Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure
Criteria and Procedures for The Ohio State University Department of Comparative Studies

Approved by the Faculty: 9/11/2017

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 12/12/2017

Table of Contents

I. Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty; the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs *Policy 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 voting faculty of the department, by the dean of the college, and the Office of Academic Affairs before it may be implemented. It sets forth the department's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the college and university, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the dean and the Office of Academic Affairs accept the mission and criteria of the department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to departmental mission and criteria.

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

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

II. Department Mission

The Department of Comparative Studies encourages critical reflection about culture across boundaries of discipline, nation, and language. Comparative Studies scholars attend to the construction of knowledge and the dynamics of power and authority in a range of historical discourses and practices: social, religious, literary, aesthetic, technological, scientific, political, and material. Our comparative methods question the assumptions that shape humanistic study, as we work to account for the

historical, material complexities of social relations and human existence. In this sense, "comparison" entails a self-reflective, critical analysis of our own social, cultural, historical and political contexts even as it heightens our sensitivity to the immediate specificities of the intellectual and material issues at hand. Our work is informed by a commitment to social justice, and energized by critical questions about how justice is to be defined and how it can be realized. Our scholarship engages with our academic peers, continuing the intellectual conversation that drives the production of knowledge. Our scholarship reaches beyond those peers to address broader publics. That same scholarship informs our teaching, ensuring that our students engage with the most current critical concepts and data. We encourage and help our students to become effective global citizens, guided by an ethos of mutual respect and persistent questioning, and recognition of the value and pleasures of critical intellectual work.

The department includes in its mission the achievement of international distinction in the kinds of interdisciplinary and cross-cultural research outlined above, and is also committed to sharing this knowledge through superlative teaching and service to the people of Ohio and the nation, and to fostering cooperation in research and teaching among arts and sciences faculty at The Ohio State University. The department offers a Bachelor of Arts degree in Comparative Studies, a BA in Religious Studies, and a BA in World Literature. It provides students across the university with innovative courses that fulfill general education requirements for both the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degree, and administers undergraduate minors. On the graduate level, the department offers a Master of Arts degree in Comparative Studies, a Ph.D. Minor in Comparative Cultural Studies, a Ph.D. in Comparative Studies, and Graduate Interdisciplinary Specialization in Comparative Literature. Many of the department's interdisciplinary seminars attract graduate students from other departments in the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences as well as the university's professional schools. The department's faculty regularly advise and sit on degree committees of graduate students in Comparative Studies as well as a wide variety of departments and programs across the university. On regional campuses, the department is committed to excellence in implementing the instructional undergraduate program of the humanities, and supports the specific mission mandated for those campuses by the Ohio Board of Higher Education.

The department acknowledges the importance of achieving excellence in research, teaching, and service, and hence values and encourages scholarly and pedagogical innovation as well as professional and community service that promote its mission as stated above. More broadly, the department is committed to contributing to an intellectual foundation for public discourse on the complexities of a culturally diverse nation and world.

III. Definitions

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

1. Tenure-track Faculty

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of tenure-track faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty whose tenure resides in the department. For an appointment at senior rank, a second vote is taken by the faculty members eligible to vote on the rank under consideration.

The eligible faculty for senior rank new appointments and for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion reviews of tenure-track faculty consists of all tenured faculty of equal rank to or higher than the candidate whose tenure resides in the department excluding the department chair, the deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

For tenure reviews of probationary professors, eligible faculty are tenured professors whose tenure resides in the department excluding the department chair, the divisional dean and executive dean of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

2. 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 a promotion review of that candidate.

3. Minimum Composition

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

B. Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. 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.

1. Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive. An independent positive recommendation from the chair is necessary for a complete recommendation from the department.

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

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal is secured when a two-thirds majority of the votes cast are positive. An independent positive recommendation from the chair is necessary for a complete recommendation from the department.

IV. Appointments

A. Criteria

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

The department may make joint appointments that enhance its ability to carry out its interdisciplinary mission. The details of these appointments and the rights and responsibilities of the faculty member in relation to Comparative Studies are clarified in a memorandum of understanding issued at the time of the joint appointment.

