

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure

Criteria and Procedures

for

The Ohio State University

***Department of Chemistry
and Biochemistry***

Last approved by the Faculty: April 9, 2021

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: May 20, 2021

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS AND TENURE
Criteria and Procedures of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry

Revised April 9, 2021

Table of Contents

I. PREAMBLE	4
II. MISSION STATEMENT	4
III. DEFINITIONS	5
A. Committee of Eligible Faculty	5
1. Tenure-track Faculty.....	5
2. Associated Faculty.....	6
3. Conflict of Interest.....	6
4. Minimum Composition.....	6
B. Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee	6
C. Quorum	6
D. Recommendation from the Committee of Eligible Faculty	7
1. Appointment	7
2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure	7
E. Other Definitions	7
IV. APPOINTMENTS	7
A. Criteria	8
1. Tenure-track Faculty.....	8
2. Tenure-track Faculty – Regional Campus	9
3. Associated Faculty – Nontenure track, Lecturers, and Senior Lecturers	9
4. Emeritus Faculty.....	10
5. Courtesy appointments.....	10
B. Procedures	10
1. Tenure-track Faculty.....	11
2. Tenure-track Regional Campus Faculty	13
3. Associated Faculty.....	14
4. Courtesy Appointments	15
V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW PROCEDURES	15
A. Documentation	16
B. Probationary tenure-track faculty	16
1. Regional tenure track faculty members	17
2. Assistant Professor Mentoring Committees.....	18
3. Fourth Year Review.....	18
4. Exclusion of time from probationary appointments.....	18
C. Tenured Faculty	19
D. Tenured Faculty - Regional Campus	19
E. Associated Faculty	19
F. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers	Error! Bookmark not defined.
G. Salary Recommendations	20
1. Teaching	20

2. Service	21
3. Research.....	21
VI. PROMOTION & TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS.....	21
A. Criteria.....	21
1. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure.....	22
2. Promotion to Rank of Professor.....	23
3. Alternative Path to Promotion to Professor	24
4. Regional Campus Faculty.....	25
B. Procedures: Columbus Campus	26
1. Candidate Responsibilities.....	26
2. Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee Responsibilities	26
3. Committee of Eligible Faculty Responsibilities	28
4. Department Chair Responsibilities	28
5. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty.....	30
6. Procedures for Promotion and Change in Appointment Type for Associated Faculty...	30
7. External Evaluations	31
C. Dossier.....	32
1. Teaching	33
2. Research and Scholarship	34
3. Service	36
VII. APPEALS	37
VIII. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS	37
IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING.....	37
A. Student Evaluation of Teaching	37
B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	38
1. Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	39

I. PREAMBLE

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

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

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

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

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

The chair of the department will generally consult with Cabinet and/or the Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) on matters pertaining to appointments, merit review and promotion. The composition of the Cabinet and FAC are described in the department's Patterns of Administration (POA) document.

II. MISSION STATEMENT

The **Mission** of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry is to provide an inclusive environment of innovative teaching, world-class research and dedicated service with an agile, responsive faculty and staff.

To this end, the **Vision** of the Chemistry and Biochemistry Department will:

Be the pre-eminent location for providing the best undergraduate opportunities to learn the language and concepts of Chemistry and Biochemistry and to participate in the research of the department.

Be a top-tier location for graduate and postdoctoral research by providing challenging, novel and relevant cutting-edge research opportunities via faculty, staff and students dedicated to exploration, support and excellence and to opening new frontiers to benefit the citizens of Ohio, the nation and the world. Provide leadership to chart the direction of The Ohio State University as a premier center of teaching, research and service to the state of Ohio and the world.

III. DEFINITIONS

- The eligible faculty for all appointment (hiring), reappointment, contract renewal, promotion, or promotion and tenure reviews must have their tenure home or primary appointment in the Department.
- The Department Chair, the Executive Dean, Divisional, Assistant and Associate Deans of the College, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President may not participate as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, promotion and tenure, or contract renewal.

