

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR
APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

Autumn, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Preamble	1
II.	Department Mission	1
III.	Definitions	2
	A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty	2
	1.. Tenure-track Faculty	2
	2.. Conflict of Interest.....	3
	3.. Minimum Composition	3
	B. Quorum	3
	C. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty	3
	1.. Appointment.....	4
	2.. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal	4
IV.	Appointments: Criteria and Procedures	4
	A. Criteria for Offering an Appointment	4
	1.. Tenure Track Faculty and Tenured Faculty	4
	2.. Regional Campus Faculty	5
	3.. Non-Tenure-Track Faculty	6
	4.. Courtesy Appointments	7
	B. Procedures for Offering Appointments.....	7
	1.. Resources.....	7
	2.. Non-Tenure-Track Candidates (Associated Appointments)	10
	3.. Courtesy Appointments:	11
V.	Annual Reviews	11
	A. General.....	11
	B. Annual Reviews Of Probationary Faculty	12
	1.. Regular Annual Reviews for Columbus Campus Faculty.....	12
	2.. Annual Reviews for Probationary Faculty on Regional Campuses	13
	3.. Fourth Year Reviews.....	14
	4.. Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period	15
	C. ANNUAL REVIEWS OF TENURED FACULTY	16
	1.. Annual Reviews of Associate Professors	16
	2.. Annual Reviews of Full Professors	17
	3.. Reviews of Regional Campus Tenured Faculty	17
VI.	Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards.....	17
	A. Criteria	17
	B. Procedures.....	18
	C. Documentation.....	19
VII.	Promotion & Tenure and Promotion Reviews.....	21
	A. Criteria	21
	B. Procedures For Promotion And Tenure Decisions	24
	1.. Procedures for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	24
	2.. Procedures for Promotion to Full Professor	26
	3.. Procedures for Promotion and Tenure of Regional Faculty	27
	C. Documentation.....	27

1.. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	27
2.. Promotion to Full Professor	29
VIII. Appeals.....	29
IX. Seventh Year Reviews	29
X. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	30
A. Student Evaluation of Teaching.....	30
B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	30

**POLICIES, CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES
FOR APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND
TENURE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY**

I. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapter 6 of the Rules of the University Faculty (Rules Concerning Tenure Track Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure) <http://trustees.osu.edu/university/facultyrules>; the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion <http://oaa.osu.edu/policiesprocedureshandbook.html>; and other policies and procedures of the college and University to which the Department and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the Department will follow the new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years on the appointment or reappointment of the Department Chair.

This document must be approved by the Dean of the College and the Office of Academic Affairs before it may be implemented. It sets forth the Department's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the College and University, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the Dean and the Office of Academic Affairs accept the mission and criteria of the department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to departmental mission and criteria.

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

II. DEPARTMENT MISSION

The Philosophy Department of The Ohio State University has both undergraduate and graduate teaching missions. Our undergraduate teaching mission divides into one for undergraduates at large and a special mission for our majors and honors students. For undergraduates at large, our goal is to provide rigorous and intellectually stimulating courses that allow them to develop critical and creative thinking skills along with the cultural knowledge of distinguished philosophers, and philosophies, in our history. For our majors and honors students, we have the additional goal of providing an undergraduate experience

and atmosphere comparable to that of the finest liberal arts colleges. We recognize and reward faculty members who are especially effective in helping us reach our goals for our undergraduate teaching mission. Our graduate teaching mission is to be the major institution in Ohio granting doctoral degrees in philosophy. Our goal for our graduate teaching mission is to develop one of the best philosophy Ph.D. programs in North America. We are building a program that will place those who earn an Ohio State Ph.D. in philosophy in the most prestigious colleges and universities of North America. Part of this goal for our graduate teaching mission is to recruit into our program the most promising young faculty, who will play a crucial part in our undergraduate teaching mission and who will stimulate and participate in faculty research.

Our research mission is to contribute to scholarship in the areas of philosophy as well as to create and develop philosophical concepts and theories. Our goal for our research mission is to provide a cadre of outstanding faculty and an ambiance for them in which they make contributions to scholarship and philosophy which brings them, and the Department, national and international distinction. Part of the goal of creating an ambiance to stimulate creative development of new concepts and theories is to recruit and reward faculty who work with those in other disciplines.

The Philosophy Department has service missions to the University, the profession and the community. To carry out our service mission to the University, we recognize and reward faculty participation in the various committees of the College of Arts and Sciences and the University. Because it is so important for attaining national and international recognition, The Philosophy Department encourages its faculty to participate in professional associations, be editors and referees for journals, and to write reviews and abstracts. We provide service to the community by offering lectures and conferences open to the public and presenting philosophical presentations in community venues.

III. DEFINITIONS

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

1. Tenure-track Faculty

The eligible faculty for voting on appointment of tenure-track faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty whose tenure resides in the department.

For an appointment at senior rank, a second vote is taken by the faculty members eligible to vote on the rank under consideration. The eligible faculty for voting on appointment to senior rank for new appointments, reappointment, promotion and tenure of assistant professors, and promotion of associate professors consists of all tenured faculty whose tenure resides in the department and who are of rank equal to or higher than the rank to which the candidate will be appointed, excluding the department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

By longstanding practice, The Department of Philosophy uses the working title “Senior Council” for the associate and full professors of the Department holding tenure-track appointments.

2. Conflict of Interest

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

3. Minimum Composition

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

B. Promotion and Tenure Committee.

A group of three members of the eligible faculty who are appointed for each tenure and/or promotion review for the purpose of assembling documents concerning the candidate. Documents will include teaching evaluations, scholarly works, and letters of evaluation from scholars outside the University.

C. Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted.

1. Appointment

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

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

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

IV. APPOINTMENTS: CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

A. Criteria for Offering an Appointment

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

1. Tenure Track Faculty and Tenured Faculty

- a. *Instructor*: Appointment at the rank of Instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of Assistant Professor, but requirements for the doctoral degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. The Department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the Instructor level is limited to three years. When an Instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor by the end of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the

department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked without a formal request for an extension of the probationary period. In addition all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

- b. *Assistant Professor:* An earned doctorate is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high quality teaching, and high quality service to the Department and the profession is highly desirable. Appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted.
 - c. *Associate Professor and Professor:* Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the Department's criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at senior rank normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at senior rank is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional—*i.e.*, terminal—year of employment is offered.
 - d. 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. Regional Campus Faculty
- a. *Assistant Professors:* A minimum requirement for appointment as an Assistant Professor is that the candidate have an earned Ph.D. Further, the candidate must be judged by the Department to be likely to be effective in carrying out its research mission. The candidate must also be judged by the Dean of the regional campus as likely to be an effective contributor to that campus' teaching and service missions. Concurrence of the regional campus Dean is also required for an appointment.
 - b. *Associate Professors:* To be appointed at the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate must have earned such a professional reputation for scholarly achievement that the tenured members of the Department vote to offer the

candidate tenure. Concurrence by the Dean of the regional campus is also required.