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. When an instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the divisional 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. In addition all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor. An earned PhD is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the department and the profession is highly desirable. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. 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, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted.

Associate Professor and Professor. 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.

Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at senior rank normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at senior rank is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the 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.

Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a senior rank and approved for tenure, if appropriate, but the university will not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Education.

2. Tenure-track Faculty, Regional Campus

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.

3. Associated 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 that the individual have, at a minimum, a doctorate in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction; or a Master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience with documentation of high quality. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The initial appointment for a senior lecturer 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. They may not be reappointed for more than three consecutive years at 100% FTE.

4. Courtesy Appointments

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

B. Procedures

See the Faculty Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments in the Office of Academic Affairs *Policies and Procedures Handbook* for information on the following topics:

- recruitment of tenure-track, clinical, 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

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

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

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

The department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the department.

Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo inclusive hiring practices training available through the college utilizing resources offered by the Office of Diversity and Inclusion. Implicit bias training, also strongly encouraged, is available through the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity.

The search committee:

- Appoints a Diversity Advocate who is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants.

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

- Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must advertise using at least one 30-day online ad in a national professional journal. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency ("green card"), and strict U. S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their appointment to a tenure track position included an advertisement in a field-specific nationally prominent professional journal.

- Screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents to the full faculty a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. If the faculty agrees with this judgment, the search committee chair submits the list of finalists, along with requested data about the search, to the divisional dean for approval to invite the finalists for on-campus interviews. If approved, these visits are then arranged by

the search committee chair, assisted by the department office. If the faculty does not agree, the department chair in consultation with the faculty determines the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, cancel the search for the time being).

On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee; graduate students; the department chair; and the dean or designee. In addition, all candidates make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their scholarship. Optionally, candidates may teach a sample class meeting. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format.

Following completion of on-campus interviews, the eligible faculty meet to discuss perceptions and preferences, and to vote on each candidate. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on each candidate to the department chair. An offer to hire requires a two-thirds majority support of the eligible faculty.

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

In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the department chair decides which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the department chair.

Potential appointment of a foreign national who lacks permanent residency must be discussed with the Office of International Affairs. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency status. The department will therefore be cautious in making such appointments and vigilant in assuring that the appointee seeks residency status promptly and diligently.

2. Tenure-track Faculty, Regional Campus

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

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, department chair, department eligible faculty, and regional campus search committee. Candidates are evaluated on both campuses, with the faculty at the Columbus campus taking primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's record and potential as a scholar. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. A decision to make an offer requires agreement by the department chair and regional campus dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the department chair and the regional campus dean.

3. Associated Faculty

The appointment, review, and reappointment of all compensated associated faculty are decided by the department chair in consultation with the Chair's Advisory Committee.

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

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

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

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

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

4. Courtesy Appointments

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty member from another Ohio State department. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular department council meeting. Whenever such a proposal is made, the prospective appointee's curriculum vitae and a brief statement are circulated among the faculty, who vote on the appointment at a regularly scheduled meeting of the faculty. If the proposal is approved by the eligible faculty, the department chair extends an offer of appointment. Courtesy appointments are reviewed every five years by the department chair, who determines in consultation with the faculty whether or not to renew such appointments.

V. Annual Review Procedures

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the Policy on Faculty Annual Review.

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

The documentation required for the annual performance review of every faculty member is described under Merit Salary Increases below. This material must be submitted to the department chair no later than the first Monday of classes in the spring semester.

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

A. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty

Every probationary tenure track faculty member is reviewed annually by the chair in accordance with OAA policies (http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/facultyappointments.pdf and http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf). The annual review evaluates the performance of a non-tenured faculty member in the areas of teaching, research, and service, with regard to expectations for continued employment and eventual candidacy for tenure. The annual review is further intended to encourage and advise the faculty member in his or her professional

development, and to identify departmental resources that may aid in furthering that development.