A. Committee of Eligible Faculty

1. Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews:

- For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an assistant professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the Department.
- For appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) at senior rank (associate professor or professor), a review is performed and a second vote cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews:

- For the reappointment and promotion and tenure reviews of assistant professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors.
- For the promotion reviews of associate professors and the tenure reviews of probationary professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors.

As stated in the Department's Pattern of Administration, tenure track faculty members with $\geq 30\%$ joint appointments are eligible to participate in departmental governance votes, but are not eligible to participate in or vote on personnel matters, including promotion and tenure. Only faculty members whose tenure resides in the department are eligible to participate in promotion and tenure decisions.

2. Associated Faculty

The promotion of non-tenure track Associated Faculty with tenure-track titles will be discussed by the tenure-track Eligible Faculty, all of whom will be of higher rank than the candidate. Associated Faculty of higher rank than the candidate may also participate in the discussion, but are not eligible to vote.

3. 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 or who have substantial shared grants will be expected to withdraw from final discussions or promotion review of that candidate, although their input will be sought.

4. 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 consultation with the divisional dean will appoint one or more faculty members from another department within the College of Arts and Sciences for the review so that the minimum number of three can be reached.

B. Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee

A subset of the Committee of Eligible Faculty comprises the Promotion and Tenure subcommittee. This subcommittee is responsible for organizing faculty promotion and tenure reviews, and presenting each case to the entire Committee of Eligible Faculty.

This subcommittee will be composed of the following members. The Committee Chair: this is a professor appointed by the department chair; a Procedures Oversight Designee (POD): this professor is assigned to ensure the review procedure is properly executed, including considerations of diversity, equity and inclusion issues; and an ad hoc member of the P&T committee whose disciplinary specialty is close to that of the candidate. This member will vary depending on the candidate under review.

The Promotion and Tenure subcommittee is further described in the Department's [Pattern of Administration](#).

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 the quorum only if the department chair has approved the off-campus assignment.

Eligible faculty who are away from campus are “present” if they are linked via teleconferencing or video conferencing technology. However, they must participate in the entire discussion to be eligible to vote. Faculty who are recused from the review because of conflict of interest are not included in the “2/3” count for the quorum. The department chair is also not counted in computing quorum.

D. Recommendation from the Committee of Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters, only “yes” and “no” votes are counted. Abstentions are not counted as votes. Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted.

1. Appointment

A positive recommendation from the Committee of Eligible Faculty for appointment is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

A positive recommendation from the Committee of Eligible Faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

E. Other Definitions

1. Faculty Advisory Committee, FAC, an elected group of faculty in the department who provide advice to the chair.
2. Vice Chair for Research and Administration, VCR, faculty member who assists the chair with administrative tasks and in expanding the department’s research portfolio.
3. Vice Chair for Graduate Studies, VCG, faculty member who supervises the graduate studies program of the department.
4. Vice Chair for Undergraduate Studies, VCU, faculty member who supervises the undergraduate studies program of the department.
5. Faculty Search Committee, FSC, faculty committee organized to search for new faculty members.

IV. APPOINTMENTS

A. Criteria

The department is committed to making faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the department. Important considerations include the individual's record to date in teaching, 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 same criteria will be applied to joint or partial appointments (less than 1.0 FTE) as for full appointments (1.0 FTE).

1. Tenure-track Faculty

Assistant Professor. An earned Ph.D. or its equivalent is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Only those individuals with evidence of potential for excellence in teaching, service, and distinguished independent research will be appointed to the faculty. Such evidence consists of publication in peer reviewed journals, securing external research grants, statement of teaching philosophy, experience as a teaching assistant or lecturer, and letters of recommendation from distinguished academicians familiar with the qualifications of the individual. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory 4th year review, and tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the 7th year will be the final year of employment. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the 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.

Associate Professor and Professor. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to these ranks. Generally, individuals appointed at these levels will have an established record of international distinction in research; an important criterion is whether the appointment will immediately raise the national reputation of the department in the relevant area. Appointment at senior rank normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at senior rank is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

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

2. Tenure-track Faculty – Regional Campus

As the mission of the regional campuses emphasizes undergraduate instruction, regional campus criteria for appointment at the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor are similar to those for Columbus campus faculty, but give relatively greater emphasis at each level on teaching experience and quality.