- c. *Full Professors:* To be appointed at the rank of Full Professor, candidates must have a national or international scholarly reputation of such distinction that it is likely that the appointment will enhance the reputation of the Department. Concurrence of the regional campus Dan is also required for an appointment.
3. Non-Tenure-Track Faculty and Visiting Scholars
 - a. *Lecturers:* Lecturers are appointed to serve temporary teaching needs and they must be judged competent to fill those needs by the Department Chair or by a committee appointed by the Chair. Individuals appointed as lecturers will have passed the general examination leading to the PhD.
 - b. *Senior Lecturer:* Appointment as Senior Lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a doctorate in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide high quality instruction; or a Master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience with documentation of high quality. Senior Lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion.
 - c. *Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%:* Appointment with tenure-track titles is for individuals at 49% FTE or below, either compensated or uncompensated. The rank of associated faculty with tenure-track titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure track faculty. Associated faculty with tenure-track titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure track faculty.
 - d. *Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor:* Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Visiting faculty on leave from a regular academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of regular tenure track faculty. Visiting faculty are not eligible for tenure or promotion. They may not be reappointed for more than three consecutive years at 100% FTE.
 - e. *Adjunct Faculty:* Adjunct faculty are either compensated or uncompensated for their contributions to the missions of the department. Nevertheless, the Department must judge that association of these faculty with the Department enhances the reputation of the Department in ways which help it attain its goals for its teaching and research mission.
 - f. *Visiting Scholars:* Visiting scholars from other universities will be accommodated in the Department only if a Department faculty member has agreed to sponsor the visiting scholar. Visiting scholars are not members of the Departmental faculty, and receive no compensation from Ohio State University.

They will generally receive no office or secretarial support from the Department. They will be welcome at Department colloquia and other events, and the Department will petition for the visiting scholars to have access to University library holdings.

4. Courtesy Appointments

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

B. Procedures for Offering Appointments

1. Resources

See Volume 1 in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, <http://oaa.osu.edu/policiesprocedureshandbook.html> on the following topics:

- recruitment of tenure track faculty
- appointments at senior rank or with prior service credit
- hiring faculty from other institutions after April 30
- appointment of foreign nationals
- letters of offer Candidates for Tenure Track or Tenured Appointments

2. Tenure Track Appointments

a. Assistant Professors:

As soon as it becomes known that a position will be open at the assistant professor level, following the approval of the dean, the Department Chair will propose a job description for departmental approval and form a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the Department. The Chair will designate a member of the search committee as the Diversity Advocate. These actions can only move forward if a quorum of voting Department members is present for the approval of the actions to be taken. [‘Quorum’ is defined in the Definitions section above.] The search committee will seek out the advice of all Department members concerning potential candidates for the open position. The committee will also conduct an appropriate and thorough national and international search for top candidates, including some candidates who will contribute to the diversity of the unit. The Department will advertise the position in the most widely used national listings for positions in philosophy, and as directed by College and University policies. The search committee will conduct initial interviews to assist it in preparing a short list of top candidates. After informing itself as well as circumstances allow, the search committee will prepare

a proposed short list of top candidates, complete with relevant documentation, for consideration by the full Department at a meeting. The short list of candidates should include at least one candidate who could contribute to the diversity of the Department. If the search committee judges that in the pool of candidates there is no qualified person who can contribute to the diversity of the Department, it will explain at a meeting of the faculty its efforts to attract a diverse pool of candidates and will describe the pool of applicants and the pool of finalists before asking the faculty to vote on inviting finalists to campus for an interview.

After due discussion and deliberation, the Department is to vote on the matter of filling the open position. This vote may take any of several forms, depending upon circumstances.

- i. It may vote to invite one or more candidates to campus for formal interviews;
- ii. It may vote to authorize the Department Chair to make an offer to one of the candidates;
- iii. It may vote to authorize the Department Chair or a committee to make a choice among several possible candidates, either to invite them to campus for interviews or to make an offer;
- iv. It may vote to make no offer and discontinue the search.

All votes involving “multiple-candidate/single-winner” situations, whether they are to bring a single candidate to campus or to make an offer to a single candidate, must follow the approval voting method outlined in the Department’s Pattern of Administration. A vote to bring one or more candidates to campus for an interview requires a two thirds vote for passage. Also, a vote to offer a position to a candidate requires a two thirds vote of all eligible faculty who are present at the meeting where the vote is taken. In both cases the vote is to be by confidential, written ballot. The vote of the Department is advisory to the Department Chair, who will report his/her recommendation to the Dean.

In unusual circumstances (such as lateness in the year), the Department may authorize the Department Chair or a committee to act without further departmental approval in interviewing, inviting to campus for interview, or making an offer to one or more candidates. In the event of a very late resignation or authorization from the administration, the Department Chair or a committee named by the Department Chair, after consultation with faculty who are available, is authorized to seize such opportunity as may appear in interviewing to make a non-tenure offer. Such procedures are not normal, however, and will be fully disclosed by the Department Chair if ever used. All offers, of course, must have the prior approval of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

In the event that an offer of a position as assistant professor is accepted by a candidate who has not yet completed the doctorate, it will be a condition of the appointment that all formal requirements for the doctorate be completed prior to the beginning of the appointment. If these requirements are not completed, then the appointment will be a term appointment as Instructor, in accordance with applicable University and College regulations.