The department chair informs probationary faculty members at the time of initial appointment, and in a timely fashion each year thereafter, when the annual review will take place. Probationary faculty are provided with a copy of the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, which must be completed by the faculty member in reporting accomplishments to date as well as future plans and goals. In addition, the annual review dossier includes copies of Student Evaluations of Instruction, summaries of narrative student evaluations of teaching, peer evaluations of teaching, course syllabi, and copies of publications and forthcoming publications.

It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to compile his or her dossier and to see that his or her curriculum vitae and bibliography in the department files are kept up to date. It is the right of the individual faculty member to examine the contents of this dossier at any time, upon notification to the department chair, in accordance with college and university guidelines. Dossiers remain on file with the Fiscal/HR Officer.

After the faculty member has assembled his or her dossier and presented it to the department chair by the date specified in the letter of notice, the department chair makes the dossier available to the members of the committee.

The Committee of the Eligible Faculty conducts annual reviews of non-tenured faculty and makes recommendations to the department chair concerning reappointment. Tenured members of the faculty with joint appointments whose TIU is in another department may participate in the discussion of each case but may not vote. The department chair appoints one member of this committee to act as chair and to draft a report of the committee's deliberations and vote. The department chair likewise appoints one member of the committee as "Procedures Oversight Designee" in conformity with OAA guidelines. Each member of the committee, except the department chair, exercises full voting rights concerning whether to recommend to the department chair the reappointment of probationary faculty.

After sufficient time has been allowed for the members of the committee to review the dossier, the department chair calls a meeting of the committee at which time the dossier is discussed and a vote is cast on whether to recommend to the department chair the reappointment of a probationary faculty member. A two-thirds majority is sufficient to establish the committee's decision and recommendation concerning reappointment. Upon completion of the meeting, the chair of the committee forwards to the department chair a letter detailing

the committee's deliberations, recommendation, and vote, which becomes part of the candidate's dossier.

The deliberations and vote of the committee are taken under consideration by the chair, who formulates a decision, or, in the case of the fourth-year review, a recommendation to the divisional dean on the reappointment of probationary faculty. If the department chair should decide to forward a recommendation to the dean that is contrary to that made by the committee for annual reviews, he or she must first call a meeting of the committee to explain his or her decision and invite discussion.

At the completion of each annual review, the department chair provides the probationary faculty member and the divisional dean with a written assessment of the faculty member's performance and professional development and an indication as to whether the faculty member is being recommended for reappointment for an additional year.

If the department chair's recommendation is to reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year of service, that recommendation is final (except for the fourth-year review), and the following procedures apply:

a) At the conclusion of the annual review, the department chair arranges a conference with the candidate for the purpose of discussing the recommendation. The chair will invite the candidate's mentor to attend this meeting.

b) At this conference, the department chair may wish to indicate areas where, in the best judgment of the tenured faculty who conducted the review, the performance of the candidate needs improvement.

c) The candidate also receives notice that he or she may respond in writing to any or all of the points discussed in the assessment, such response (if any) to be included in the department files.

If the department chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The department chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals. If the chair does not recommend reappointment, a review that follows the Fourth Year review process will occur.

1. Regional Campus Faculty

Annual review of the probationary faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then

moves to the department and proceeds as described above. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

2. 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 exception that external evaluations are optional and the divisional dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

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

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

The eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department chair. 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.

3. 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*.

B. Tenured Faculty

The annual review evaluates the performance of tenured faculty members in the areas of teaching, research, and service and, in the case of associate professors,

their progress toward promotion. The annual review is intended to encourage and advise faculty members in their professional development, and to identify departmental resources that may aid in furthering that development.

The annual review of tenured faculty is the responsibility of the department chair, who consults with the professors regarding the evaluation of associate professors. Each year the department chair solicits from each tenured faculty member a completed Annual Faculty Activity Report, detailing his or her publications, research, teaching, and service for the previous calendar year. The report follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, and is accompanied by copies of Student Evaluations of Instruction, summaries of narrative student evaluations of teaching, peer evaluations of teaching, course syllabi, and copies of publications and forthcoming publications.

