate satisfactory performance in service. Service to the university and the college is generally not expected at the probationary level. Departmental criteria for a positive evaluation and examples of documentation include the following:

SERVICE	
Criteria	Examples of Documentation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conscientious service on departmental committees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluations of service contributions in annual review letters.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty/department citizenship including regular participation in required departmental activities (e.g., faculty meetings) • Emerging professional service to the discipline and/or the community/public directly related to one's professional expertise. • Service to department peers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Descriptions of service to professional journals, professional societies, funding agencies, and related service to the discipline • Description of service activity with industry, education, or government • Description of administrative service to department and any administrative service to college, university, and student life including initiatives undertaken to enhance diversity in the unit, college, or university. • Description of any consulting activity • Descriptions of advising to student groups and organizations • Evidence of awards and prizes for service to profession, university, and/or department • Evidence of public dissemination of research • Any available documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier.
---	--

2. Promotion to Professor

[Faculty Rules 3335-6-02\(C\) and \(D\)](#) establish 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. Promotion standards 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 is to be awarded not only to those faculty who have demonstrated impact in their research and creative activity, teaching and learning, and service, but also to those who have exhibited outstanding academic leadership that has made a visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the department and The Ohio State University.

In the College of Arts and Sciences, promotion to professor typically requires excellence in both scholarship and teaching. Excellence in service, as defined by evidence of leadership, is highly desirable. The college APT document defines excellence in each domain. For promotion to full professor, excellence in scholarship means attainment of measurable national and international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of high-quality published research or other relevant endeavors. A successful candidate will have achieved national distinction as a scholar and have an emerging international reputation. Excellence in teaching means the provision to all students the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning and, to the most capable and motivated students, an enhanced learning experience. It can be measured by the attainment of national or international recognition, as evidenced

by pedagogical publications, awards, honors, and/or critical student outcomes. Excellence in service means the provision of a high level of professional expertise to one or more publics—including the University, the Columbus community, the state of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations.

Departmental criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure (see charts in Section VI.A.1), with the following added expectations: sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, evidence of established national or international reputation in the field, demonstration of excellent performance in teaching, strong performance in service to the department, and service to one or more publics—including the University, the Columbus community, the state of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations.

The department exercises reasonable flexibility in evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, balancing, as the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. As faculty enter and continue in new fields of work, including interdisciplinary endeavors, instances will arise in which the work of the faculty member may depart from established academic patterns. The department takes the pursuit of research excellence as our core value. Where a candidate has made truly extraordinary contributions in the areas of teaching, service, or academic leadership, that record may warrant promotion to full professor in combination with a less extensive, though excellent record of continued productivity in research activity.

3. Promotion of 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 external funding is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation.

Promotion to Research Professor. For promotion to research professor, a faculty member must have a national and international reputation built on an extensive body of high-quality publications and with demonstrated impact on the field. A record of continuous external funding is required, along with demonstrated research productivity resulting from such funding.

4. Associated Faculty

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

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

Promotion to Senior Lecturer. Lecturers may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank as described in Section IV.A.3.

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

5. Regional Campus Faculty

Expectations for regional campus faculty differ somewhat from those for faculty on the Columbus campus. The primary mission of the regional campuses is to provide high quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities. The relative emphasis on teaching and service expected of regional campus faculty will therefore ordinarily be greater.

The department expects regional tenure-track campus faculty members to establish a program of high-quality scholarship. The department recognizes, however, that the greater teaching and service commitments of regional campus faculty require a different set of expectations. The judgment whether a particular body of work meets departmental standards for tenure and or promotion will take into consideration the regional campuses' different mission, higher teaching and service expectations, and lesser access to research resources. In evaluating regional campus faculty, the department puts heavy weight on the regional campus evaluation of teaching and service and gives scrutiny to the quality of the research program and the trajectory of research productivity, recognizing that the rate and total quantity of publication may be somewhat reduced when compared with Columbus campus faculty.