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

b. Associate Professors

Procedures for hiring a new associate professor are the same as those for hiring a new assistant professor (above), except for the following:

- i. The vote for appointment will be taken by the eligible faculty: all tenure-track faculty whose tenure home resides in the department.
- ii. The voting procedure to be used by the eligible faculty is that of a written confidential ballot. All votes involving “multiple-candidate/single-winner” situations, whether they are to bring a single candidate to campus or to make an offer to a single candidate, must follow the approval voting method outlined in the Department’s Pattern of Administration. A two thirds majority is required for an appointment recommendation. This vote is advisory to the Department Chair.
- iii. If the vote for appointment is successful, a second vote will be taken by the eligible senior faculty (the associate and full professors) to determine whether the candidate can be appointed at the rank of associate professor. A two thirds majority is required for an appointment recommendation. This vote is advisory to the Department Chair.
- iv. An appointment as associate professor is normally with 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. Approval of the petition requires a compelling rationale regarding why appointment at the rank of associate professor is appropriate but tenure is not. All appointments to the rank of associate professor require prior approval of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs.

c. Full Professors:

Procedures for hiring a new full professor are the same as those for hiring new assistant and associate professors (above), except for the following:

- i. If the initial vote for appointment of all eligible faculty is successful, a second vote will be taken by the eligible senior faculty (the full professors) to determine whether the candidate can be appointed at the rank of full professor. A two thirds majority is required for an appointment recommendation. This vote is advisory to the Department Chair.
 - ii. A new full professor is normally hired with 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. Approval of the petition requires a compelling rationale explaining why appointment at the rank of professor is appropriate but tenure is not. All appointments at the rank of professor require prior approval of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs.
- d. Candidates at Regional Campuses

In the case of a tenure-track or a tenured 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, as a minimum, be interviewed by the regional campus Dean/Director, the Chair of the Department, the search committee and representatives of both faculties. Candidates will be evaluated on both campuses, with the faculty on the Columbus campus taking primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's record and potential as a scholar. In its evaluation of the candidates for a regional campus appointment at assistant professor, associate professor, or full professor rank, the Department will follow the same procedures for appointment of a faculty member in the Columbus department at one of those ranks. These procedures are detailed above in (B.2.a) – c.)

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 chair of the Department and the Dean/Director of the regional campus. In the case of appointment of a tenured associate or full professor, agreement is also required from the Office of Academic Affairs.

3. Non-Tenure-Track Candidates (Associated Appointments)

a. Lecturers:

Individuals may be hired as lecturers or senior lecturers for the purpose of meeting temporary classroom needs at the discretion of the Department Chair or

a committee formed by the Department Chair. Such appointments are strictly temporary and carry no presumption of appointment beyond the designated term, which can be for a period of one semester up to a maximum of three years. Individuals hired as lecturers will be compensated on a per course basis in accordance with prevailing College rates.

b. Visiting Faculty:

Visiting appointments, at any level, are generally to be for a period of at most one year and under no circumstances no more than three. Visiting appointments require the prior approval of the College, and the Department. Under pressing conditions, where normal procedures are not feasible, the Department Chair is authorized to recommend visiting appointments, provided that no assurance or invitation to consider a tenure appointment is made to the appointee. Such procedures are not normal, however, and will be fully disclosed by the Department Chair if ever used.

c. Adjunct Faculty:

An individual may be recommended for an adjunct position in the Department, provided the appointment is approved by the entire Department. Such appointments will normally be made to individuals from other institutions or who are at OSU in other departments, in accordance with applicable University regulations. Faculty who are adjunct appointees may not vote in the Department, but they may attend meetings and other department functions.

d. Visiting Scholars:

In the case of an appointment of a visiting scholar, the Department Chair may offer appointment only if there is a faculty sponsor for the candidate.

4. Courtesy Appointments:

The procedures for making a courtesy appointment are the same as those for making an appointment of an adjunct professor. Any Department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track faculty member from another Ohio State department. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this Department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the faculty, the Department Chair extends an offer of appointment. The Department Chair reviews all courtesy appointments annually to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

V. ANNUAL REVIEWS

A. General

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the OAA Policy on annual reviews, <http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>.

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

The documentation required for the annual performance review of every faculty member is described below. This material must be submitted to the Department Chair by a date during spring semester set and announced to all faculty by the Chair.

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

B. Annual Reviews Of Probationary Faculty

(NOTE: The term 'Probationary faculty' refers to instructors and assistant professors who are on track for promotion/tenure. Excluded, therefore, from these procedures are visiting faculty, lecturers, adjunct or courtesy faculty, and faculty who have been given formal notice of non renewal.)

1. Regular Annual Reviews for Columbus Campus Faculty

(NOTE: The term 'regular' is used to contrast annual reviews with the fourth year review which is more thorough and requires approval of the Dean.)

Each probationary faculty member will be reviewed annually by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty (Senior Council). The Senior Council consists of the associate and full professors of the Department holding tenure-track appointments.

The purpose of these annual reviews is to determine whether or not a recommendation is to be made that a probationary appointment be renewed; to evaluate the performance of a non-tenured faculty member in the areas of teaching, research, and service with regard to expectations for continued employment; and to encourage and advise candidates in their professional development.

Annual reviews normally occur in spring semester. The faculty member will be notified well in advance of the review meeting concerning the time and place of the review and will be provided an opportunity to submit materials for consideration in the review process. A member of the Senior Council will be appointed by the Department Chair for the purpose of assisting the probationary faculty member in preparing materials for consideration by council members. Untenured faculty must present their dossiers in the form required by the Office of Academic Affairs for that year. The Department Chair will provide the Office of Academic Affairs dossier guidelines for that year to the faculty member well in advance of the annual review, so that the faculty member will have ample time to assemble needed materials. In addition, the faculty member will be provided at the time of appointment with all relevant documents that detail the tenure and promotion policies and criteria of the

Department, the College, and the University. If changes are made to any of these documents during the faculty member's probationary period, he or she will be provided with updated documents in a timely fashion.

The annual review will include cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught by the faculty member during the past year. The probationary faculty member should include in the dossier submitted for the annual review student discursive comments and evaluations about teaching, peer evaluations of teaching, course syllabi, and copies of publications.

In its annual review of a probationary faculty member, the Senior Council will have been provided with the faculty member's review materials at least one week prior to the review meeting. At the review meeting, the Senior Council member who has been appointed to assist the probationary faculty member will summarize the review materials. The Senior Council members conducting the review may also seek additional information concerning the probationary faculty member, including consultation with colleagues if necessary, in order to conduct a fair and thorough review.

In accord with University policy, faculty members with a familial or comparable relationship with a probationary faculty member should not participate in the review of that person.

