

JANUARY 30, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PREAMBLE 4

II. MISSION STATEMENT 5

III. DEFINITIONS..... 5

 A. COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY 5

 B. CONFLICT OF INTEREST 5

 C. PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE AND P&T CHAIR..... 6

 D. QUORUM..... 6

 E. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY..... 7

 F. SCHOLARSHIP 7

 G.

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION & TENURE:
CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

PROBATIONARY PERIOD 7

H. CORE DOSSIER	7
IV. FACULTY APPOINTMENTS	8
A. CRITERIA FOR HIRING	8
B. HIRING PROCEDURES	11
V. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES	14
A. ANNUAL REVIEW OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	14
B. TENURED FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEWS, COLUMBUS.....	18
C. TENURED FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEWS, REGIONAL CAMPUSES	19
D. ASSOCIATED FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEWS, COLUMBUS	19
E. ASSOCIATED FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEWS, REGIONAL CAMPUSES	19
VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS	20
A. CRITERIA FOR MERIT SALARY INCREASES, ALL CAMPUSES	20
B. PROCEDURE FOR MERIT SALARY INCREASE RECOMMENDATIONS, COLUMBUS.....	20
C. PROCEDURES FOR MERIT SALARY INCREASE RECOMMENDATIONS, REGIONAL CAMPUSES	21
VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEWS	21
A. EXCLUSION OF TIME FROM PROBATIONARY PERIOD.....	21
B. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE	22
C. GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR P&T REVIEWS	29
D. DOCUMENTATION FOR P&T REVIEWS.....	36
VIII. APPEALS OF NEGATIVE DECISIONS	39
IX. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEW FOR NEGATIVE DECISIONS	39
X. PROCEDURES FOR DOCUMENTING STUDENT AND PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING	39
A. STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING	39
B. PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING.....	40

APPENDICES

A. Annual Activity Report Template for English, Columbus Campus.....**42**
B. Annual Merit Review Rubric for English.....**47**
C. Documentation of bias in SEI-Type Evaluations.....**49**

I. PREAMBLE

What follows is a supplement to Chapter 6 of the Rules of the University Faculty (Additional Rules Concerning Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure) <http://trustees.osu.edu> the Office of Academic Affairs' annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews at <http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>; and any additional policies established by the College and the University to which the Department and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the Department will follow those 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, in accordance with Faculty Rules, has been approved by the Executive Dean of the College and the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University; any significant changes must also receive approval before they can be implemented. This section 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 its criteria and procedures for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the Executive Dean and Executive Vice President and Provost accept the mission and criteria of the Department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating continuing faculty and candidates for positions 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 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) 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 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) 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 (<http://hr.osu.edu/policy/policy110.pdf>).

II. ENGLISH DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT

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

III. DEFINITIONS

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

The eligible faculty for appointing tenure-track faculty on the Columbus campus consists of all tenure-track faculty (Instructors, Assistant, Associate, and Professors) for whom English is the Tenure-Initiating Unit (TIU).

The eligible faculty for promotion and tenure reviews of tenure-track faculty consists of all tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate (or the same rank for professors evaluating other professors) whose tenure resides in the Department excluding the Department Chair, the Dean and Assistant and Associate Deans of the College, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President.

B. Conflict of Interest

No faculty member may participate in the review of a particular candidate when he or she has a conflict of interest. Such a conflict exists in the following cases:

- When there is a familial relationship with a candidate.
- When there is a close professional relationship such that the faculty member stands to gain or lose professionally from the outcome of the review of the candidate, for example, co-authorship or co-editorship on a significant portion of the candidate's **scholarship** or collaboration with the candidate on major grants supporting that **scholarship**.
- When the faculty member was the candidate's dissertation adviser.

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

C. Promotion and Tenure Committee and the P&T Chair

The Committee on Promotion and Tenure (P&T) consists of faculty chosen from the ranks of Professors and Associate Professors. Its primary duty is to gather relevant information on Associate Professors being considered for promotion, and for Assistant Professors being considered for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, in order to aid the eligible faculty in making decisions concerning tenure and promotion.

One member of the Committee is designated the Procedures Oversight Designee (the "junior POD") for Assistant Professors coming up for promotion to Associate; another member is designated the "senior POD" for Associate Professors coming up for promotion to Professor. Both positions are dedicated to seeing that the Department fairly and appropriately carries out its own promotion and tenure procedures and those of the College and OAA. (See VII C.8). The senior POD also organizes the annual reviews of Associate Professors.

The Chair of the P&T Committee (the P&T Chair) oversees the Committee, ensures the proper execution of the Department's P&T policies and procedures, and assists the Department Chair in coordinating and conducting annual reviews of Assistant Professors and Professors.

The P&T Committee also makes recommendations regarding P&T policies and procedures in order to advise the Department Chair, who is responsible for updating the Department's Appointments, Promotion, & Tenure (APT) document. In addition, the P&T Committee may serve in other capacities as required by Department, OAA, and College guidelines, such as making recommendations to the Department Chair regarding requests from untenured faculty for unpaid leaves of absence or exclusions of time from the tenure clock.

All tenured faculty in the Department serve at the request of the P&T Chair for particular duties related to promotion and tenure, including but not limited to: serving as scribe for a promotion meeting, recruiting external reviewers, and summarizing discursive teaching evaluations.

D. Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is three-fifths of the eligible faculty not on an approved Leave of Absence, Faculty Professional Leave, or External Fellowship Subsidy. Eligible faculty who are on approved business travel and faculty who are assigned to teach during the time of the personnel meeting are also excused from the quorum. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment

may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the 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.

E. Recommendations 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 and will be entered in the record but not counted in the vote total, according to OAA and College stipulations. Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted, though faculty participating via Skype or the equivalent may vote. A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment, promotion, or tenure is secured when two thirds (67%) of the votes cast are positive. See “Hiring Procedures: Tenure-Track Faculty” for what happens when the positive appointment vote is more than half but less than two-thirds of the votes.

F. Scholarship

Following the university faculty rules, we define **scholarship** as activity pertaining to “discovery, scholarly and creative work, applied research, and the scholarship of pedagogy” (Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#)).

G. Probationary period

- An appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor is always probationary, and may not exceed six years, including prior service credit as approved by OAA.
- An Instructor who has completed the terminal degree and is advancing to the rank of Assistant Professor must make a written request to be credited for prior service during the time served as Instructor (see IV A.1, below).
- Appointments as Associate Professor and as Professor will normally entail tenure. However, a probationary period not to exceed four years may be granted by the Office of Academic Affairs upon petition of the Department and the College of Arts and Sciences. For the petition to be approved a compelling rationale must be provided regarding why appointment at a senior rank is appropriate but tenure is not.

H. Core Dossier

- All candidates for promotion must submit a completed “core dossier” in the format prescribed by OAA (at present, online on “Vita”). Probationary faculty must begin their core dossiers in time for their annual reviews in the Spring of the first academic year of their appointments.