3. Associated Faculty – Nontenure track, Lecturers, and Senior Lecturers

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give academic service to the department, such as teaching a course, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure track faculty. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure track faculty.

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

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. Appointments of senior lecturers may be made for up to a three-year time period.

Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%. The rank of an associated faculty with a tenure-track title is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure track faculty. Associated faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure). The relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty. Associated faculty are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching. They are also expected to engage in externally recognized scholarly activity, and participate in department, college, and/or university level service activities commensurate with their faculty appointment.

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not

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

4. Emeritus Faculty

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

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the Department Chair outlining academic performance and citizenship. The Committee of Eligible faculty (tenured associate professors and professors) will review the application and make a recommendation to the Department Chair. The Chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the Divisional Dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered.

See the OAA [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) Volume 1, Chapter 1, for information about the types of perquisites that may be offered to emeritus faculty, provided resources are available.

Emeritus faculty may not vote at any level of governance and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters.

5. Courtesy Appointments

Occasionally, the active academic involvement in this department by a tenure-track faculty member from another department at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in this department. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, 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 University rank, with promotion in rank recognized. Courtesy faculty members are not eligible to vote on matters of governance, though their input may be sought. Continuation of the appointment should reflect ongoing contributions. Courtesy appointments do not require formal annual review.

B. Procedures

See the Faculty Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) for more information 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

1. Tenure-track Faculty

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

Searches for tenure track faculty proceed as follows:

- The Executive Dean of the college provides approval for the department to commence a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise.
- The department chair appoints a faculty search committee (FSC) composed of faculty with sufficiently diverse backgrounds to provide a variety of perspectives, as well as sensitivity to diversity issues. 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](#).

The department chair provides the faculty with the written charge to the FSC and identifies the FSC Chair.

1. The FSC Chair designates one committee member at the initial meeting to be the Diversity Advocate. This individual is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants.
2. The FSC develops a position description based on the guidelines provided by the chair and his or her consultation with the Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC). The search announcement is posted internally in the university Personnel Postings through the Office of Human Resources and external advertising, subject to the department chair's approval. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made

that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.

3. The FSC develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must advertise using at least one 30-day online ad in a national professional journal. The university cannot legally grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency ("green card"), and strict U. S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their appointment to a tenure track position is included in an advertisement in a field- specific professional journal.
4. The FSC screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents to the full faculty a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. If the faculty agrees with this judgment, and with the approval of the divisional dean, on-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the department office. If the faculty do not agree, the department chair in consultation with the faculty determines the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, cancel the search).
5. Candidates invited for on campus interviews present a research-based seminar during their visit, and a presentation on their proposed research plans. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format. The initial interview is widely announced. The candidate's curriculum vitae and other documents are shared with all department faculty members and any University faculty members involved in the interview process. The FSC schedules interviews with department and university faculty who share common scholarly interests. The option to participate in the candidates' interviews is offered to all department faculty and interviews are scheduled if a department faculty member indicates an interest in participation in the interview process and if time allows. Departmental graduate students are invited to attend the research-based seminar of each candidate. The FSC will also invite 4-5 graduate students to meet with each candidate for lunch. Both the chair of the department and the division dean or the dean's designee will meet with each candidate during the campus interview. At the conclusion of each candidate's initial visit, all faculty members who have participated in the visit submit evaluative information to the FSC Chair. Responses are shared with members of the FSC committee.
6. As the search process reaches its final stage, the FSC should have created a diverse pool of applicants, reviewed and evaluated all external letters of recommendation, and identified the strengths and weaknesses of all candidates. The FSC will have arranged for on-site interviews for those under serious consideration, completed all necessary documentation on the search, and

recommended candidates for final selection by the Chair with approval by the Dean of the College.