As noted in the definitions section above, two thirds of the Senior Council must be present for a recommendation vote to be taken. Except as noted elsewhere in this document, a motion to recommend continuation of a probationary faculty member requires a majority of Senior Council members present at the meeting for passage. Council members who are not present may have their views expressed at the meeting, but their votes will not count. The vote of the Senior Council is advisory to the Department Chair, who will make a recommendation to the Dean.

The results of Senior Council's review and the Chair's recommendation will be made known to the probationary faculty member in writing by the Department Chair and in a meeting between the Department Chair and the faculty member. If the chair recommends nonrenewal at the conclusion of the first, second, third, or fifth annual review of a probationary faculty member, the comments process will be followed as set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04, and the case will be forwarded to the Dean, who will conduct a college-level review that follows fourth year review procedures as described in Section IV,B,3,a) and 3,c) below. The Dean makes the final decision in the case. Faculty members who believe a nonrenewal decision was made improperly may appeal that decision, if they wish, under the procedures outlined in Section VII, below.

2. Annual Reviews for Probationary Faculty on Regional Campuses

Probationary faculty on regional campuses will be reviewed annually by the regional campus Dean/Director and by the Chair of the Department on the Columbus campus.

The regional campus review, which focuses mainly on teaching and service, should take place first, with the Dean/Director's report of the review forwarded to the chair of the Department. The Department review will focus on the candidate's scholarly work, but will consider all aspects of his/her record. The Department Chair should give a written review to the faculty member and a copy to the Dean/Director. It is important that the chair of the Department and the regional campus Dean/Director be alert to any developing discrepancy for the probationary faculty member between the quality of teaching and service on the one hand and the quality and quantity of scholarly work on the other, in order to minimize the possibility that the regional campus and the Department might eventually disagree on a tenure recommendation. When such discrepancies become apparent, the regional campus Dean/Director should seek appropriate means of addressing this problem with the faculty member and the Chair of the Department.

The Department will conduct its annual review of a regional campus probationary faculty member by following the same procedures for annual reviews of probationary faculty members on the Columbus campus. These procedures are detailed above in II, A, 1.

3. Fourth Year Reviews

The fourth year review differs from regular annual reviews only in requiring the comments process, as set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04, and college level review. In the fourth year it is the Dean who makes the final decision on reappointment for the fifth year.

The mechanism for the fourth year review is the same as for other annual reviews, except for the following.

- a) The fourth year review will be more thorough than other annual reviews, including (if deemed necessary or desirable by the Chair because the eligible faculty need additional expertise in order to evaluate the scholarship) outside letters of evaluation. Those responsible for conducting the review may also seek such additional information, including consultation with colleagues, as necessary, to ensure a fair and thorough review.
- b) A motion for continuation requires a two-thirds majority of Senior Council members present at the review meeting. Votes at the review meeting will be taken by written, confidential ballot. [To have binding votes, a quorum of eligible members of the Department must be present. See the Department's Pattern of Administration, Section VII, C.]
- c) A report will be submitted to the Dean. The Dean decides whether or not the candidate is to be appointed for a fifth year. The Dean reports to the candidate whether there is re-appointment for a fifth year or whether the fifth year is a terminal year. Appointment for a fifth year is no guarantee of continued reappointment or of promotion and tenure.

4. Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period. The full text of the rule is available at <http://trustees.osu.edu/university/facultyrules>; the most relevant paragraphs for the department are reproduced below:

(1) There are three circumstances under which probationary tenure-track faculty may obtain an exclusion of time from probationary periods. These exclusions are intended to recognize that there are factors that can impact the ability of probationary faculty to meet the criteria for tenure within the probationary period outlined in paragraph (B) of this rule. A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any of the reasons listed in paragraphs (D)(1)(a) to (D)(1)(c) of this rule must be made prior to April first of the year in which the mandatory review for tenure is scheduled to occur.

(a) A probationary tenure-track faculty member will have time excluded from the probationary period in increments of one year to reflect the caregiving responsibilities associated with the birth of a child or adoption of a child under age six. This exclusion is guaranteed provided the faculty member informs the head of her/his tenure initiating unit, the dean, or the office of academic affairs in writing within one year of the birth or the adoption unless the exclusion of time is prohibited by paragraph (D)(3) of this rule, and no later than April first of the mandatory review year. It is the responsibility of the unit head to inform the college dean and office of academic affairs of the birth or adoption. The probationary faculty member may decline the one-year exclusion by informing her/his unit head in writing before April first of the original mandatory review year. It is the responsibility of the unit head to inform the college dean and office of academic affairs of the faculty member's choice to decline the exclusion. The maximum amount of time that can be excluded from the probationary period per birth event or adoption is one year.

(b) A probationary tenure-track faculty member may 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 the performance of the usual range of duties associated with being a successful university faculty member, i.e., teaching, scholarship, or service. Requests to exclude time from the probationary period made under the terms of this paragraph must be submitted in writing to the head of the faculty member's tenure initiating unit within one year of the illness, care, or other factors. Requests shall be reviewed by the tenure initiating unit promotion and tenure committee which shall advise the head of the tenure initiating unit regarding the appropriateness of the request. In units that do not have a promotion and tenure committee, the eligible faculty shall review the request. Such requests require approval by the head of the tenure initiating unit 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 first of the 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 reviewing the appropriateness of the request.

C. ANNUAL REVIEWS OF TENURED FACULTY

1. Annual Reviews of Associate Professors

The Council of Full Professors will review annually the professional accomplishments of the tenured associate professors. In accord with University policy, faculty members with a familial or comparable relationship with a person under review should not participate in this review. The purpose of this review is to determine whether a review is to be conducted for possible promotion to full rank and to advise and encourage candidates in their professional development. Reviews will be based upon the associate professors' annual faculty reports, vitas, publications, teaching evaluations, and other materials as may be submitted for review. Specifically, the reviewed associate professor should provide an up to date curriculum vita, a list of courses taught over the past year, evidence of teaching effectiveness including both peer reviews and any student evaluations collected other than the University's SEI forms, a list of service assignments over the past year, professional assignments, and a record of scholarship. The Council of Full Professors will also review the cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught by the faculty member in the previous year. The record of scholarly achievements should make clear what scholarship has been achieved since promotion to associate professor. It should include copies of published work and work in progress.

Associate professors who, at the time of the annual review, are also considered for promotion to full professor, will be asked to provide additional materials. In addition to the above-noted materials, they will be asked to provide evidence of teaching effectiveness for all courses taught over the past five years; this is to include peer reviews and any student evaluations used other than the University's SEI forms. The Council of Full Professors will also review the cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught by the faculty member during the previous five years. In addition, the associate professor should submit a statement on research and a statement on teaching.