IV. FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

A. Criteria for Hiring

1. Criteria for Hiring Tenure-track Faculty, Columbus Campus

- **Instructor:** Appointments to the rank of Instructor will normally be made only when the offered appointment is that of Assistant Professor but the appointee has not completed the terminal degree (Ph.D., M.F.A., or equivalent) at the onset of the appointment. Such appointees must have completed this degree by the end of the third year of employment, or the appointment will not be renewed. On promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor, faculty will only be granted prior service credit for the time spent as an Instructor if they request in writing, at the time of promotion to Assistant Professor, that they wish to receive such credit. 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. Prior service credit must be approved by the eligible faculty, the Department Chair, the Dean, and OAA.
- **Assistant Professor:** A person appointed as Assistant Professor is normally expected to hold the Ph.D., M.F.A., or equivalent. An appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor is always probationary, and may not exceed six years, except for approved exclusions of time on the tenure clock., with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible upon the candidate's request, if the candidate passes a screening by the eligible faculty (see VII.B.4). 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:** A person appointed as Associate Professor or Professor is normally expected to hold the Ph.D., M.F.A., or equivalent, to have successful **teaching** experience, and to be capable of distinguished **scholarship** on the evidence of work already accomplished. A person appointed as Professor should have demonstrated a distinguished record of **teaching** and **scholarship**. All appointments to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor require prior approval of the Executive Vice President and Provost. Appointments to Associate Professor or Professor normally entail tenure (See III G). Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a

senior rank and approved for tenure, if appropriate, but the University does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency.

2. Criteria for Hiring Tenure-track Faculty, Regional Campuses

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. Criteria for Hiring Associated Faculty, Columbus Campus

As resources allow, the Department hires Associated Faculty at the rank of Senior Lecturer or Visiting Assistant Professor to teach three or more courses per semester on benefits-eligible contracts from one to three years long. Associated Faculty may also be appointed at the rank of Lecturer for less than a semester (as when another faculty member's illness requires hiring a substitute) or for a single semester to teach one or more courses as the need arises. With the exception of Visiting Faculty, Associated Faculty may be reappointed. The full-time course load for Associated Faculty is 4 courses per semester, 8 courses per year. Associated Faculty appointments are not eligible for tenure.

The Department appoints the following categories of Associated Faculty:

- Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, or Visiting Professor. Appointments to this position require the Ph.D., M.F.A., or the equivalent. Such appointments may not exceed three continuous years.
- Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor at .49 FTE or less. These appointments are not tenure-eligible, though faculty in these ranks may come up for promotion following the same standards as the tenure-track faculty.
- Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, or Adjunct Professor. Whether unsalaried or salaried, appointments to these positions require the Ph.D., M.F.A., or the equivalent as well as the **scholarly** and **teaching** profile suitable for the specified rank. Expected contributions to the Department include work with graduate students, participation in the scholarly life of the Department, and, in some cases, teaching in the Department.

- Senior Lecturer. Appointments to this position require the Ph.D., M.F.A., or the equivalent (e.g., an M.A. and five or more years of teaching experience). Senior Lecturer appointments may be renewed indefinitely, according to University rules, for terms of up to three years. The Department, however, may limit terms of some Senior Lecturers for programmatic or budgetary reasons. Expected contributions to the Department include undergraduate **teaching** and, only when specifically assigned as part of the position, administrative work. Participation in committee work or in the scholarly life of the Department is welcomed but not expected, given that it is not compensated.
- Lecturer. Appointments to this position require the M.A. or its equivalent, though in most cases the Department prefers the Ph.D., M.F.A., or the equivalent. Lecturer appointments are typically made on a semester-by-semester basis to fill short-term undergraduate **teaching** needs, though appointments for two semesters may also be made when resources allow.

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

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

4. Criteria for Hiring Associated Faculty, Regional Campuses

Criteria for hiring Associated Faculty on Regional Campuses are determined by the Regional Campus's Deans and Department Coordinators.

5. Courtesy Appointments for Tenure-track Faculty Outside of English

The Department may extend courtesy appointments to tenured or tenure-track Ohio State faculty from other tenure initiating units (TIU) whose **teaching** and **scholarship** have ties to the work of the Department. Expected contributions include advising of graduate students, participation in the scholarly life of the Department, and, in some cases and with the permission of the home TIU, occasional teaching in the Department. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

B. Hiring Procedures

1. Tenure-track Faculty Appointments, Columbus Campus

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

The Chair, in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Department, will appoint a Search Committee for each position the Department seeks to fill. Each Search Committee will consist of 3 or 4 people, including the department's Diversity Officer or designee, at least one faculty member in the field of the prospective hiring and at least one in a different but related field within the Department or from another Department. Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo inclusive hiring practices training available through [the college with resources from the Office of Diversity and Inclusion](#). Implicit bias training, also strongly encouraged, is available through the [Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity](#). In consultation with the Executive Committee, the Chair will designate one person on each Search Committee to serve as Committee Chair. The Department Chair and/or Vice-Chair will be a voting member of each Search Committee. Faculty not on the Search Committee are invited to read letters of recommendation, CVs, and writing samples and to make comments, but the Search Committee will select the list of interviewees. A typical search for a tenure-track Assistant Professor proceeds as follows:

The search committee selects approximately eight to ten candidates to interview at the appropriate conference (usually MLA), by Skype, or by phone. As soon as possible after the interviews (typically before or during the first week of Spring semester), each Search Committee will determine which two (or sometimes three) candidates to bring to campus—at least one of whom should contribute to the diversity of the Department. If the search committee judges that in the pool of candidates there is no person who can contribute in this way, the Committee's report will explain to the faculty its efforts to attract a diverse pool of applicants and the reasons why those efforts did not produce diversity among the finalists. Shortly after the finalists are selected, the Search Committee(s) will present these candidates to the Department in the form of a written narrative about the search process so far and the strengths of the candidates selected for campus

visits. The presentation of this narrative is the first stage of a "hand-off" of the hiring process from the Search Committee(s) to the eligible faculty (i.e., the tenure-track faculty of the Department). The slate of finalists must be approved by the divisional dean; the approval process includes submission of the Faculty Search Diversity Report Form (<https://intranet.asc.ohio-state.edu/apt/hiring>).

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

After the campus interviews, the Search Committee will solicit advice from all who met the candidate, were at the talk, or were otherwise involved in the visit, as well as those who read the candidates' materials. The Committee will then meet to decide which candidate to recommend to the eligible faculty to receive the first offer, which the second offer, or, indeed, any other way of proceeding. This recommendation constitutes the final stage of the hand-off from the Committee to the larger body. The Chair of the Committee will present in a meeting of the eligible faculty not only the Committee's recommendation but also a narrative of how the recommendation was arrived at, a narrative that includes a précis of debates within the committee. If a two-thirds majority of the eligible faculty present vote in favor of the Committee's recommendation, and if the Executive Dean approves the decision, the Department Chair will then extend the offer. If the top candidate receives more than half but less than two-thirds of the votes, the faculty will vote again on the top candidate, separate from the rest of the slate of candidates. If this candidate still receives less than two-thirds of the votes, the Chair in consultation with the Executive Dean will decide whether to make an offer to the Committee's top-ranked candidate on the basis of a simple majority, to move to the second candidate, or to end the search and begin again.