Subsequent to candidate interviews, the department will hold a faculty meeting in which the FSC will summarize each candidate's strengths and weaknesses to the faculty. The eligible faculty whose TIU is CBC will be offered the opportunity to cast a vote in support of each candidate. Strong consensus (defined as at least 2/3 positive response by the voting faculty) in favor of a candidate will be required for making an offer. The Chair will conduct all negotiations with faculty candidates. Potential joint appointments in other departments will be negotiated by the chair.

7. If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible voting faculty members vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. In both instances, two-thirds of the eligible faculty must vote yes or no, and of those votes two-thirds must be positive for the senior rank or prior service credit to be approved. All offers at the Associate Professor and Professor ranks, and all offers of prior service credit require the prior approval of the college and of the appropriate individual in the Office of Academic Affairs. This approval will be sought by the Chair.
8. In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the department chair decides which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the department chair.
9. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs (OIA). A foreign national who does not have H-1B status or permanent residency must be offered an appointment contingent upon receipt of one or the other. Visiting appointments as an alternative to tenure track appointments for foreign nationals should only be made in special circumstances and after consultation with OIA.
10. Joint appointments may only be made through a consultative process requiring faculty vote. Duties for such appointees will be specified in a memorandum of understanding.

2. Tenure-track Regional Campus Faculty

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

A short list of not more than five candidates will be chosen by the committee. Those candidates will be invited to meet faculty and make a public seminar at both at the regional campus and the Columbus campus. Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, department chair, department eligible faculty and regional campus search committee. The chair of the search committee will seek opinions of all faculty involved in the interviews.

On completion of the interviews, the committee will provide a description of the preferred candidate(s) to the faculty of the department at the Columbus campus. An appointment vote on the candidates by the eligible department faculty will occur. The same quorum and appointment rules for Columbus-based tenure-track faculty will be applied to these decisions. The results of the vote and the candidate's curriculum vitae will be reported to the College of Arts and Sciences and also to the regional dean. A decision to make an offer requires a positive vote by the tenure-track faculty of the department, the department chair, regional campus dean, and the executive dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the department chair, the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and the regional campus dean.

The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document.

3. Associated Faculty

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

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department. The proposal is considered at a faculty meeting and if approved by the eligible faculty (at least two-thirds positive vote of faculty whose TIU is CBC), the department chair extends an offer.

Associated faculty appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter period is appropriate to the circumstances. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Adjunct appointments may be renewed only when the academic service for which the appointment was made continues.

Visiting appointments are limited to three consecutive years at 100% FTE.

Senior Lecturer appointments are typically multi-year, while lecturer appointments are usually made on an annual or term-by-term basis.

Associated faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for tenure track faculty (see PROMOTION AND

TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS below), with the exception that the review does not proceed to the College of Arts and Sciences if the department chair's recommendation is negative, and does not proceed to the university level if the dean's recommendation is negative.

Adjunct status will automatically be recommended for one year by the chair to faculty who resign from the University but have graduate students finishing research projects in the Department.

4. Courtesy Appointments

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 faculty meeting. The candidate will generally present an open seminar to the department faculty. If the proposal is approved by the eligible faculty, the department chair extends an offer of appointment. The chair and FAC review courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified, and the chair takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular faculty meeting.

Sample uncompensated service/teaching justifying courtesy appointments:

- 5 formal hours of lecture/year
- Service on faculty search committees
- Service on other committees (e.g., strategic planning, graduate recruiting)
- Contributing to collaborative (center) grant applications
- Developing summer workshops that benefit our research and teaching missions
- Representing the department on OSBP committees

V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW PROCEDURES

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the [Faculty Annual Review Policy](#), which stipulates that such reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting as well as a written assessment.

The annual performance and merit review of every faculty member is based on expected performance in teaching, research, and service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties and responsibilities in the Pattern of Administration; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.

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

the file.

An annual written performance review that looks both at past accomplishments and future promise is mandated for every tenure-track faculty member. The purpose of such a review is to assist faculty in improving professional productivity through candid and constructive feedback and through the development of professional development plans that meet the joint needs of the department and the faculty member. The broad objectives of this annual meeting include:

- Establish the goals and metrics against which faculty performance will be assessed in the foreseeable future.
- Document faculty performance in the achievement of previously stated goals and metrics in order to determine salary increases and other resource allocations, progress toward promotion and in the event of poor performance, the need for remedial steps.
- In addition, annual reviews and fourth-year reviews for probationary tenure-track faculty serve to monitor progress toward tenure and determine whether the probationary appointment will be continued for another year or terminated, subject to the relevant standards of notice.

A. Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to the Department Chair no later than February 1:

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

Other documentation for the annual performance and merit review will be the same as that for consideration for promotion and/or tenure. That documentation is described in Section VI of this document.

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

B. Probationary tenure-track faculty

At the time of appointment, probationary tenure-track faculty members shall be provided with all the pertinent documents detailing the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry promotion and tenure policies and criteria. If these documents are revised during the probationary period, probationary faculty are provided copies of the revised documents. Each

probationary faculty member is reviewed by three separate groups each year (mentoring committee, committee of eligible faculty, and the FAC).

The members of the FAC review the annual reports of every faculty member in the department (assistant professors, associate professors, and professors for both the Columbus campus and the regional campuses). This review is based on the faculty member's annual report as well as those for the last three years. This review is thorough and typically occurs within three – four meetings in February and March. The Chair and the VCR take notes during this review and also ask questions during the FAC's review. The Chair is responsible for writing the draft reviews of the junior faculty while the VCR writes the draft reviews of the senior faculty.

The members of the Committee of Eligible Faculty meet during the spring semester (typically March) to review the progress of the junior faculty. For each junior faculty member, the chair of the mentoring committee of his/her designee leads the discussion with mentoring committee's annual review. The chair of the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee takes notes during this meeting. During the meeting the Committee of Eligible Faculty also provides opinions to the P and T subcommittee on junior faculty who are ready for promotion based on their performance. The chair of the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee forwards a written performance review to the department chair with recommendations of potential candidates for promotion. The promotion and tenure subcommittee also works with the chairs of the mentoring committees to make certain that there is follow through on key decisions on mentoring and advocacy.

The department chair conducts an independent assessment of performance; meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and, as appropriate, future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

If the department chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The department chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The department chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the divisional dean of the college. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments, if he or she chooses).

If the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)) is invoked. This process is also described in the PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURES section of this document. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

1. Regional tenure track faculty members

The annual performance and merit review of the probationary faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then moves to the Department and proceeds as described above. The regional faculty members are included in same annual evaluation as the Columbus faculty. They have a similar support structure too as described below. The review of the regional faculty focuses primarily on research performance unless he/she is also teaching on the Columbus campus. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the Department, the Department Chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

2. Assistant Professor Mentoring Committees

The Chair will appoint an advisory committee of three tenured faculty members for each assistant professor. Members of this committee will assist in proposal reviews before submission, visit the assistant professor's classroom and provide oral and written advice on improvements in classroom instructional efforts. In addition, the members of the committee will study the annual report and publications of the assistant professor to provide further recommendations. This committee, or the committee's designee, will discuss the progress of the assistant professor annually at the spring meeting of the Committee of Eligible Faculty.

3. Fourth Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluations are not solicited and the executive dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. The outcome of the review will decide first whether the candidate will continue in a tenure-track position beyond the fifth year. Second, the review may provide as guidance regarding the expectations of the department for the probationary faculty member who is continued but would give him/her sufficient time before the mandatory sixth year review. Since this department follows fourth-year review procedures for all annual reviews of probationary tenure track faculty, no modifications are required for the fourth- year. However, at the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

4. Exclusion of time from probationary appointments

Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#) (D) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period. Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

C. Tenured Faculty

Associate Professors are reviewed annually by the members of the FAC and the Committee of Eligible Faculty as described above in VA. The mentor meets annually with the associate professor before the meeting of the Committee of Eligible Faculty.

In consultation with the FAC, VCR, VCG and VCU, the chair conducts an independent assessment; 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 opt to provide written comments on the review.

Professors are reviewed annually by the chair in consultation with the FAC, VCR, VCG and VCU (see section VA1 of this document). The 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. On completion of the review, the department chair prepares a written assessment on the faculty member's performance and future plans and goals. The faculty member may opt to provide written comments on the review.