The Department Chair shall participate in the review discussions. The Department Chair meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future

plans and goals, and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

2. Annual Reviews of Full Professors

In their annual consultation with the Chair, full professors review their work during the preceding year. It is the Chair's responsibility, in consultation with other full professors, to help full professors with professional weaknesses to remedy these weaknesses over time.

Each full professor should provide the Chair with his/her record of scholarly achievement over the past year; with evidence of teaching effectiveness over the past year (including, where appropriate, peer reviews, and any student evaluations used other than the University's SEI forms); and a record of service assignments for the department, College, and University. Professional service and awards, where appropriate, should also be included. In conducting the annual review of full professors, the Department Chair will also review the cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught by the faculty member during the past year and may request additional information beyond that listed here, and may consult with others as regards the review. The Department Chair meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals, and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review

3. Reviews of Regional Campus Tenured Faculty

Tenured faculty on regional campuses will be reviewed annually by the regional campus Dean/Director and by the Chair of the Department on the Columbus campus. The regional campus review, which focuses mainly on teaching and service, should take place first, with the Dean/Director's report of that review forwarded to the Chair of the Department. The Department review will focus on the candidate's scholarly work, but will consider all aspects of his/her record. The Department Chair should give a written review to the faculty member and a copy to the Dean/Director.

VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS

A. Criteria

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

The Department has its own amount of raise money available for distribution to its faculty. In making decisions on merit salary increases, the Department Chair will assess the quality of each faculty member's teaching, service, and research. However, the Chair will also take into account such equity issues as may exist in making salary

recommendations. Assessments of quality of teaching, service, and research are to be made within the context of the Department's goals as specified in its Mission statement.

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

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

B. Procedures

The Department will have a Salary Recommendation Committee, composed in accordance with the provisions of the Pattern of Administration.

This Committee will make its salary recommendations to the Department Chair based on a holistic appraisal of each faculty member's scholarship, teaching, and service—to the Department, the University, and the profession—during the preceding year. Typically, scholarship and teaching will count equally in the appraisal of merit in a given year, and together they will standardly account for no less than eighty percent of a given faculty member's recommended increase. Service will be construed broadly, so as to include an appraisal of Department contributions, wherein faculty are evaluated for their overall contributions to the intellectual and pedagogical vitality of the Department, as well as for their contributions to the College, the University, profession, and community.

Prior to the Committee's convening, each faculty member will fill out the Departmental form described below and is invited to submit, as well, a letter to the Department Chair summarizing the previous year's progress and highlighting the contributions she or he would most like the Committee to take into account (including evaluations by earlier Committees). If a letter to the Chair is submitted, the faculty member should indicate whether or not it is to be shared with the Salary Recommendation Committee. The Department Chair will present those letters that are intended to be shared with the Committee to the Committee members, along with the completed forms.

The Committee and the Department Chair may also seek such additional information as necessary for a fair and thorough review of each case. Salary recommendations (to the Department Chair) for each member of the Salary Committee will be made by the

remainder of the committee, following the procedures outlined above. Salary recommendations by the committee are advisory to the Department Chair.

The Department Chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the dean, who may modify these recommendations. Salary increases are formulated in dollar amounts rather than percentage increases, with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries.

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.

C. Documentation

“For purposes of uniform comparison, each faculty member shall fill out a form provided by the Department Chair reporting on work done in the previous year and submit it in a timely way. The information collected will include at least the following:”

I. Scholarship

A. Written work

1. Books, published or accepted for publication
2. Edited books, published or accepted for publication
3. Papers in refereed journals, published or accepted for publication
4. Papers in anthologies or conference proceedings, published or accepted for publication
5. Reviews, published or accepted for publication
6. Translations, published or accepted for publication
7. Reprintings of previously published work
8. Papers under submission to journals or other scholarly publications
9. Grant applications under submission or submitted and accepted/rejected this past year
10. Work in progress, with an indication of state of development and expected final form (book, journal article, *etc.*)

B. Presentations

1. Invited presentations
 - a. Invitations received since last year’s review
 - b. Invited papers presented since last year
2. Refereed presentations
 - a. Papers submitted for presentation since last year
 - b. Papers accepted for presentation since last year
 - c. Papers presented since last year

- C. Awards (fellowships, prizes, or other awards, as well as invitations to visit institutions other than those listed above)

II. Teaching

- A. Courses taught during the preceding year, with a summary of enrollments for each course, nature of teaching assistance, if any, indication of special circumstances (new course, new version of old course, and so on). Student evaluations other than those collected by the University's SEI forms.
- B. Teaching awards and other recognitions for the past year
- C. Course development work (summary of all work for the development of new courses within the Department or elsewhere)
- D. Advising
 - 1. Undergraduate advisees, indicating general advising, undergraduate thesis advising, and so on

III. Service

- A. Departmental
 - 1. Committee work
 - 2. Other departmental service
- B. College
- C. University
- D. Service to the profession
- E. Community

Important achievements other than those covered above should be mentioned in the letter to the Chair. Each faculty member is responsible for seeing to it that the Committee receives copies of all forms of student evaluation of teaching other than the University's SEI forms for all courses taught since the last review. The Chair is responsible for seeing to it that the Committee receives copies of all peer evaluations of teaching since the last review.

The significance of publications, public lectures, awards, etc., will be evaluated in accordance with prevailing professional criteria of the contribution they make to philosophy, as indicated by, for example, the quality and nature of the publication venue or the group addressed. Normally, manuscripts published or accepted for publication will be granted the greatest weight, but in cases where a faculty member's research cannot be comfortably accommodated within the Committee's 36 month cycle, faculty are expected to aid the Committee in its deliberations by supplying both a detailed description of the project(s) in question and samples of unpublished work and/or other evidence of scholarly progress.

VII. PROMOTION & TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

A. Criteria

As in the case of appointments, *criteria* specify what is relevant in judging faculty with respect to the teaching, research and service missions of the Department. The goals of our mission set high standards for judging how well faculty satisfy these criteria. Our standards are always qualitative reflections of the professional judgments of the faculty and Department Chair. *Documentation* concerns both the gathering and reporting of information to support judgments about how well faculty satisfy the various criteria. It is the policy of the Department that all documentation is available to the faculty being evaluated. It is also the policy of the Department to report recommendations in the dossier formats required by the Office of Academic Affairs.