For appointments to the rank of Associate Professor, immediately following a positive vote by the tenure-track faculty, the Associate Professors and Professors will vote to determine whether the candidate meets the Department's criteria for appointment at that rank with tenure. For appointments to the rank of Professor, immediately following a positive vote by the tenure-track faculty, the Professors will vote to make a preliminary determination as to whether the candidate meets the Department's criteria for appointment at that rank with tenure. A two-thirds majority of those voting Yes or No by secret ballot is required. Following a positive vote from the eligible faculty and the relevant body of Associate Professors and Professors, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will arrange an expedited tenure process, soliciting evaluations of the candidate's scholarship by at least two scholars whose names are not given to the Department by the candidate. The Chair will give the eligible faculty access to the new external review letters and ask whether

they would change anyone's vote from "yes" to "no." If one person says their vote would change, the eligible faculty will meet again to discuss and take a new vote on the tenure case; a two-thirds majority of "yes" votes is required for the tenure decision to move forward. Once the expedited tenure process is completed, the Chair will secure the approval of the Executive Dean, and then extend the formal offer. All offers at the Associate Professor and Professor ranks, with or without tenure, and all offers of prior service credit require the prior approval of OAA. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

2. Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments, Regional Campuses

For a tenure-track position on a regional campus, the regional campus Dean/Director has primary responsibility for determining the need for a position and the position description but should consult with and seek agreement with the Department Chair. The Chair of the Department and the regional campus Dean/Director will agree on a single search committee for the position consisting of members of both units. Candidates should, at the minimum, be interviewed by the regional campus Dean/Director, the Department Chair, the search committee, and representatives of both faculties. Candidates will be evaluated on both campuses, with the faculty on the Columbus campus (particularly those in the field) serving in an advisory role to the hiring campus. A decision to hire requires agreement on the part of the Department Chair and of the regional campus Dean/Director. Negotiations with a candidate should not begin without such agreement, and a letter of offer must be signed by the Department Chair and the Dean/Director of the regional campus.

3. Associated Faculty Appointments, Columbus Campus

Appointments to the positions of Visiting Assistant Professor and Senior Lecturer will be made after a review of candidates by a hiring committee (with both the Department Chair and the Vice Chair for Rhetoric, Composition, and Literacy as two of the members), appropriate interviews (typically including one on campus), and a vote of the hiring committee.

Appointments to the positions of Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor, or Lecturer, as well as faculty with Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor titles hired

at <50% FTE (and therefore not tenure-eligible) will be made at the discretion of the Department Chair, after consultation with the Executive Committee.

Columbus Campus Associated Faculty appointed as Lecturers in English generally teach less than a 75% FTE load; Senior Lecturers generally teach 75% FTE or more, and are therefore benefits-eligible. However, Senior Lecturers who wish to teach less than a 75% load may opt to do so. Associated Faculty are not eligible for tenure.

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

Associated faculty for whom promotion is a possibility must follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for tenure-track faculty (see Criteria for Hiring Associated Faculty 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 university level if the Dean's recommendation is negative.

4. Associated Faculty Appointments, Regional Campuses

Associated faculty on regional campuses are hired by the English Coordinator and Dean/Director of the particular campus.

5. Courtesy Appointments

Courtesy appointments will be made at the discretion of the Department Chair, after consultation with the Executive Committee.

V. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES

A. Annual Review of Tenure-track Faculty

The Department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the Faculty Annual Review Policy (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>).

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 consists of the Annual Activity Report (see Appendix A) and an updated dossier. Assistant Professors must also submit a sample of work in progress, and Associate Professors have the option to do so, if they would like feedback from their Professor review partners or the Chair. See A.1 for more details about materials required of Assistant Professors. This material must be submitted to the Department Chair no later than January 15 of the year following the calendar year under review.

The Department Chair is required (per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35 [<http://trustees.osu.edu>]) to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04 [<http://trustees.osu.edu>]) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

1. Probationary Faculty Annual Reviews, Columbus Campus

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

Annual reviews of probationary faculty are conducted during the Spring semester. The Assistant Professor submits to the Department Chair an Annual Activity Report; a report of activities in the format of the OAA dossier outline; discursive student evaluations of **teaching** and syllabi for the past year; a selection of **scholarship** in progress or completed; and any relevant evidence concerning **service**. The Department Chair may also solicit such other information and consult with colleagues as necessary to ensure a fair and thorough review. The Department Chair appoints a tenured faculty member in the Assistant Professor's field or a related field to serve with the Department Chair, Vice-Chair, and the P&T Chair on the Assistant Professor's annual review team. The four members of the team review the material and meet with the Assistant Professor to discuss strengths and weaknesses of the performance, to offer advice about preparing for the fourth-year and sixth-year reviews, and to respond to any concerns the Assistant Professor might wish to raise. The Vice Chair produces a summary of the discussion of the meeting to be included in the Assistant Professor's annual review letter; copies of the annual review letter also go to each member of the team and to the Executive Dean. The Assistant Professor may respond in writing. The Department Chair's annual review letters (and any responses

from the candidate, if the candidate so chooses) become part of the faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure. The annual review letter must inform the faculty member of the right to review his or her personnel file.

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

2. Probationary Faculty Annual Reviews, Regional Campuses

Probationary faculty on regional campuses will also be reviewed annually by the regional campus Dean/Director and by the Department Chair on the Columbus campus. The regional campus review, which focuses mainly on teaching and service, takes place first. The Dean/Director's report of that review and a copy of the faculty member's annual report will be forwarded to the Department Chair with a copy to the Executive Dean of the College. The Department review will focus on the candidate's scholarly work but will consider all aspects of his/her record. Annually, the Regional Campus Director/Dean and the Department Chair meet to review faculty and to recommend a rating for each faculty member. Following that meeting, the Department Chair must provide a written review to the faculty member and a copy to the Dean/Director.

Throughout the career of regional campus faculty, It is important that the Department Chair and the regional campus Dean/Director be alert to any developing discrepancy between the quality of the teaching and service on the one hand and the quality and quantity of the scholarly work on the other. 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.

In the event that the regional campus Dean/Director recommends renewal and the Department Chair recommends nonrenewal, the case shall be reviewed by the Executive Dean of the College. The disagreement shall be considered during that review, with the Executive Dean of the College's judgment prevailing. If the Dean/Director recommends nonrenewal, and the Department Chair recommends renewal, the case will be reviewed by the Executive Dean of the College. All nonrenewals must proceed with a review using the Fourth-Year review process. The Executive Deans of the College's decision is final.

3. Probationary Faculty Fourth-Year Reviews, All Campuses

The purpose of the fourth-year review is to determine whether, in the view of the senior faculty, an Assistant Professor is making satisfactory progress toward establishing a record of **teaching, scholarship, and service** that is likely to meet the Department's expectations in time for the sixth-year promotion and tenure review.

Procedures for the fourth-year review are the same as those for the sixth-year review except that the Department typically does not solicit external letters of evaluation. This includes submitting all parts of the dossier outline as listed in section 4.1 of Volume III of the OAA Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/policies-procedures-handbook/3HBPT.pdf>) with the exception of external letters of evaluation.

In assessing whether or not a colleague at fourth year is making satisfactory progress in **teaching**, the eligible faculty will consider all of the information in the dossier, including peer observations, summaries of discursive evaluations, SEI reports, and annual review letters. In assessing satisfactory progress in **scholarship**, the senior faculty will use measures appropriate to the candidate's field as defined in section VII.A.1 below. The Department's expectations with regard to **scholarship** should be established early and reiterated both verbally in the annual review meetings and in writing in the Department Chair's letters that result from those meetings. In assessing the satisfactoriness of a candidate's **service** by fourth year, senior faculty will consider the record of annual review letters and other relevant evidence, such as feedback from the chairs of committees on which the candidate has served.

Before or at the mid-point of Spring semester of the fourth year of service as a member of the tenure-track faculty, the candidate submits to the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee all relevant evidence concerning **teaching, scholarship, and service**. For each candidate the committee assembles and distributes to the eligible faculty materials that include: (a) the OAA-designed dossier for reporting **teaching, scholarship, and service** activities; (b) the candidate's cumulative SEI report and summaries of student evaluations of **teaching**, made by the committee and approved (or else rebutted in writing) by the candidate; (c) reports of classroom visitation by senior colleagues; (d) evaluations by senior colleagues of the candidate's scholarly writing (if available), and (e) the candidate's annual review letters. The Department Chair may also solicit such other information and consult with colleagues as necessary to ensure a fair and thorough review. Such information will be included in the dossier that goes forward to the college for review.