The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the Department, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the Department, the University, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty.

If a professor has an administrative role, the impact of that role and other assignments will be considered in the annual review.

The VCR, VCG and VCU will be reviewed annually by the chair, with input from the FAC.

D. Tenured Faculty - Regional Campus

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

E. Associated Faculty

Annual review of the associated faculty member with tenure-track title is conducted as described above for tenure-track faculty, but with a focus on teaching and service. The chair meets with each associated faculty member with tenure-track title annually to discuss performance specifically in scholarship. The VCU will provide an annual review of the lecturers and senior lecturers. The VCU will meet with the lecturer to discuss this review and also provide the review to the chair and the FAC.

F. Courtesy Faculty

Every three years, the chair will request from courtesy appointees a copy of their regular annual report, updated biosketch, and brief description of activities undertaken over the last three years, and plans for the next three years. The chair and FAC will review these documents during the regular annual review process for all faculty. In case of a favorable review, the appointment is extended another three years. If the FAC and chair decide to recommend against renewal, this is voted on and discussed at a regular faculty meeting.

G. Salary Recommendations

It is the responsibility of the Chair to recommend merit, equity, excellence, and market based raises to the Executive Dean or designee, who may modify them. Merit pay increases are based on the three-year average performance of the faculty during the immediate three-year period. Equity, excellence, and market raises will be used to redress inequities in the salary of individuals or groups of faculty when these are discovered relative to peer groups, or to retain outstanding faculty members. The recommendation of the Chair will follow consultation with the VCA, VCG, VCU and the FAC, and if warranted, an external advisory committee.

Specific merit raises will be based on a weighting of teaching, service, and research as detailed below. At the discretion of the Chair, the weightings of these categories may vary between individuals, to reward extraordinary accomplishment in a particular area.

1. Teaching

Teaching performance will be based on student evaluation of instruction and additional information, including mentoring in research, curriculum development, and success of a faculty member's students. This information should be provided by the individual faculty as part of the faculty member's annual report. Probationary faculty members are directed to maintain a teaching portfolio. The portfolio will contain copies of syllabi, handouts, examinations and quizzes used in courses taught by the probationary faculty member. The teaching portfolio will be submitted for peer review at the time of fourth and sixth year reviews. Senior faculty will periodically monitor the classroom teaching of probationary faculty and will communicate their opinions to the chair. The chair may use peer review of the teaching portfolio and classroom teaching as part of any annual review.

Teaching performance of senior faculty will be assessed through student and peer review of instruction.

Teaching and mentoring of graduate students within a research group is evidenced by timely progression of students to graduation, to the publication of their work in peer-reviewed journals, and their meaningful employment upon graduation.

2. Service

Ratings will be based on information provided in the annual report and performance information provided by the committee chair. Faculty who are making major service contributions to the college and university are invited to document these efforts and obtain letters of support from the university administration.

3. Research

Candidates will be held to a very high standard of excellence in their area of individual scholarship based on the norms of their area. The faculty of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry are expected to lead research groups containing a mixture of undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral students. The new knowledge produced by this research should lead students to graduation in a timely fashion, to publication in high-impact, peer-reviewed journals, and to meaningful professional employment upon graduation. The research must be supported by significant external funding and enhance the international reputation of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry. Performance in research is measured by a variety of quality indicators, including the impact factor of the journal in which work is published, Hirsch-index, the frequency of citation of published work, invited lectureships, funding levels, and other appropriate information.

Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation (see Section V-A above) for an annual performance and merit review at the required time will receive no salary increase in the year for which documentation was not provided, except in extenuating circumstances, and may not expect to recoup the foregone raise at a later time.

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

VI. PROMOTION & TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

A. Criteria

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

In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and

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

In the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, excellence in research will be given the highest priority in evaluating tenure-track faculty performance. Excellence in teaching and service are required for promotion.

1. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure

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

The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a scholar, and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the university. Examples of criteria and types of documentation that demonstrate impact and show that criteria have been met are provided below.