In evaluating regional campus research 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 procedures for promotion and tenure reviews must be consistent with those set forth in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-04](#) and the Office of Academic Affairs' annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in [Volume 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

1. Tenure-Track 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 indicating the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators compiled for their case according to department guidelines. Each of these elements is described in detail below.

- Candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion are responsible for submitting 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 POD and chair of the committee of the eligible faculty make reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that they complete.
- See section VI. A above for examples of documentation appropriate for inclusion in the dossier.

- The time frame for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty, it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, 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.
- 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. All scholarship outcomes will be reviewed for increasing independence over time. There should also be evidence of an increasing trajectory of sufficient scholarly outcomes over time.
- The time frame for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to the present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty, it is the date of last promotion to present 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.
- 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.
- Candidates may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the department's current APT document, (b) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (c) 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. Candidates who elect to be reviewed under a previous APT document (option b or c above), must submit a copy of the previous APT document when the dossier is submitted to the department.
- Candidates are responsible for reviewing the initial list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair in consultation with the eligible faculty. The candidate may independently suggest no more than three potential evaluator names but is not required to do so. The candidate is asked to remove anyone with whom there is a close or mentoring relationship and may request the removal of no more than two additional names, providing the reasons for the request. The department chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

Only the candidate may stop a review for promotion and tenure once external letters of evaluation have been sought. The candidate may withdraw from review at any stage of the process by informing the department chair in writing. If the review process has moved beyond the department, the chair shall inform the dean of the candidate's withdrawal.

b. Reading Committee Responsibilities

The responsibility of each reading committee is to coordinate mandatory promotion and tenure reviews (including fourth-year reviews) and nonmandatory promotion reviews. Reading committees, appointed by the chair of the committee of the eligible faculty, typically consist of two faculty members.

Full-scale reviews for promotion to professor and non-mandatory (“early”) reviews for promotion to associate professor with tenure are preceded by preliminary departmental reviews in Spring semester of each year to determine whether the eligible faculty recommend that a formal review occur in Autumn semester. In preparation for the review by the eligible faculty, the reading committee for each candidate provides a preliminary summary of each case. This preliminary summary is distributed to the eligible faculty prior to its meeting to conduct the fourth-year review or preliminary departmental review.

For candidates undergoing mandatory (excluding Fourth Year Reviews) or nonmandatory promotion review, the reading committee suggests names of external evaluators to the department chair in Spring semester. In Autumn semester, the reading committee provides a report of the candidate’s performance in teaching, scholarship, and service to the eligible faculty along with the dossier.

c. Committee of the Eligible Faculty Responsibilities.

The responsibilities of the members of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty are as follows:

- Review this APT document annually and recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair.
- 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 Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.
- The chair of the committee of the eligible faculty and the procedures oversight designee (POD) review candidates’ dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements. They also work with candidates to ensure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
- Review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- Hold a meeting to discuss promotion and tenure candidates, review the draft analysis of the Reading Committee, and vote by secret ballot on candidates for promotion and tenure. The department strongly encourages informed participation of all eligible faculty at the meeting. In the case of unavoidable absence, faculty members may submit written comments to the department chair, who will report those views as part of the discussion at the meeting. Those reported views may be included in the Committee of the Eligible Faculty’s report but are not part of the numerical vote taken at the meeting.
- 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.
 - In the case of assistant professors requesting a non-mandatory review, the Committee of the Eligible Faculty consider this request at the time of the meeting to discuss the annual review (see section V, part A, above). In addition to the materials submitted for the regular annual

review, the candidate submits narrative statements on teaching, research, and service (modelled on those in the core dossier) as well as a cumulative SEI report. If this request is made at the fourth year, the committee may consider it at the same time as they conduct the fourth-year review, holding a separate vote regarding whether the candidate should be reviewed for promotion and tenure in the following Autumn Semester