Faculty on leave for part or all of an academic year are required to submit an Annual Activity Report. If an individual is away for part of an academic year, the evaluation of teaching is based on any course(s) taught while present. A similar procedure is followed for evaluation of service.

The chair conducts the annual review of the professors. A committee of the tenured faculty at professor rank (including the department chair as non-voting member, if the chair is a professor) conducts an annual review of the associate professors and makes recommendations to the department chair concerning their performance and prospects for promotion. The department chair appoints one member of the committee to act as chair of that committee and to draft a report of the committee's deliberations.

The deliberations and evaluation of the committee are taken under consideration by the chair, who after a careful examination of the Annual Activity Report and accompanying documents, provides each faculty member with a written annual review, and with a scheduled opportunity to hold a face-to-face meeting with the chair or the chair's designee.

C. Tenured Faculty, Regional Campus

Annual review of the tenured faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then moves to the department and proceeds as described above. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

D. Associated Faculty

Compensated associated faculty members must be reviewed regularly. The Teaching Committee will organize the review of their teaching. The department chair arranges a meeting with the associated faculty member to discuss the teaching review after it has been completed. This conversation provides an opportunity for the chair and the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. The chair will write a report on this conversation, which is then shared with the faculty member and becomes a part of her or his record. The department chair's recommendation on renewal of the appointment is final**.**

VI. Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards

A. Criteria

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

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

Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service are assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. The time frame for assessing performance will be the past 36 months, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity. Faculty with high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

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

B. Procedures

On the Columbus campus, merit raises are recommended by the department chair to the divisional dean, who may modify these recommendations. Prior to deciding what raises to recommend, the department chair consults with the

salary advisory committee, which consists of two tenure-track faculty elected by the voting faculty. Committee members may make no recommendations concerning their own salaries or those of faculty members with whom they have a familial or comparable relationship. Salary increases are formulated in dollar amounts rather than percentage increases, with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries across the department.

Discussions with the department chair regarding salary increases should focus on the resulting salary (rather than the increase), since increases are solely a means to the end of an optimal distribution of salaries.

C. Documentation

The annual performance review of every faculty member requires that all documentation described below, including the two summary documents, be submitted to the department chair no later than the first Monday of classes in the spring semester.

- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place
- updated Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, *Policies and Procedures Handbook*, Volume 3 or Annual Activity Report, which follows the OAA dossier outline.

Any published materials presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or other final form that documents actual publication. An author's manuscript does not document publication.

Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the annual review, as such solicitation places its recipient in an awkward position and produces a result that is unlikely to be candid. Faculty may, however, inform the chair about significant external contributions. The chair may then solicit evaluations of those contributions.

The time period covered by the documentation described below is the previous 12 months.

1 Teaching

Cumulative eSEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught.

Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details, including required number, included in Section X: Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching below)

Copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed. This letter may be in electronic form. An accepted but unpublished work submitted for consideration in a given annual review may not be resubmitted after publication for consideration in a future annual review.

Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.

2 Scholarship

Copies of all materials published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed. This letter may be in electronic form.

Documentation of grants and contracts received.

Other relevant documentation of scholarship as appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted).

3 Service

Any available documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier.

VII. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

A. Criteria

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the university enters

new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established academic patterns. In such cases care must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

Outstanding undergraduate and graduate teaching is essential to Comparative Studies's successful maintenance of a viable and coherent curriculum. Therefore, due consideration is given during tenure and promotion reviews to demonstrated teaching proficiency. It is also one of the primary objectives of the department to generate and communicate new knowledge. Therefore, publication of articles in refereed journals and of books with reputable academic presses remains the strongest and most direct route for tenure and promotion. New forms of scholarly research, new forms of publication and distribution of knowledge, and new understandings of the complex interactions among scholars and publics require that departments begin to expand criteria for promotion. Digital scholarship and engaged scholarship are among the innovations that have become increasingly important means of producing new knowledge. While acknowledging that professional evaluation standards are still evolving, the department will assure that innovative forms of scholarship will be evaluated fully and fairly within these criteria

1) Scholarly and educational purposes
2) Professional reception of these projects
3) Delineation of the contribution to any collaborative projects through a description of the role of the individual contributor
4) Best professional standards for evaluating their worth at the time of their publication.