Teaching. Candidates must demonstrate a high quality of teaching at all levels, including high-enrollment undergraduate course(s), and graduate course(s). Mentoring graduate students and leading to their completion of an advanced degree, training undergraduate students in the research laboratory, as well as serving as a member of student exam committees, such as undergraduate thesis defense, PhD candidacy, PhD or MS defenses, and annual graduate student review. Peer review of teaching, descriptions of curriculum development, completion of University Institute of Teaching training modules, and distinctions of students mentored can be used to document that the candidate has met the department standards of teaching. Student evaluations of teaching may also be used, yet only as one data point, given the well documented bias of such evaluations in published literature.

Service. Candidates must demonstrate service to the university and to the professional community. Service as an active member of one or more departmental committees, such as graduate admissions, graduate recruiting, safety, or publicity, or coordinating divisional seminars, represent activities that demonstrate service to the university. Demonstration of service to the professional community may include reviewing manuscripts for high impact scientific journals and major proposals as part of the

peer-review process, participation as a member of the editorial board of a major journal, organizing symposia at a national/international meeting, or service in a formal role in a professional society.

Scholarship/Research. Candidates must demonstrate national visibility, a high level of productivity, the creation of an independent body of independent research, and must have contributed substantively to new knowledge in their field. Publications in peer-reviewed journals and their impact (based on journal impact factor and citations), invitations to present their work at national/international conferences and at major universities, and major funding from federal agencies to support their research efforts are considered valuable metrics in the evaluation process. Collaborative works and funding should clearly indicate the contribution from the candidate. External faculty experts will aid in the evaluation of whether the candidate has met the criteria in this area.

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

The award of tenure is a commitment of lifetime employment. It is therefore essential to evaluate and judge the probability that faculty, once tenured, will continue to develop professionally and contribute to the department's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university.

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

Excellence in teaching, research, 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](#).

The accomplishments listed above are expected of faculty for promotion to associate professor with tenure. In the evaluation of untenured associate professors for tenure that can result from external hires, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

2. Promotion to Rank of Professor

According to Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) (C):

Promotion to the rank of professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in teaching; has produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated leadership in service, both within the university and in his/her area of scholarship. The faculty member will contribute in a significantly positive manner to the external reputation of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry.

In addition, a Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry faculty member who is ready for promotion to professor should serve as a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. He/she should also be a good citizen of the Department and the University.

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

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

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

3. Alternative Path to Promotion to Professor

In reviewing promotion from associate professor to professor, the department will be receptive to cases in which the faculty member has demonstrated excellence in teaching or in areas of scholarship outside traditional research. Correspondingly, less weight will be placed on original research. For a faculty member to be promoted under such circumstances, the contributions in other areas must be substantial and of high quality, as demonstrated by recognition at local and national levels. External letters documenting the quality of this work will be sought.

4. Regional Campus Faculty

Qualifications for each candidate for promotion and tenure whose service has been rendered wholly or for the most part at one of the regional campuses shall be evaluated according to the following criteria:

- quality of performance in assigned instructional activities, formal and informal, and within and outside of the classroom and laboratory
- quality and level of research
- quality and level of activities in service to his/her local academic community and to the wider community of teachers and scholars.

The tripartite mission of the university requires excellence in teaching, research, and service. However, the mission of the regional campuses is sufficiently different from the Columbus campus to require an explicit awareness of these differences in the design of the review criteria. Reviews of regional campus faculty must take into account the differences in the relative importance of the teaching, research, and service components between the regional campuses and the Columbus campus. For regional campus faculty, relatively more weight will be given to the teaching and service missions than would be the case for a Columbus campus candidate.

Teaching. Regional campus faculty spend a much larger percentage of their time teaching than Columbus colleagues. They are usually responsible for, and conduct, all aspects of the course: lecture, recitation, and laboratory. Some regional campuses do not have stockroom assistants. Teaching is exclusively with undergraduates, usually freshmen and sophomores. Student evaluation of instruction (SEI), written student comments, and campus peer evaluation data are all appropriate instruments for the evaluation of teaching. Regional campus probationary faculty will be encouraged to teach occasionally on the Columbus campus to facilitate peer review and to foster a sense of community.