The Department Chair, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the candidate should pay careful attention to the guidelines and materials—and the format of their presentation—specified by the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs. The P&T Chair and the Procedures Oversight Designee

will be responsible for verifying the accuracy of the candidates' citations and other aspects of the candidates' dossiers. The Procedures Oversight Designee will also check the dossiers to ensure the appropriateness of their contents.

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

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

If all annual review decisions in the first five years are positive, the Department's Committee of Eligible Faculty meets to make a recommendation about promotion and tenure in the autumn of the sixth year. The Committee of Eligible faculty sends the recommendation to the Chair, who forwards it to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. From there it is sent to the Executive Dean, then to the Executive Vice President and Provost, and, finally, for positive decisions, to the Board of Trustees. If the ultimate decision about the case is negative, the seventh year is a terminal appointment. If the ultimate decision about the case is positive, the promotion and tenure takes effect the day the Board of Trustees approves the decision.

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

B. Tenured Faculty Annual Reviews, Columbus Campus

All tenured faculty receive an annual evaluation of their performances. For the Associate Professors, the Department Chair consults with the Professors, who help with the process. During early Spring semester, the Chair, consults with the faculty at the Associate Professor and Professor ranks to arrange review partners, ensuring that the workload is distributed as fairly as possible and that, ideally, the same person is not reviewing the same colleague repeatedly. The Department Chair is responsible for conducting annual review of Professors.

All Associate Professors and Professors receive an annual review letter based on their Annual Activity Report. The annual review letter is separate from the salary letter. The purpose of the annual review letter is:

- to aid individual faculty in their on-going self-assessments of their **teaching, scholarship, and service**;
- to foster greater knowledge of each other's work and the opportunity for regular, serious discussion of it; and
- to provide fuller information to the Department Chair and the salary committees for their deliberations about merit raises.

For Associate Professors, the letter becomes part of their official Promotion and Tenure file. By OAA policy, a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face conference with the Department Chair or Designee must be extended to every faculty member. Any faculty member at the Associate Professor or Professor rank who wants a more extensive annual review may request one. Such reviews typically require the assessment of additional materials.

C. Tenured Faculty Annual Reviews, Regional Campuses

Tenured regional campus faculty are reviewed annually following the same procedures used for Columbus tenured faculty. The one difference is that they will also receive a performance review of **teaching** and **service** by their regional campus Dean/Director, as set forth in the Policy on Faculty Annual Reviews in the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook. The regional campus Dean/Director will send that letter to the Department Chair so that the regional campus assessment of **teaching** and **service** might be referenced in the Chair's letter and placed in the faculty member's personnel file. The Department will have primary responsibility for evaluating a faculty member's **scholarship**. In the case of a 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. In addition, the faculty member, the Dean/Director, or the Department Chair may request a meeting to discuss the review or any other concerns.

D. Associated Faculty Annual Reviews and Reappointments, Columbus Campus

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

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

The Department Chair strives to confirm Associated Faculty reappointments as soon as possible during the academic year; however, reappointment letters cannot be released until the Divisional budget has been confirmed, usually during the summer preceding the academic year of the reappointment.

E. Associated Faculty Annual Reviews, Regional Campuses

Procedures for performing annual reviews for Associated Faculty on regional campuses are determined by the Deans/Directors of the specific campuses.

VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS

A. Criteria for Merit Salary Increases, All Campuses

Except when the University dictates any type of across the board salary increase, all funds for annual salary increases for tenured and tenure-track faculty 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 on the basis of the Annual Activity Report and the updated c.v. (See Appendix A for the Annual Activity Report Template.) The time frame for assessing performance will be the twelve months of the previous calendar year, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity. Publications will be counted in the year in which they appear in print (or other suitable medium). Faculty with high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty 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 by the stated deadline 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 for Merit Salary Increase Recommendations, Columbus Campus

The Department Chair annually presents to the Executive Dean recommendations about merit salary increases. In preparing those recommendations, the Department Chair seeks the advice of the Associate Professors and Professors through the establishment of a Committee on Merit Salary Increases. This Salary Committee consists of the Department Chair and the elected Professors and Associate Professors on the Executive Committee. These five persons are charged to look at merit and equity issues, on an annual and career basis. Any faculty member is entitled to confer on an individual basis with the Department Chair on excellence and equity issues.

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

Since final favorable action upon the Department Chair's recommendations for promotion or merit salary increases is determined by a number of factors—the sufficiency of legislative appropriations, the budgets of the College and the Division, the approval of the Executive Dean and the Executive Vice President and Provost—Department members should realize that the Department Chair's recommendation sets in motion administrative procedures over which the Department has no direct control. The College and

Divisional Deans may, for example, make changes to the Department Chair's recommendations for salary equity.

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.

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

C. Procedures for Merit Salary Increase Recommendations, Regional Campuses

Each of the regional campuses has separate funding for compensating faculty. Regional campus Deans/Directors have responsibility for recommending to the Executive Vice President and Provost increases for regional campus faculty. Each Dean/Director will consult with the Department Chair before making these recommendations.

VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEWS

A. Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) (trustees.osu.edu) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure-track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period.

An exclusionary year for care-giving responsibilities associated with the birth or adoption of a child under age six is automatic once the Department and the College notify OAA using the Notification of a Birth or Adoption Form. If the exclusionary year is not desired, the form does not need to be submitted.

A probationary faculty member may also apply to exclude time from the probationary period in increments of one year because of personal illness, care of a seriously ill or injured person, an unpaid leave of absence, or factors beyond the faculty member's control that hinder professional performance. Requests for such an exclusion must be made to the Department Chair, who shall ask the Promotion and Tenure Committee to vote upon these requests. Such requests require approval by the Department Chair, Executive Dean, and Executive Vice President and Provost. A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any of these reasons must be made prior to April 1 of the calendar year in which the mandatory review for tenure must occur. The extent to which the event leading to the request was beyond the faculty member's

control, the extent to which it interfered with the faculty member's ability to be productive, and the faculty member's accomplishments up to the time of the request will be considered in the review of the request.

A request to exclude time from the probationary period will not be granted after a nonrenewal notice has been issued nor will previously approved requests to exclude time from the probationary period in any way limit the University's right not to renew a probationary appointment. The maximum number of years that may be excluded from a probationary period is three.

Expectations for productivity during the probationary period cannot be increased as a consequence of exclusions of time granted for any of the above reasons.

Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook) (<https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook>).

B. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

Promotion and tenure in the Department of English shall be administered in accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-6-02 \(D\)](#) and other University and College guidelines. Copies of these documents shall be made available to every new or continuing tenure-track faculty member (of the level of Instructor or above), together with such additions, amendments, and/or revisions as might subsequently be issued.

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

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

1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, Columbus Campus

Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in the Department of English requires excellence in both **scholarship** and **teaching**, where **scholarship** is defined as activity pertaining to “discovery, scholarly and creative work, applied research, and the scholarship of pedagogy” (University Rule [3335-6-02](#)). Demonstration of commitment to and effectiveness in **service** is required, and the promise of excellence in **service** is expected. Specific criteria are outlined below.

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:

<http://www.aaup.org/report/statement-professional-ethics>.