Excellence in both teaching and scholarship constitutes the most important criterion for promotion and tenure. While the department recognizes that some faculty may be stronger in one area than the other, there nonetheless must be a balance between the two areas. Extraordinary teaching cannot compensate for a poor publication record, and extraordinary scholarship cannot compensate for unsatisfactory teaching.

In addition, it is expected that tenured members of Comparative Studies achieve national or international recognition as scholars and contributors in their respective fields and that untenured members show promise and evidence of

achieving such recognition. In relation to service, activities that further the interdisciplinary and comparative missions of the unit are especially important.

1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 provides the following general criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure:

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

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

The award of tenure is a commitment of lifetime employment. 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.

For promotion to associate professor with tenure candidates must complete a body of significant and original scholarly work; this typically includes at least one book that has been published or is under board-approved final contract and in production with a respected academic press, as well as published essays in peer-reviewed journals or edited volumes and papers at professional conferences. New forms of scholarly research, new forms of publication and distribution of knowledge, and new understandings of the complex interactions among scholars and publics require that departments begin to expand criteria for promotion. Digital scholarship and engaged scholarship are among the innovations that have become increasingly important means of producing new knowledge. While acknowledging that professional evaluation standards are still evolving, the department will assure that innovative forms of scholarship will be evaluated fully and fairly within these criteria:

1) Scholarly and educational purposes
2) Professional reception of these projects
3) Delineation of the contribution to any collaborative projects through a description of the role of the individual contributor to any collaborative projects

4) Best professional standards for evaluating their contribution to knowledge and, if appropriate, their impact in the community involved, at the time of their publication.

Candidates must also establish a pattern of active and ongoing research, and show promise of further professional development.

Candidates must demonstrate an ability to teach effectively at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, to advise majors and/or students preparing theses, and to develop syllabi and courses that further the department's instructional mission. Teaching excellence is measured by student and peer evaluations, by awards and other formal recognition (see below, "Documentation for Teaching") and by the statement on teaching included in the candidate's dossier.

Finally, candidates must serve effectively on department, college, and university committees, and demonstrate an ability to work effectively with other colleagues in the management of the department (see below, "Documentation for Service").

Excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service are moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics

2. Promotion to Professor

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

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

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

Candidates for promotion to professor are expected to be able to demonstrate advanced leadership in at least some of the following:

- Teaching, including but not limited to successful advising of graduate students, continuing contributions to the undergraduate curriculum, and potentially extending to the development of innovative pedagogical approaches;
- Scholarship, typically including a second substantial contribution to the scholarship of an appropriate interdisciplinary field and national or international recognition for that contribution, and potentially including the development of new forms of engaged scholarship;
- Service, including active contributions to the department, college, university, and profession.

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

In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another. Where a candidate has made truly extraordinary contributions in the areas of teaching or service, that record may warrant promotion in combination with a less extensive, though excellent record of continued productivity in scholarship.

3. Regional Campus Faculty

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

B. Procedures

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

tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the *Policies and Procedures Handbook*. The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty in the department.

1. Candidate Responsibilities

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

- To submit a copy of the department's APT Document that was in effect at the time of the candidate's hire or when the candidate was last promoted, whichever is more recent, if s/he wishes to be reviewed under that document's criteria and procedures. This must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the department.

- To review the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate may suggest up to five names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The department chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

2. Committee of the Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

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

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

    - A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 for one year. 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.

- Consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policy, only faculty members who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non-mandatory tenure review. The committee must confirm with the department chair that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident (has a "green card"). Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.

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

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

  - **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines. In the department of Comparative Studies, the Procedures Oversight Designee also serves as a mentor for the candidate for the promotion process.