Excellence in both scholarship and teaching constitutes the most important criterion for promotion and tenure. Though it is recognized that some faculty are stronger in one area than the other, there must be a balance between the two areas. Exemplary teaching will not compensate for a poor research record, and extraordinary scholarship will not compensate for poor teaching.

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 <<http://trustees.osu.edu/university/facultyrules>> provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the university enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established academic patterns. In such cases care must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

1. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure

- a. **Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching.** Candidates are evaluated on their effectiveness as both graduate and undergraduate instructors. Candidates will be evaluated on their command of the subject; their continuous growth in their fields; their ability to organize their material and to present it with logic and conviction; their objectivity; and the extent and skill of their participation in the general

advising of students. Since one of the goals of our mission is to encourage and reward interdisciplinary work, candidates will also be judged on their capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of their subject to other fields of knowledge; their ability to arouse curiosity in students; and their concern for their students. Where appropriate, candidates may also be judged on the degree to which clear models of writing have been provided for students; the degree to which competent writing has been expected of students; and the degree to which clear, expressive writing has been emphasized as a goal.

In cases where program direction is an assigned responsibility, that aspect of the candidate's appointment will be given particular attention. In such a case, the candidate will be evaluated on the basis of effectiveness in the training and supervision of TA's, the adaptation or development of materials used in the program being supervised, and the establishment and maintenance of standards for the evaluation of student performance.

In cases where candidates have taught in interdisciplinary courses, evaluations of teaching will be sought from the departments involved.

- b. **Criteria for the Evaluation of Scholarly Work.** It is recognized that research may take many forms, but all research relevant for evaluation should clearly be philosophical and contribute to the advancement of philosophical knowledge. Professional philosophers within, and outside, the department are those competent to judge whether or not work is philosophical, and whether or not a philosophical contribution has been made. However, because one of our goals is to encourage and to reward interdisciplinary work, it is our practice to consult with scholars in the related disciplines to help us determine the philosophical dimensions of the work.

Candidates will be evaluated on the quality of scholarly output. In all cases, candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to have a research record that demonstrates clear distinction in philosophy and the promise of prominence in the profession, as is appropriate for faculty at a major research institution. Typically, the minimum expectation is that six substantial articles will have been published or accepted for publication in journals and volumes that are among the most prominent in the field. In addition, all candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to have an active record of conference or colloquium presentations.

- c. **Criteria for the Evaluation of Service.** Candidates will be evaluated on the basis of service to the Department, College, University, and the profession. In some cases, candidates will also be evaluated on the basis of service beyond the aforementioned bodies, but only where such service clearly draws upon philosophically relevant professional expertise. The forms that service can take may vary greatly. In all cases, service will be evaluated within the context of the

faculty member's total academic activities and the academic goals of the Department.

It is expected that faculty members will be good citizens of the department, serving as required on committees and working effectively and cooperatively with colleagues and staff in managing the department.

2. Criteria: Promotion to Rank of Full Professor

The criteria for promotion to full professor are the same as those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, except that they are strengthened in the ways indicated below. Furthermore, the teaching, service, and scholarly work upon which the evaluation is based must be subsequent to that upon which promotion to associate professor was based.

- a. Teaching is expected to involve, to the degree feasible given areas of specialization, significant involvement in the individualized education of graduate students as shown by such activities as beneficial service on graduate exam and dissertation committees and/or skilled and conscientious directing of graduate student dissertations. Faculty who are unable to contribute actively to the graduate program are expected to find other ways to make a distinctive contribution to the Department's teaching mission. Faculty are also expected to contribute to the intellectual vitality of the Department.
- b. Compared to service expectations for probationary faculty being considered for promotion to associate professor with tenure, those being promoted to full professor are expected to have joined with the full professors in engaging in more extensive service and in more significant roles at the departmental, institutional, or professional level.
- c. Scholarly work must provide evidence of a significant developed research program, or programs, for which the candidate has gained a distinguished national and/or international reputation. Evidence of this may take several different forms. For example, the publication of a book in a reputable press in addition to several articles and reviews in peer reviewed journals. Evidence could also take the form of a set of substantive articles in peer-reviewed philosophy journals and editor-reviewed volumes that make a significant contribution to a developed research program or programs. These examples are not exhaustive. (Significant professional presentations at conferences and colloquia will also constitute contributory evidence of a distinguished national and/or international reputation.)

3. Criteria: Promotion and Tenure for Regional Campus Faculty

Expectations for regional campus faculty differ somewhat from those for faculty on the Columbus campus. The primary mission of the regional campuses is to provide

high quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities. The relative emphasis on teaching and service expected of regional campus faculty will, therefore, ordinarily be greater. The Department expects regional campus faculty to establish a program of high quality scholarship and publication. The judgment whether a particular body of work meets Department standards for tenure and/or promotion will take into consideration the regional campuses' different mission, teaching expectations, and access to research resources. Furthermore, in light of the focus of the regional campuses on undergraduate teaching, there is no expectation that regional campus faculty be involved in the education of graduate students.

B. Procedures For Promotion And Tenure Decisions

1. Procedures for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Each Fall, when appropriate, the Department Chair convenes the Committee of Eligible Faculty, which in Philosophy consists of the associate and full professors with tenure-track appointments, with the exception of the Department Chair. The Department Chair appoints a chair for the committee and the committee selects a procedures oversight designee.

The responsibilities of the candidate are as follows:

- To submit a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist.
- To submit a copy of the department's APT Document that was in effect at the time of the candidate's hire or when the candidate was last promoted, whichever is more recent, if s/he wishes to be reviewed under that document's criteria and procedures. This must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the department.
- To review the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee (as described further below).

The CEF will meet to decide on whether to recommend promotion and tenure no later than the seventh week of the autumn semester of the tenure candidate's sixth year, unless the candidate's tenure timetable differs from the normal case in a way that has been approved by the Dean and Provost in response to a petition from the department in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D). In accord with university policy, and as defined above, members of the CEF with a familial or comparable relationship with a candidate are not on the CEF for that person.

If a faculty member petitions for a non-mandatory promotion and tenure review or promotion review, the CEF decides whether to conduct such a review.