- Teaching

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

Evidence of **teaching** effectiveness should ordinarily consist of: (a) student evaluations (in the form of summarized discursive evaluations) from a variety of classes, at different levels of the curriculum where appropriate; and (b) written reports of classroom visitation by senior colleagues, including assessments of syllabi and other course materials. The Department requires 5 peer reviews of teaching to be included in the dossier for the tenure/promotion to Associate Professor vote.

- Scholarship

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

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

No single quantitative standard for **scholarship** will suffice for a Department as large and diverse as English. We therefore accept that different subfields should establish clear expectations and specify (through the annual review process and, when appropriate, through a memorandum of understanding) what form(s) and quantity of evidence are appropriate for a candidate in a given area. For many subfields in English, the principal evidence of scholarly achievement remains a book, singly or collaboratively authored, published by a press with a strong reputation or an emerging series in the candidate's field. If the book is not yet published by the time of the Department's formal vote in the Fall, the manuscript should be under final contract. (Here and afterwards, having a "final contract," as opposed to an advance contract, means that the work has received final board approval from the press and that the author has completed revisions in response to all levels of review at the press.) For candidates who have been hired to teach in the Creative Writing MFA Program, the principal evidence of scholarly contribution will typically take the form of two published books (one published before or under contract at the time of hire), or of a published book and a second book under final contract by the time of the tenure vote. For any candidate who works in a subfield of English Studies where a monograph is not necessarily the norm for tenure and first promotion (e.g., Linguistics; Folklore; Digital Media Studies; Rhetoric, Composition and Literacy) , the Department will establish standards of evidence for **scholarship** appropriate to his/her field. In such cases, the Department Chair and the P&T Chair will work together with the candidate and his/her senior area-colleagues to determine suitable, field-specific guidelines, which will then be documented in the candidate's annual review letters and, if appropriate, in a memorandum of understanding.

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

- Service

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

2. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, Regional Campuses

- Teaching

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

- Scholarship

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

- Service

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

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

3. Promotion to Professor, All Campuses

In cases for promotion to the rank of Professor, the same general definitions of excellence in **teaching**, **scholarship**, and **service**, and the same principles for assessing the record in those areas, will be applied as for cases of promotion to Associate Professor with tenure (see VII.B.1, above). The following paragraphs are supplemental to those guidelines.

As a rule, candidates for promotion to Professor in the Department of English will have built a record of significant accomplishments beyond those required for promotion to Associate Professor. The record should also demonstrate a probability that a candidate's high rate of quality **scholarship** and/or excellence in **teaching** and **service** will continue. External hires at the Professor level with tenure should demonstrate accomplishments in **scholarship**, **teaching**, and **service** comparable to those of persons promoted within the university.

While acknowledging that a typical case for promotion to Professor will emphasize a candidate's scholarly or creative achievements, especially as measured through publication and/or (inter)national reputation, the College of Arts and Sciences also recognizes that, "[w]here a candidate has made truly extraordinary contributions in the areas of **teaching** or **service**, that record may warrant promotion in combination with a less extensive, though excellent record of continued productivity in **scholarship**." In screening candidates for promotion, the Department of English honors this principle of exception as described in the College's APT document, with an understanding that such contributions—whether within or beyond the university—must be documentable in ways that can be reviewed by external evaluators as well as by the eligible faculty.

These general criteria for promotion to Professor apply to Columbus and Regional Campus faculty alike. However, the heavier course load and scarcity of Faculty Professional Leave opportunities at regional campuses will be taken into consideration in evaluation of the quantity, though not the quality, of a regional faculty member's case for promotion.

- Teaching:

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

promotion or the immediate past five years (whichever is shorter). Candidates who have had the opportunity to teach at the graduate level within the five-year window prior to promotion should have at least one peer evaluation of their graduate **teaching**.

- Scholarship:

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

In many instances, the centerpiece of a candidate's post-tenure **scholarly** record will take the form of an additional published book or a set of **scholarly or creative** projects, comparable in their collective substance and impact to a major, book-length work. Such projects may be singly or collaboratively authored and disseminated in peer-reviewed venues or other media as appropriate to the candidate's specialty. In some subfields of English studies, including Folklore, Linguistics, and Rhetoric, Composition, & Literacy, the centerpiece of the case is commonly a set of projects, typically a collection of strong articles and/or book chapters, individually or collaboratively authored.

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

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

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

- the development of pedagogical resources or learning tools (print or digital);
- the direction of institutes that have documentable impact on teaching and/or **scholarship** in a given field, and which may have been supported by competitive external grants;
- the creation of major new **scholarly** tools (print or digital);
- the performance of extra-departmental administrative roles that relate directly to a candidate's field of **scholarly** expertise and produce new knowledge or other kinds of impact that can be assessed by peer review.

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

All associate professors are encouraged to take advantage of the annual review process as an opportunity to discuss with the annual review partner and the Department Chair the Department's expectations regarding appropriate measures of quality, quantity, and impact in particular fields. When an associate professor requests a face-to-face annual review meeting with the Chair, the annual review letter will provide a written record of the Chair's advice.

- Service:

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

C. General Procedures for Promotion and Tenure Reviews

As noted above, annual reviews of untenured faculty (including those on regional campuses) are the responsibility of the Chair of the Department.

For fourth-year reviews, sixth-year reviews, and reviews regarding promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, the P&T Chair notifies candidates of deadlines, contacts external reviewers, ensures the timely

distribution of all materials to the eligible faculty, and otherwise oversees the process of the review. The formal recommendations in each case are reached by vote of the relevant body of eligible faculty at a meeting or meetings scheduled by the P&T Chair early enough to meet subsequent deadlines set by the College of Arts and Sciences.

The longstanding tradition of the Department of English is that the Department Chair facilitates the meetings in which faculty discuss and vote on cases for fourth-year, sixth-year, and promotion review. Because the Department Chair writes and submits to the College an independent evaluation of the case and does not vote with the rest of the body, however, the Department Chair's participation in these meetings remains as neutral as possible. The Department Chair will follow normal Rules of Order, refraining from calling twice on any speaker before all who wish to speak have been recognized, except when speakers are responding to questions directed to themselves from the floor. The Department Chair will not make evaluative comments on cases under discussion, although s/he may respond to requests from the floor for factual information.

If the Department Chair decides for any reason to recuse him/herself from the duties of running all or part of a P&T meeting, s/he retains the right to be present in order to hear the full discussion. If the Department Chair is recused from running all or part of a P&T meeting, his/her duties in that respect will fall to the P&T Chair.

For fourth-year reviews, sixth-year reviews, and reviews for promotion to Professor, the voting procedure is as follows: after all candidates have been discussed, a straw vote is taken on those candidates by secret ballot; the results are announced to the meeting, and those results determine the order of final discussion. The candidate with the highest total of "yes" votes in the straw vote will be considered first. Each consideration will begin with the introduction of a formal motion that the candidate pass the review. Once the formal motion has been made, discussion of the case is resumed. At the conclusion of the discussion of each case, a separate final vote by secret ballot will be conducted for each candidate. A two-thirds majority is required for an affirmative recommendation. Proxy votes are not allowed, but those who have participated in the meeting via Skype or the equivalent may vote.

For reviews of candidates for tenured Associate Professor or Professor positions: the same procedures apply, except that the straw vote may be omitted if any member of the eligible faculty proposes going straight to the final vote and everyone present agrees.

The P&T Chair, acting for the committee of the whole, submits a letter reporting on each candidate to the Department Chair indicating the eligible faculty's vote and recommendation, and an explanation of that recommendation, including a summary of the discussion among those participating in the review meeting. That letter is included in the dossier forwarded to the Executive Dean.