  - **Late Spring**: Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair.

  - **Early Autumn:** Ensure that the Procedures Oversight Designee completes a review of the candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.

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

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

- The chair of the eligible faculty must draft an analysis of each case following the department council meeting, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair. A two-thirds majority vote of the eligible faculty is sufficient to recommend promotion.

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

- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure-initiating unit is another department.

3. Department Chair Responsibilities

- The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

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

  - Where relevant, to verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty members who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure will not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.

  - **Late Spring Semester**: To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the chair and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

- To make adequate copies of 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.

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

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

- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:

    - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair

    - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair

    - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects 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, except in the case of associated faculty for whom the department chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases.

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

4. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

Regional campus 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.

5. External Evaluations

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. A minimum of five credible and useful evaluations must be obtained. A credible and useful evaluation:

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will solicit evaluations 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. In instances where the primary scholarly projects of the candidates fall under the definitions of either digital scholarship or engaged scholarship, the pool of appropriate peer evaluators may include individuals appropriate to that form of scholarship, some of whom may have demonstrated expertise in spaces other than peer institutions.

- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no

circumstances will “usefulness” be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters are sought than are required, and they are solicited no later than the 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 Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the department chair, and the candidate.

This list is approved by the divisional dean, then shown to the candidate, who may indicate to the department chair that one or more individuals on the list might favor or devalue the candidate’s scholarship for other than substantive or academic reasons. The candidate at the same time may suggest up to five additional scholars who are both qualified and likely to render an impartial assessment. The department chair takes this information under advisement and then solicits evaluations from at least five external evaluators. Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate. If the circumstance arises that either of the two lists of external evaluators is exhausted without the requisite number of letters received, an expanded list or lists undergoes the same process. All solicited letters that are received must be included in the dossier. Unsolicited letters of evaluation or those solicited by anyone other than the department chair or the chair of the promotion and tenure committee may not be included in the dossier.

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, in the course of the review process.

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

C. Documentation

As noted above under Candidate Responsibilities, every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. While the Procedures Oversight Designee and 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 are to be completed by the candidate.

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

Any published materials presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or other final form that documents actual publication. An author's manuscript does not document publication.

1. Teaching

The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, to present.

Teaching is evaluated in relation to the department’s mission of promoting innovative and interdisciplinary undergraduate and graduate instruction. Some faculty may demonstrate particular strengths in one or more areas of teaching, and faculty may be assigned differing instructional responsibilities, but all areas of instruction is regularly evaluated. The expectation, however, is that all faculty will have significant teaching responsibilities in the education of undergraduates as well as graduate students.

The evaluation of teaching is a developing art and the expectation is that the department is always be in the process of analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of its evaluation vehicles and of making revisions and innovations. At any given time, however, the methods of evaluation must be

uniform and any changes to the discursive evaluation forms or procedures for peer review must be approved by the voting members of the department.

The following forms of documentation covering the time period since the last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, are used in evaluating the teaching of the Columbus campus faculty:

a) Student Evaluation: Every course in every semester is evaluated by students and these evaluations become part of the instructor's dossier to be reviewed by the department chair and relevant committees in the regular promotion and tenure process, as well as in annual and merit raise reviews. The evaluation pays particular attention to recurrent patterns in student responses.

   The process of student evaluation always has both a quantitative part (SEI) and a qualitative, discursive part (SET). The College of Arts and Sciences requires that the department use the electronically-administered Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) as its quantitative measure. The department uses its own Student Evaluations of Teaching forms for qualitative evaluation.

b) Peer Evaluation: All probationary faculty undergo peer review of teaching at least once each year. Starting in 2017-2018, candidates for promotion to professor are expected to have at least 4 peer evaluations for the 5 year period prior to consideration for promotion. The faculty members doing the review are appointed by the department chair or the teaching committee chair. At the beginning of the semester in which the review takes place, the instructor is notified of the review and of which peer faculty member will undertake it. Because of the interdisciplinary nature of the department, the department chair may appoint an appropriate faculty member from outside Comparative Studies as well as a regular Comparative Studies faculty member or affiliate to conduct the review. In making the selections for the peer review, the department strives over the years to have a variety of peer reviewers (the majority of whom should ordinarily be regular Comparative Studies faculty) and a range of courses reviewed.