Well in advance of the CEF committee's meeting, the Department Chair is to appoint a three-member promotion and tenure committee from the CEF for the purpose of assembling documents concerning the candidate. The documents will be made available to the CEF no later than one week prior to the meeting. Documents will include teaching evaluations, scholarly works, and letters of evaluation from scholars outside the University. The list of outside evaluators will be chosen by the Department Chair from a list of names recommended by members of the CEF, as supplemented by the candidate. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The Department Chair will decide whether removal is justified. Outside reviewers must be at peer institutions and at a higher rank than the candidate. The candidate will be given an opportunity to comment upon all recommended potential outside reviewers prior to the selection of an actual list but will not have the power to veto any names. The external evaluators will be contacted in a timely manner, in the later part of the spring semester of the candidate's fifth year, so that ample time is provided for them to study materials and make their reports by the beginning of the fall semester of the candidate's sixth year. The selected outside evaluators will be sent all of the candidate's published and forthcoming work done in rank, and a record will be kept of all work sent to each external evaluator. The Department Chair will include in the promotion and tenure file all letters from outside evaluators, negative and positive, and copies of the letters sent to the external evaluators. Outside evaluators will be told at the outset that candidates may inspect letters of evaluation.

Although the Department Chair may participate in the discussions, the Department Chair is not permitted to vote in these proceedings. Statements from members of the CEF who are not in residence may be read to the CEF. However, members of the Senior Council not present at the meeting cannot cast absentee ballots.

Voting: After appropriate discussion, a vote is taken on the question: Does the CEF recommend the faculty member for tenure and promotion to associate professor? If at least two thirds vote affirmatively, that is the council's recommendation to be reported to the chair. The vote is to be taken by a written and confidential ballot.

If the Chair decides to make a different recommendation, the Chair must explain to the CEF the reasons for disagreeing with its recommendation. The Chair's letter will be part of the documentation sent to the Dean, as will the P&T chair's report of the CEF deliberations.

Promptly after a decision to send a favorable or unfavorable recommendation to the Dean, the candidate will be notified in writing of the completion of the Department review and of the availability of the Chair's letter and the P&T chair's report. The candidate may request a copy of these documents. The candidate may provide the Department Chair with written comments on the Department review for inclusion in the dossier within ten calendar days of notification of the completion of the review. The P&T chair and/or Department Chair may provide written responses to the

candidate's comments for inclusion in the dossier. Only one iteration of comments on the departmental level review is permitted.

The Department Chair shall forward the dossier with all internal and external evaluations, candidate comments on the Department review and P&T chair and/or Department Chair responses to those comments, if any, to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Once a mandatory promotion and tenure review has begun, only the candidate may stop the review by requesting the Department Chair, in writing, to stop the review. A candidate's request to stop a mandatory review means that tenure will not be granted.

2. Procedures for Promotion to Full Professor

The full professors with tenured appointments, with the exception of the Department Chair and any full professors who have a familial or comparable relationship with the candidate for full professorship, constitute the Eligible Faculty on all recommendations for promotion to the rank of full professor. At its annual review of associate professors the Full Professors will advise the Department Chair on which, if any, of the associate professors are to be reviewed for promotion. A two thirds majority is required for a promotion review to be conducted, and the vote on this is to be by a written, confidential ballot. Should a promotion review be conducted, it will be conducted and concluded by the CEF no later than the seventh week of the following autumn semester.

By Rule 3335-6-04 (A) (3), an Associate Professor may ask to be considered for nonmandatory promotion review at any time. The screening meeting for a nonmandatory promotion review must be completed by March 15 in order for a promotion case to go forward in the following Autumn. Associate Professors who wish to be considered for promotion review in a given year should convey this wish to the Chair by the end of January of that year.

The full professors (CEF) will base its deliberations on materials supplied by the candidate for promotion. These will include an up to date curriculum vita, evidence of scholarly achievement since promotion to associate professor, and evidence of teaching effectiveness. In the case of scholarship, this should include all articles and books published or accepted since promotion to associate, as well as unpublished papers presented at conferences or colloquia. In the case of teaching this should include any student evaluation of instruction other than the University's SEI forms for all courses taught since promotion to associate professor, and a list of all service assignments in that same period of time.

In addition the CEF will have copies of all of the candidate's annual review letters since promotion to associate professor. The candidate should supply the Committee, as well, with a statement of research and a statement on teaching.

An associate professor may petition the full Professors for review for promotion to rank of full professor. The full profesors may not refuse such petitions for more than

one consecutive year. Consistent with the policies of the Office of Academic Affairs, only faculty who are citizens or permanent residents of the U.S. may be considered for non-mandatory tenure review.

The review procedures leading to recommendations concerning promotion to full professor are the same as those for promotion to associate professor with tenure (section VII-B-1 above), except for obvious procedural modifications.

It is the candidate's responsibility to assemble his/her dossier in line with OAA guidelines and with guidelines provided by the College.

3. Procedures for Promotion and Tenure of Regional Faculty

Regional campus faculty who are candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion (if the Department has agreed to conduct a review) are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on each campus, and then by their Regional Campus Dean/Director. This review focuses on teaching and service. The Regional Campus Dean/Director forwards the reports of these reviews and a recommendation to the Chair of the Department for inclusion in the candidate's dossier and for the guidance of the Department's eligible faculty. From this point the review follows the same course as all promotion and tenure reviews.

C. Documentation

1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

a. Documentation of Teaching

Student evaluation of teaching is required for every course taught in the Philosophy Department. Such evaluations must be obtained by use of the standard University SEI forms. Both the quantitative and the discursive information on these forms are reported to the Department Chair by the Office of the University Registrar.

SEI forms for all courses for all probationary years are to be included in the documentation for promotion to associate professor. A summary statement of SEIs, including a summary of discursive comments, should also be included.

Peer reviews of teaching for all of the candidate's probationary five years are required, as is a summary statement of the peer reviews. Such evaluations will be based upon classroom visits, review of syllabi and exams, and may include interviews with students. At least one course each year will be evaluated. Courses to be reviewed, and the faculty who do the reviewing, will be chosen by the Department Chair. Reviewing faculty will submit reports to the Teaching Evaluation and Assessment Committee. The candidate has the right to review all of the peer review letters.