The Department Chair also writes a separate letter expressing the Chair's own recommendation and assessment of the case to be included in the dossier sent to the Executive Dean. The purpose of this letter is to present an assessment from the Department Chair's perspective of the candidate's work in the areas of **teaching, scholarship, and service**. While the Department Chair's letter should not comment on evidence in the case not available to the eligible faculty, the letter may discuss at greater length items of which the Department Chair, by virtue of his/her position, has special knowledge. The Department Chair's letter will also comment on the relevant contextual features of the case such as the disciplinary standing of the external evaluators.

After the Chair and the P&T Chair have forwarded their completed letters to the candidates, they will meet with each candidate to address questions about the letters and about the subsequent process. Candidates may submit comments on the letters up to ten calendar days after receiving them. If a candidate provides comments, the Committee of Eligible Faculty and the Chair separately review the comments and determine if the vote changes for the Committee or the Chair's decision and provide any response deemed needed to the comments.

If the Department Chair's individual view of a candidate's merit may lead to a recommendation different from that of the relevant body of eligible faculty, the Department Chair will communicate in writing to that body the reasons for that recommendation.

1. Promotion Review Procedures for Associate Professor with Tenure, Columbus Campus

The procedure is identical to that followed for fourth-year review (see above) with one exception: the Committee on Promotion and Tenure solicits evaluations of the candidate's **scholarship** from scholars outside the University as well as colleagues within the Department.

2. Promotion Review Procedures for Associate Professor with Tenure, Regional Campuses

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

The Dean/Director will initiate a review by the regional campus faculty according to the procedures established on the campus. This review focuses mainly on **teaching and service**. The Dean/Director forwards the report of this review, and a recommendation to the Department Chair, for inclusion in the candidate's

dossier and for the use of the Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee. From this point, the review follows the same course as all promotion and tenure reviews.

3. External Evaluations for Promotion and Tenure Reviews

A minimum of five credible and useful external evaluations of **scholarship** is required for all P&T as well as all promotion reviews. To ensure that this minimum is met, the Department generally lines up six evaluators for each candidate.

A credible and useful evaluation:

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's **scholarship** (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, former academic advisor, or postdoctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. The Department will obtain evaluations, whenever possible, from scholars who hold the rank of Professor 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.

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

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

If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor the Department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

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

The Department will follow the College of Arts and Sciences' suggested format, provided at <https://intranet.asc.ohio-state.edu/apt/external-eval-materials>, for letters requesting external evaluations.

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

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

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

4. Non-Mandatory Reviews for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

The eligible faculty meet during Spring semester or after a positive fourth-year review to decide whether to approve requests from Assistant Professors to undergo a non-mandatory review for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure in the Fall of that calendar year. The screening of candidates who have just

undergone fourth-year review will be based on the materials submitted for that review. The screening of all other candidates (i.e. those who have not yet passed a fourth-year review) will be based on the following materials submitted for the eligible senior faculty to review: (1) the candidate's current core dossier, including complete narrative sections on **teaching, scholarship and service**, plus a cumulative SEI report; (2) a current C.V.; (3) copies of all previous annual review letters and peer **teaching** observations; and (4) documentation confirming the publication schedule of any book(s) or comparable major project(s) that will be central to the promotion and tenure case. The documentation mentioned under item (4) should include, in the case of books, a final board-approved contract (see VII.B.1, above), or compelling evidence that such a contract will be in hand by the time the eligible faculty votes in the fall. In the case of articles or other works, the documentation required under item (4) may include letters of acceptance or other formal agreements to publish the work(s) in question.

Except in the cases of those who have just gone through fourth-year review, this screening meeting for candidates seeking non-mandatory P&T review should typically occur within the first six weeks of spring semester, and all the relevant materials for review should be available at least one week prior to the date of the screening meeting.

A two-thirds majority of the eligible faculty is required for a promotion and tenure review to be conducted the following year, and the vote on this is to be conducted by secret ballot. If the decision is to move forward with the non-mandatory review, the Department Chair and the P&T Chair begin the same process as that followed for a mandatory sixth-year review. A decision to permit a review to take place in no way commits the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department Chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the promotion and tenure review itself. Nor does a decision to permit a non-mandatory review obligate the candidate to go through with the review should he or she choose, on the basis of feedback from the screening meeting or other factors, to wait until the completion of the full probationary period before undergoing a mandatory sixth-year review. If the recommendation of the eligible faculty at the Spring semester or fourth-year review meeting is negative, the matter is considered closed for that year.

5. Stopping the Promotion and Tenure Review

Only the candidate may stop any review for promotion and tenure once external letters of evaluation have been sought. The candidate may withdraw from review at any stage of the process by so informing the Department Chair in writing. If the review process has moved beyond the Department, the Department Chair shall inform the Executive Dean or the Executive Vice President and Provost, as relevant, of the candidate's

withdrawal. Withdrawal from the mandatory tenure review during the final probationary year means that tenure shall not be granted.

6. Promotion to Professor, All Campuses.

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

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

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

This screening meeting should typically occur within the first six weeks of spring semester, and all the relevant materials for review should be available at least one week prior to the date of the screening meeting. At the screening meeting, a two-thirds majority, voting by secret ballot, is required to approve a request that a promotion review be conducted in the following autumn.

If the decision is to consider promotion, the Department Chair and the P&T Chair begin the same process as that followed for a sixth-year review: they assemble and distribute complete dossiers on each

candidate, including documentation about **teaching**, published reviews of **scholarship**, and at least five, though preferably six, written evaluations by scholars at other universities. At a meeting during Autumn semester, the Professors decide whether to recommend promotion. A two-thirds majority of those voting by secret ballot is required for an affirmative recommendation. Proxy votes are not honored, but those who have participated in the meeting via Skype or the equivalent may vote.

If the recommendation of the Professors at the Spring semester meeting is negative, the matter is considered closed for that year. However, the Professors may delay for only one year the request of an Associate Professor to be considered for promotion to Professor. Any subsequent request by the Associate Professor will automatically result in a full review.

7. Comments Process

As soon as the letters from the P&T Chair and the Department Chair to the Executive Dean have been completed, the candidate is given copies. The candidate may provide the Department Chair with written comments on these letters for inclusion in the dossier within ten calendar days of receiving the letters. The Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Department Chair may, in turn, provide written responses to the candidate's comments for inclusion in the dossier. Only one iteration of comments on the Departmental review is permitted.

8. Procedures Oversight Designees (PODs)

When the Promotion and Tenure Committee is appointed, two members must be selected as the Procedures Oversight Designee (one POD, the “junior POD,” is assigned for Assistant Professors coming up for promotion to Associate and another, the “senior POD” for Associate Professors coming up for promotion to Professor). This member will work to ensure that the review body at each level follows written procedures governing the reviews, that the proceedings are carried out in an ethical, professional manner, and, in particular, that the proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions about members of underrepresented groups that could bias the review. Any procedural difficulties or other concerns about the review should first be brought to the attention of the relevant review body. If they cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of the POD, then they should be brought in writing to the attention of the relevant administrator (Department Chair, Executive Dean, or Executive Vice President and Provost, depending on the level of the review). That individual must look into the matter and provide a written response to the POD regarding either actions taken, or why action is judged not to be warranted.

D. Documentation for Promotion and Tenure Reviews

Every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. While the Promotion and Tenure Committee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by the candidate, including the Core Dossier (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/CoreDossier.pdf>).