- In the case of associate professors requesting a non-mandatory review, candidates prepare a partial dossier and provide a current curriculum vitae and a set of papers completed since the last promotion for the preliminary departmental review.
- In preparation for a non-mandatory review, the chair of the committee of the eligible faculty establishes a Reading Committee to provide a preliminary summary of the candidate's case. This preliminary summary is distributed to the eligible faculty prior to the meeting to conduct the preliminary departmental review.
- The Committee bases its recommendation on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and dossier and on a determination of the availability of all required Department documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
- A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) for only one year. 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 recommendation to conduct a formal review does not constitute a commitment by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to make a positive recommendation to the college after a full-scale review.

d. The responsibilities of the Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty are as follows:

- Draft a final report that incorporates the discussion of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty and includes the results of the faculty vote. This report must be balanced and inform the department chair of the strengths and weaknesses of the case. The report must explain the sources of any disagreements among the faculty.
- Circulate this report to the eligible faculty, receive their comments, and prepare a final report. The final report must be signed by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty Chair on behalf of the entire committee and delivered to the department chair by the announced deadline. The committee chair provides 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 committee does not vote on these cases.

e. 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.

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

2. Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Adjunct faculty and associated faculty with tenure-track titles follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed 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 and does not proceed to the executive vice president and provost if the 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.

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

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 research who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged based on the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. The 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.

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

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the 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 of the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. If

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 (requesting permission from the Office of Academic Affairs to exclude that letter from the dossier). It is in the candidate's self-interest to assure that there is no ethical or procedural lapse, or the appearance of such a lapse, during the review process.

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

VII APPEALS

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described by 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 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. A faculty member may not request a seventh-year review, appeal the denial of a seventh-year review petition initiated by the department, or appeal a negative decision following a seventh-year review.

After fully considering all new information about a candidate's performance, and determining due reason, the department may petition the dean to conduct a seventh-year review for an assistant professor who has been denied promotion and tenure. Both the eligible faculty and the chair of the department must approve this petition. The petition must document substantial new information regarding the candidate's performance germane to the reasons for the original negative decision. The petition must be initiated before the beginning of the last year of employment.

IX PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

A. STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) form is required in every course offered in this department. Faculty should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if they are 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. 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 considered in future teaching.

B. PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The department chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process and will assign faculty of a higher rank to provide peer evaluations of assistant and associate professors. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the tenured faculty from year to year to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the department.

The following guidelines apply to peer review procedures in this department:

- The teaching of probationary tenure-track faculty should be reviewed at least four times during the first three years of service, and at least once during the remainder of the probationary period, with the goal of adequately assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction (e.g., graduate and undergraduate) to which the faculty member is assigned.
- The teaching of tenured associate professors is generally reviewed every two years, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. When associate professors are reviewed for promotion to professor, they will be required to have a minimum of two peer evaluations of teaching since last promotion or in the past 5 years, whichever is smaller, before the commencement of the promotion review.
- The teaching of associated faculty members is generally reviewed at least once every three years.
- The teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review, including professors, may be initiated at the department chair's request. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence assistance in improving teaching is needed.
- The teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review may be arranged upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative. 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 may also seek the services of the [Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#).
- Reviews conducted upon the request of the department chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the chair or faculty member.

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations (the first two situations listed above) are comprehensive and include, in addition to classroom visitation, review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and exams. Evaluations of a faculty member's teaching over time should be conducted by more than one peer. At the beginning of the semester, the assigned peer reviewer will request from the faculty a list of dates on which visitation would be inappropriate because a quiz or exam is being given, a guest speaker is scheduled, etc.

Peer review focuses particularly on aspects of teaching that most students are not qualified to evaluate, such as: appropriateness of curricular choices given the goals of the course, implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and appropriateness of approach relative to current

disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the review, the peer reviewer submits a written report to the department chair, copied to the faculty member. The faculty member may provide written comments on this report and the peer reviewer may respond in writing to those comments if desired. All such comments are appended to the report for inclusion in the faculty member's promotion and tenure dossier, unless the faculty member requests that the comments be excluded.

Regularly scheduled reviews are both summative and formative (they provide both an assessment of the faculty member's teaching for use in annual and promotion reviews, and advice to improve the faculty member's teaching).