Textbooks, editions, anthologies, computer software programs, and other instructional devices may be judged as contributions to teaching (but may also be judged as research output).

b. Documentation for the Evaluation of Scholarly Work

Work in progress will be assessed along with already published work. In determining quality, evidence will be sought which establishes that the scholarly work makes a significant contribution to the field and that the candidate has a significant developing research program or direction. Such evidence includes, but is not restricted to, the following:

Publications: The kind, scope, and quality of each publication will be considered. These will include the following:

- 1) Books and articles based on original research have primary importance as evidence of scholarly accomplishment. In addition, the quality of the journal, volume, or press will be taken into consideration.
- 2) Textbooks, editions, anthologies, digital resources, and other instructional devices will be judged as scholarly works only to the extent that they present new philosophical ideas or incorporate philosophical research.
- 3) Reviews written for professional journals will be evaluated as they reveal the scholarly knowledge and judgment of the reviewer.

Other Scholarly Activity: Papers and participation in panels or symposia at philosophical conventions will be evaluated in much the same way that publications are, but with the understanding that the form of expression may be less formal than in published work. Also relevant in the evaluation of scholarship are such things as prizes, awards, grants, fellowships, invitations to deliver public lectures or colloquia, invitations to teach at other institutions, and other items that might be deemed pertinent by the candidate or the evaluators (e.g., frequency of citation in footnotes of other scholars).

c. Documentation for Service

In evaluating service, the Department Senior Council will take into account the faculty member's service to the Department, the College and University, and to the profession. It will consider both service that has been assigned to the faculty member as well as service initiated by the faculty member. The Senior Council will consider the nature, extent, and impact of the faculty member's service activities, and will consider the extent to which these activities foster the Department's mission. In the case of service to the College, the University, and to the profession, original letters offering such service assignments are to be included in the file.

The faculty member will submit a record of all service activities to the Department Chair, who will make them available to the members of the Senior Council. The Chair may seek additional information, as necessary, and consult with colleagues so as to provide for a fair and thorough review.

2. Promotion to Full Professor

a. Documentation for Teaching

For promotion to full professor, the documentation for teaching is the same as for promotion to associate professor. SEI's, which are required in all courses at all levels, will be assessed in courses taught over the preceding five years. Further, associate professors will have been peer reviewed at least once per year. All of these peer reviews will be included in the file provided to the Chair and the committee. Summaries of the peer review reports and of the SEI's will also be included. These summaries will not be prepared by the faculty member under review. The Department Chair may also seek such additional information as may be necessary, including consultation with colleagues, to ensure a fair and thorough assessment of teaching.

b. Documentation for Scholarship

The documentation necessary for a faculty member being considered for promotion to full professor is the same as in the case of promotion to associate professor. (above, IV, C.1.b.) The Department Chair and the committee will consider all publications and scholarly presentations since promotion to associate professor, and will also consider the extent to which there is evidence of an ongoing research program by the faculty member. Published reviews and critical discussions of the faculty member's research will also be considered.

c. Documentation for Service

The documentation for service is the same as that for promotion to associate professor (above, IV. C. 1. c) The Department Chair and the committee will consider service to the Department, the College and University, and the profession, undertaken since promotion to associate professor. In the case of service to the College, University and profession, original letters offering service assignments are to be included in the file.

VIII. APPEALS

The department's goal is to be in full compliance with the policy of The Ohio State University to make decisions regarding the renewal of probationary appointments, tenure and promotion with the standards, criteria, policies and procedures provided by the board of trustees, supplemented by additional standards of this document. Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (A) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Further details on appeals alleging improper evaluation is contained in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05.

IX. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (B) sets forth the conditions for a seventh year review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year review.

If substantial new information is uncovered after the negative decision and if the Department Chair and faculty of the Department concur, a petition for a seventh year review may be sent to the Provost through the Dean. The Department concurs if the Chair plus two-thirds of the tenured faculty concur. If the Provost grants the petition, the Department conducts a seventh year review using the same procedures as for the sixth year review.

X. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the on-line Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) form is required in every course offered in this Department. Instructors should take reasonable and responsible steps to encourage a high completion rate, including providing time for students to complete the evaluation in class using the mobile application. Classroom exhortations, e-mail reminders, and messages on class web sites explaining the importance of the student evaluation process are all appropriate measures for encouraging completion of the SEI form. It is not appropriate to link student grades in any way to response rates for the SEI. Discursive comments received on the SEI should be summarized annually by someone other than the instructor.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The Department Chair oversees the Department's peer evaluation of teaching process.

Annually the Department Chair appoints a Teaching Evaluation and Assessment Committee (TEAC) of a size judged sufficient to meet the volume of peer review activity expected that year, without overburdening any of the members. The term of service is one year, with reappointment possible. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the Department. Although there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible.

The responsibilities of the TEAC are as follows:

- To review the teaching of probationary tenure-track faculty at least once a year during the remainder of their probationary period, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.
- To review the teaching of tenured Associate Professors and nonprobationary Associate Professors at least once every two years, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. Associate professors being reviewed for promotion to full professor must have a minimum of three such reviews.
- To review the teaching of tenured Professors at least once every four years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over time.

- To review, upon the Department Chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.
- To review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The Department Chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the University Center for the Advancement of Teaching (ucat.osu.edu)
- Reviews conducted upon the request of the Department Chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the Chair or faculty member.

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluation (i.e. the first three situations listed above) is comprehensive and includes, in addition to classroom visitation, review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and exams. Peer review focuses particularly on aspects of teaching that students are less qualified than faculty to evaluate, such as appropriateness of curricular choices given the goals of the course (e.g., survey as opposed to required major course), implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and appropriateness of approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge.

1. Policies Regarding Peer Evaluation of Teaching

- a) Faculty evaluating peers are to arrange with the instructor a particular date for a classroom observation. The date should be chosen by mutual agreement, and ideally should be chosen at least a week in advance of the observation. The reviewer should request, and the instructor should supply, a syllabus and other course material (e.g. paper topics, exams, handouts) and access to any course-related websites. It is best to provide this material in advance of the classroom observation. (If the instructor is teaching two courses, only one needs to be reviewed. The choice is normally up to the reviewed instructor.)
- b) During the classroom visit, faculty evaluating peers are not to participate in the class discussion in any way. They are not to raise questions, make comments, raise criticisms, etc. Those being evaluated are to be informed in advance that they are not to do anything to draw the attention of the students in the class to the evaluator.
- c) Peer evaluators are not to discuss any aspects of the instructor's teaching or the evaluation of that teaching with the instructor in the presence of students in the class.
- d) Peer evaluation letters are not to contain any hearsay, and peer evaluators are not to solicit student opinion for the purpose of peer evaluation