Candidates must also submit a copy of the Department's APT document that was in effect at the time of their hire or last promotion, if they wish to be reviewed under that document's criteria and procedures. This must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the Department.

The Department is responsible for summarizing discursive teaching evaluations, collecting peer evaluations of **teaching**, and acquiring the external assessments of the **scholarship**.

The complete dossier, including the documentation of **teaching**, is forwarded when the review moves beyond the Department. The documentation of **scholarship** and **service** is for use during the Department review only, unless reviewers at the College and University levels specifically request to see 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 typescript does not document publication.

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

1. Documentation of Teaching

The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, to the present. Required documentation includes but is not limited to:

- Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught.
- Individual SEI reports for every class taught.
- Copies of student discursive evaluations collected for every class taught during the time period of the review.
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the Department's peer evaluation of teaching program (see Section X). These evaluations should cover classes at different levels of the curriculum (lower-division undergraduate, upper-division undergraduate, and, if applicable, graduate courses).

- For probationary faculty, the number is five conducted since the time of hire (probationary faculty do not have to be observed in their first year of teaching, but they should have at least four peer evaluations by the time of fourth-year review).
- For tenured faculty, the number is three conducted in the past five years.
- A copy of the syllabus for every class taught during the time period of the review.
- Teaching activities as listed in the core dossier such as:
 - involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research;
 - mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers;
 - extension and continuing education instruction;
 - involvement in curriculum development;
 - awards and formal recognition of teaching;
 - presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences;
 - adoption of teaching materials at other colleges or universities;
 - any other relevant documentation of teaching quality.

2. Documentation of Scholarship

Recognizing that scholarship is a process of growth, candidates may include materials in this section from throughout their career. The primary time period for review 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. Required documentation includes but is not limited to:

- copies of books (monographs, edited collections, and/or textbooks) published or under final board-approved contract for publication
- copies of articles, chapters, short fiction, poems, short nonfiction, and other creative or scholarly papers published or accepted for publication
- Copies of contracts and reports by readers for **scholarship** as yet unpublished but under contract. Where relevant, the candidate's response to the readers' reports should also be included. Articles, book chapters, and other scholarly or creative work that have been accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter or email from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed.
- A current c.v.
- Any published reviews of the candidate's work.
- **Scholarship** activities as listed in the core dossier including but not limited to:

- documentation of other creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus including screenplays, artwork, choreography, collections, compositions, curated exhibits, moving images, multimedia, performances, radio, recitals, recordings, television, and websites;
- quality indicators, such as books or articles where the candidate's work is cited;
- documentation of grants and contracts received; and
- a list of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work.

Candidates coming up for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are strongly advised to have their book manuscripts, where relevant, published or at least to have completed revisions required at all levels of review at the press by the time **scholarship** materials are sent out to external reviewers (typically early June). In the exceptional case where the candidate is making changes to the manuscript after it is sent out to external reviewers, he or she must provide the eligible faculty with the most up-to-date version at least two weeks before the P&T review. However, in such a case, both versions of the manuscript will be made available to the eligible faculty along with the candidate's outline of the differences between the versions. The candidate should also clearly mark changes in the revised manuscript to make it easier for eligible faculty to discern and evaluate the differences.

3. Documentation of Service

The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the date of hire to the present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to the present. Examples of documentation include but is not limited to:

- **Service** activities as listed in the core dossier such as:
 - administrative and committee assignments in the Department;
 - administrative and committee assignments in the College, the University, and/or Student Life;
 - advising to student groups and organizations;
 - awards and prizes for service to profession, University, or Department;
 - involvement with professional journals and professional societies;
 - consultation activity with industry, education, or government.
- Any available documentation (e.g. letters from committee chairs) of the quality of service that enhances the list in the dossier. Such materials should not be solicited by the candidate; rather, the P&T Chair will request them when appropriate.

VIII. APPEALS OF NEGATIVE DECISIONS

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>).

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 REVIEW FOR NEGATIVE DECISIONS

In rare instances, when new evidence emerges, the Department may petition the Executive Dean to conduct a seventh-year review for a candidate who has been denied promotion and tenure, as set forth in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 \(B\)](#). As noted above, the Department understands new evidence to relate to the materials used in the P&T review, not new writing or materials collected or produced since the decision was made. A seventh-year review must be approved before the end of the sixth academic year; both the Department Chair and the eligible faculty must approve proceeding with the petition to the Executive Dean. A seventh-year review follows the same procedures as a sixth-year review; it does not presume a positive outcome. 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 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 DOCUMENTING STUDENT AND PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

All members of the Department must allow students to evaluate their courses. University rules stipulate that all courses should be evaluated by students, and the college requires that the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) form or an equivalent end-of-course teaching assessment survey/tool be

offered in every course offered in the departments and schools within the College of Arts and Sciences. For purposes of promotion and tenure decisions, Assistant Professors and Associate Professors are required to submit SEIs to satisfy the college policy; however, the Department gives more weight to other evaluative sources (such as discursive evaluations and peer observations) in reviewing an instructor's **teaching**. (See Appendix C.) All teachers in the Department are required to collect discursive commentary through the use of evaluation forms, created by the instructor and distributed in class, that solicit information about both the quality of the course's content and the quality of the instructor's performance. Annual review discussions will address the appropriateness and effectiveness of the candidate's discursive evaluation form.

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

- the instructor should not be in the room when the evaluations are filled out.
- the evaluations should be collected by someone other than the instructor (it may be one of the students or a TA), who should then place them in a sealed envelope labeled with the course number and the instructor's name and bring them to the English Department office, Denney 421.
- the instructor should not pick up and read the evaluations until after the final grades are posted to the Registrar.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

By the time of the fourth-year review, the Department requires four peer evaluations of **teaching**, and by the time of the sixth-year review, the Department requires a minimum total of five such evaluations. The first peer evaluation must be done no later than a candidate's second year. All faculty at the Associate and Professor rank are expected to do such evaluations, and the P&T Chair assists in these arrangements. Candidates' **teaching** at different levels of the curriculum should be evaluated.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor should have a minimum of three peer reviews covering the five years preceding the promotion case. All Professors are eligible and expected to do these evaluations. Candidates' **teaching** at different levels of the curriculum should be evaluated, and (except for regional campus faculty) at least one graduate course should be evaluated, if taught.

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

The following guidelines are intended to assist peer evaluators in writing evaluative reports that will be useful to those who will review the candidate's P&T case as well as to the candidate:

- Before attending the class, the peer evaluator should be given a copy of the syllabus and any relevant materials for the day of the visit, such as assignments, examinations, study guides, and handouts. If there are relevant materials posted on Carmen or pre-class discussions taking place there, the instructor should provide the peer evaluator with access to the Carmen site.
- As part of the peer evaluation report, the evaluator should describe the syllabus, including objectives, schedule, assignments, method/s of assessment, classroom policies and rules. The evaluator should also identify any stand-out strengths or potential weaknesses of the syllabus.
- The peer evaluation report should note the number of students in the class, the number who attended on the day (or days) of the visit, and, if relevant (i.e., in a discussion class), how many students contributed to class discussion. Other details—such as the room layout or student composition (e.g., an interdisciplinary class vs. a class of all or mostly English majors)—that may assist in explaining the effectiveness of the class should also be included in the report.
- The peer report should consist of an evaluative account of what the person observed. This will include a descriptive overview of how the class was structured and how each part unfolded over the allotted time. But the evaluator should also assess the success of the approach and might also cover topics such as the instructor’s effectiveness as a lecturer and/or as a moderator of class discussion, the clarity of the class objectives for the day, how well the instructor meets the aims of the course as outlined in the syllabus, the instructor’s command of the material and knowledge of the subject matter, and the instructor’s engagement with the students and helpfulness in answering questions.
- After the class, the peer evaluator should discuss his/her observations with the faculty member, and an account of this discussion may become part of the report.
- The peer evaluator may share his or her report with the faculty member before submitting a signed copy to the Department Chair or P&T Chair for inclusion in the faculty member’s personnel file. The purpose of such sharing is to give the instructor a chance to point out any (and only) factual errors. Having a report in hand can also assist the faculty member in promptly acting on recommendations that will improve his or her **teaching**. Faculty members are allowed to view the peer evaluations in their personnel file at any time.