   The peer reviewer's purpose is to evaluate the instruction and not merely write a recommendation on behalf of the reviewed faculty member. In carrying out this evaluation, the reviewer must evaluate the syllabus (its clarity, appropriateness to the course, explication of requirements and grading criteria, etc.), the mode of instruction (based on at least one class visitation), and the relevance of the course (including the way it is taught)

to the mission of the department. The peer evaluation is submitted to the department chair and placed in the instructor's file as part of the annual review process. A copy of the evaluation is also sent to the instructor, who has the right to correct factual errors and to make written comments about the evaluation and to have those comments included in the instructor's file.

Along with details about the numbers of courses and students taught each semester, each faculty member should also list the undergraduate and graduate students for which he or she has been a primary advisor and the nature of the advising (e.g., faculty advisor for major, dissertation committee member, master's thesis advisor). Because of the interdisciplinary nature of the department's faculty, it is likely that most faculty serve students in other programs as well as Comparative Studies' own. As this furthers the mission of the unit, such advising outside the unit is laudatory and is evaluated as such as long as it does not interfere with service and advising to the department's own students.

Documentation of performance in instruction may also include:

a) evidence of accomplishments in teaching or in the development of special pedagogical materials (copies of syllabi for courses taught must be submitted every semester to the department as part of the department's curriculum files and annually as part of the faculty member's annual report, but, in addition, the faculty member may submit materials such as examinations or special assignments as evidence of innovative or effective pedagogy;
b) teaching awards;
c) documentation of special accomplishments by students the faculty member has mentored;
d) any other information the faculty member or department chair may deem relevant.

2. Scholarship

In evaluating scholarly achievement, the department considers both quality and quantity, although a special emphasis is placed on quality and evidence of a significant contribution to a faculty member's field of study. Such evidence, covering the time period since the last promotion, includes the following categories:

Publications: The type and scope of each publication are considered. Because of the innovative nature of scholarship encompassed within Comparative Studies, publication may occur in emergent, refereed

interdisciplinary works (monographs, journals, and anthologies) with a high impact on emergent fields of scholarship, as well as more established venues. Books, monographs, critical editions, articles, book reviews, etc., if based on original research, are accorded special importance as evidence of scholarly achievement and development. In general, monographs and papers that undergo considerable scrutiny before publication (e.g., by editorial boards of journals or anthology editors) are more highly valued than those that do not. The quality of the venue of publication (such as respected peer-reviewed journals and appropriate university presses) is also carefully weighed. In cases where the candidate's research falls under the definitions of digital or engaged scholarship, the quality of the work produced or distributed in that form will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

1) Scholarly and educational purposes
2) Professional reception of these projects
3) Delineation of the percentage of contribution to any collaborative projects
4) Best professional standards for evaluating their worth at the time of their publication.

Other publications that are conceived primarily for university instruction such as textbooks, source books, readers, anthologies of texts, translations, and contributions in the area of foreign language teaching, as well as similar publications are judged to be scholarly works only when they present new ideas or incorporate scholarly research. Original research related directly to interdisciplinary, comparative, and cross-cultural teaching are recognized and rewarded. Translations and creative work are evaluated in light of their originality, depth, and pertinence to the academic mission of Comparative Studies. Evaluation of reviews of scholarly works written for professional journals takes into account the scholarship of the reviews and the type and quality of the journals.

Scholarly Presentations: The department expects scholarly activity at international, national, and regional professional meetings. Papers, formal participation in symposia, and official commentaries made as a discussant of the papers of others are appraised whenever possible by appropriate faculty and/or on the basis of opinions, oral and written, of scholars in the field.