Informal peer reviews—ones that do not generate an official report for a faculty member’s file, but do elicit a conversation about that faculty member’s **teaching** with a senior faculty observer—are also encouraged. Faculty seeking formative reviews should review the information available through the University Institute for Teaching and Learning.

APPENDIX A:

Template for Annual Activity Report (English)

REVISED, DECEMBER, 2017

Directions: Please fill in this form for the calendar year (January-January) and ERASE any categories for which you have nothing to report.

Teaching

- (1) Awards and Formal Recognition for Teaching
- (2) Undergraduate and Graduate courses taught
 - (a) List each course taught in this calendar year by semester, course number, title, and enrollment. Indicate whether the course was team-taught, and whether evaluations (Student Evaluations of Instruction, discursives, peer observation) were completed.
 - (b) OPTIONAL: Write a statement (100-200 words) commenting in general on your discursive evaluations, identifying strengths and areas for growth. The English Department does not use SEI scores in determining salary raises. If you are an Assistant or Associate Professor, please flag and explain any concerns about cumulative SEI scores that fall below the group mean. The Department Chair and the Promotion and Tenure Chair will work with you to improve below-average SEIs, as they may negatively impact your case for promotion at the College level.
- (3) Graduate Advising
 - (a) Give names of students with whom you have worked in each capacity, and mark with an asterisk those who completed degrees in this calendar year:
 1. Doctoral Students (dissertation advisor)
 2. Doctoral Students (dissertation committee member)
 3. Doctoral Students (candidacy examination chair)

4. Doctoral Students (candidacy examination committee member)
5. Master's Students (advising committee chair)
6. Master's Students (advising committee member)
7. Outside Reader on Dissertations in other units

(b) Mentoring of Postdoctoral Scholars and Researchers

(4) Undergraduate Advising

(a) Undergraduate Honors Theses

1. Undergrads whose theses you directed (give names)
2. Undergrads on whose thesis committee(s) you served (give names)
3. Undergraduate Research Supervised (give names)

(c) Curriculum Development (describe new course proposals, textbook affordability projects, and/or innovative methods developed)

(d) Other Academic Advising

Research (Please give full bibliographic information, including co-authors where relevant)

(1) Awards and Formal Recognition for research, scholarly or creative work:

(2) Scholarly and Creative Work:

- a. Monographs published this year
- b. Edited collections published this year
- c. Scholarly Editions published this year
- d. Articles in Peer-Reviewed Journals
- e. Articles in Editor-Reviewed journals
- f. Essays or Chapters in Edited Collections (indicate whether peer-reviewed)

- g. Textbooks published this year
- h. Bulletins and Technical Reports
- i. Reviews and Review Essays (indicate whether peer reviewed)
- j. Abstracts and short entries
- k. Papers in proceedings
- l. Keynotes and invited lectures
- m. Conference presentations
- n. Seminars and workshops led
- o. Creative Works
- p. Translations
- q. Curated Exhibits
- r. Moving Image Productions
- s. Multimedia/databases/websites
- t. Publications accepted and in press
- u. Potential publications under review
- v. Potential publications in progress

(3) Research Funding:

- a. Funded research as principal investigator. Indicate dates, source and total direct costs.
- b. Funded research as co-investigator. Indicate dates, source, your percent contribution and share of total direct costs.
- c. Proposals for research funding pending/submitted but not funded
- d. Any other funding received for academic work

Service

- (1) Awards or formal recognition for service work
- (2) Initiatives taken to enhance diversity and inclusion
- (3) Professional & Public Service (Local, National, International)
 - a. Editorships or Service as Reviewer for journal, university presses, etc.
 - b. Offices Held and other service to professional societies
 - c. Consulting Activity (industry, education, government; include grant review activities)
 - d. Other Professional/Public Service
- (4) University, College, and Division Service
 - a. Committees and elected positions
 - b. Administrative assignments
 - c. Advising of student groups
 - d. Other service to the Division, College or University
- (5) Departmental Service
 - a. Vice Chair, Director or Committee Chair
 - b. Committee member
 - c. Other Service Assignment(s)
 - d. Student Recruitment Activities
 - e. Participation in Faculty Searches
 - f. Other service to the Department

Comments (optional)

If you would like to provide any relevant contextual information about your record, especially with regard to publication/scholarship, please make a brief statement here about your progress over the past three years. You may also mention any professional accomplishments not covered in the Annual Report form

APPENDIX B

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

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

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

Teaching:

- *Outstanding:* Teaching award; strong undergraduate teaching supported by evidence in Annual Report; advisor or committee member to significant number of graduate students, inside or outside one's field of specialization (Departmental mean average in 2016 was 8)
- *Excellent:* Strong undergrad teaching supported by evidence in Annual Report; above average involvement with graduate students
- *Very Good:* Evidence of acceptable undergrad teaching and some graduate advising
- *Good:* Evidence of acceptable undergrad teaching and minimal graduate advising
- *Satisfactory:* Evidence of adequate undergrad teaching and no involvement in graduate advising
- *Unsatisfactory:* Subpar teaching record

Scholarship:

- *Outstanding:* Book publication (or equivalent) and/or major research award (e.g. ASC or OSU Distinguished Scholar; national award in discipline)
- *Excellent:* Peer-reviewed journal article or essay in edited collection (or equivalent) plus additional scholarly activity (other publications and/or presentations at national and international conferences)
- *Very Good:* Peer-reviewed journal article or essay in edited collection (or equivalent)

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

Service:

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

*The Deans of the Regional Campuses use a 4-point system for annual evaluation of faculty performance, and are not bound by this Columbus campus rubric. The Department chair weighs in on, but does not control, regional faculty member's merit ratings.

APPENDIX C

RECENT STUDIES DEMONSTRATING BIAS IN STANDARDIZED, ELECTRONIC STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING (SETs)

A September 2016 article from *Inside Higher Ed*, with several useful links to other relevant essays on the topic:
<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/09/21/new-study-could-be-another-nail-coffin-validity-student-evaluations-teaching>

As a statistics professor quoted in the article comments, given "strong association between SET and instructor gender, this adds evidence to the argument that institutions that care about learning should abandon SET as a measure of teaching effectiveness."

A link to the study that is the subject of the *Inside Higher Ed* article:
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0191491X16300323>

A January 2016 article that focuses specifically on gender bias in SETs:
<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/01/11/new-analysis-offers-more-evidence-against-student-evaluations-teaching>

A site that analyzes "Gendered Language in Teacher Reviews" on RateMyProfessor:
<http://benschmidt.org/profGender/#>

An article from June 2016, which addresses the related issue of problems with how SETs are interpreted by faculty, deans, universities (i.e., beyond the problems with SETs themselves):
<https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2016/06/17/removing-bias-student-evaluations-faculty-members-essay>