Grants, Prizes, and Awards: Importance is attached to scholarly recognition in the form of prizes, awards, grants, and fellowships, as

well as to invitations to deliver public lectures or to teach at other major research universities.

Although most clearly relevant to the evaluation of service, recognition in the form of requests to serve on editorial boards of scholarly journals, to chair sessions at professional meetings and conventions, or to serve on program committees for such meetings may be considered as indicators of the faculty member's prominence in the field.

Other Evidence: Any other evidence that a faculty member believes pertinent to his or her performance as a scholar may be submitted.

3 Service

The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty, it is the date of last promotion to present. Examples of documentation include:

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

Recognition should be given to scholarly service that a faculty member has been asked to perform or that which he or she initiated on behalf of scholarly organizations, the department, college, and the university. In evaluating service, the department considers the nature, extent and impact of the faculty member's activities. Consideration is given to activities that enhance the department's mission to foster cooperation in research and teaching among Arts and Sciences faculty at the university. Those who perform service in which the commitment of time is considerable (especially with little or no reduction in teaching responsibilities) can reasonably expect that such service receive due consideration. Any service obligations undertaken especially by non-tenured faculty members and submitted by them for evaluation under this rubric must be considered and discussed. Such requests are listed in the service portion of the dossier and document national or international service as well.

VIII. Appeals

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

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

IX. Seventh-year Reviews

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

In rare instances the department may petition the divisional dean to conduct a seventh-year review for an assistant professor who has been denied promotion and tenure as a result of a sixth year (mandatory tenure) review. Both a majority of the tenured faculty of the department and the department chair must approve proceeding with a petition for a seventh-year review. The petition must provide documentation of substantial new information regarding the candidate's performance that is germane to the reasons for the original negative decision. Petitions for seventh-year reviews must be initiated before the beginning of the last year of employment because the seventh year review, if approved, would take place during the regular university review cycle of the assistant professor's seventh and last year of employment.

If the divisional dean concurs with the department's petition, the dean in turn petitions the provost for permission to conduct a seventh-year review. If the provost approves the request, a new review is conducted equivalent to the one that resulted in the nonrenewal of the appointment.

The conduct of a seventh-year review does not presume a positive outcome. In addition, should the new review result in a negative decision, the faculty member's last day of employment is that stated in the letter of nonrenewal issued following the original negative decision.

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, since the faculty member has already been notified that tenure has been denied at the conclusion of the sixth-year review.

X. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (eSEI) is required in every course offered in this department. Faculty members should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if s/he is going to provide in-class time for students to complete the evaluation using a mobile application. The faculty member must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation. The faculty member should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and to provide feedback that can be taken into account in future teaching. The department supplements the crude instrument of the SEI with its own narrative evaluation form, the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET).

SET forms are distributed in class, completed by the students in the absence of the instructor, and then collected (by a designated student, staff person, or faculty member other than the instructor) and handed in directly to the Comparative Studies office. The faculty member may not be present when the narrative evaluations are being completed. Completed forms must be transported from the classroom to the main office of the department by a student volunteer. Instructors do not have access to results of either evaluation instrument until the final grades for the course have been recorded. Copies of the quantitative results, once tabulated, are sent to the department as well as to the evaluated instructor; discursive evaluations are retained in department files and are summarized by a staff person or faculty member other than the instructor.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

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

Annually the department chair appoints a Teaching Committee of a size judged sufficient to meet the volume of peer review activity expected that year, without overburdening any of the members. [Please see the description of the Teaching Committee and its responsibilities in the department's POA.] The term of service is one year, with reappointment possible. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the tenured faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the department. Although there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible.

The responsibilities of the Teaching Committee include:

- to review the teaching of probationary tenure-track at least once per year during the probationary period, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned

- to review the teaching of tenured associate professors least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a five year period and of having at least four peer reviews of teaching completed during the five years immediately before the commencement of a promotion review

- to review the teaching of tenured professors at least once every four years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review

- to review the teaching of the associated faculty at least once every other year

- To review, upon the department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.

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

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

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

reviewer should attend two different class sessions over the course of the semester.

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