Research and Scholarly Activity. Professional development on the regional campus requires a broader, more flexible definition. Less than optimal laboratory and library resources, limited access to graduate students and few uninterrupted blocks of time necessarily limit the type of research problems which can be studied. Expectation of the quantity (but not quality) of scholarly activity will be adjusted to reflect the regional campus culture. Collaborative work with Columbus campus colleagues, pedagogical research, and development of teaching materials are all legitimate avenues of scholarly activity for regional campus faculty. The chair will facilitate collaborative research between regional and Columbus campus faculty whenever possible.

Service. Regional campus faculty members are expected to take a very active role in campus citizenship. Service to the profession, public service, and outreach activities related to the profession are legitimate roles for regional campus faculty.

B. Procedures: Columbus Campus

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) and the Office of Academic Affairs' annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty tracks in the department.

1. Candidate Responsibilities

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

Candidates must submit a copy of the department's APT Document under which they wish to be reviewed. Candidates may submit the Department's current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion, whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year. This must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the department.

If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing, upon request by the department chair, the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair and the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The department chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS below.) Under no circumstances should a candidate solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

2. Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee Responsibilities

The department has a Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee, consisting of a Chair, Procedures and Oversight Designee (POD), and an ad hoc member selected based on disciplinary knowledge and rank of the candidate under review; the Chair and POD must be professors, while the ad hoc member must have a higher rank than the candidate. The subcommittee's chair and membership are appointed by the department chair and the term of service is three years, with reappointment possible. The subcommittee Chair and POD discharge the following responsibilities:

- To review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to

the faculty.

- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non- mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the subcommittee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
- The subcommittee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non- mandatory review.
- A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) for one year. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
- Consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policy, only faculty who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non-mandatory tenure review. The subcommittee must confirm with the department chair that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident (has a "green card"). Faculty not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.
- A decision by the subcommittee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the Committee of Eligible Faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn term, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
- **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair.
- **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
- Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not

an occasion to debate the candidate's record.

- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, research and service to provide to the full Committee of Eligible Faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The subcommittee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.
- Revise the draft analysis of each case following the faculty meeting, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
- Provide a written response, on behalf of the Committee of Eligible Faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure initiating unit is another department. The full Committee of Eligible Faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure initiating unit substantially earlier than the Committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

3. Committee of Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

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

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

4. Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- Where relevant, to verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a non- mandatory review for tenure, and tenure may not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is

established. Faculty not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.

- **Late Spring:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee, the chair and the candidate. (Also see EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS below.)
- To solicit an evaluation from a TIU head of any TIU in which the candidate has a joint appointment.
- To solicit an evaluation from a Discovery Theme director with which the candidate is associated.
- To make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the Committee of Eligible Faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.

To attend the meetings of the committee of eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.

- **Mid-Autumn:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the Committee of Eligible Faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the Committee of Eligible Faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
 - Of the recommendations by the Committee of Eligible Faculty and department chair
 - Of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the Committee of Eligible Faculty and department chair
 - Of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.

- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline, except in the case of associated faculty for whom the department chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases.
- To receive the Committee of Eligible Faculty's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the department chair of the other tenure initiating unit by the date requested.

5. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

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

The regional campus dean/director forwards the written evaluation and recommendation of the regional campus review to the department chair, from which point the review follows the procedures described for the Columbus campus faculty.

6. Procedures for Promotion and Change in Appointment Type for Associated Faculty

Dossiers are sent to external evaluators whose opinions are solicited. Those opinions and the body of work of the associated faculty member in question are used to evaluate the case for promotion. Associated faculty, emeritus faculty, and faculty who are joint appointees with TIUs in another department with at least a 30% appointment in the CBC may not participate and are not eligible to vote in personnel matters, including promotion and tenure.

Associated Assistant Professors

Associated faculty with tenure-track titles follow the same clock as tenure track faculty for promotion from Assistant to Associate professor, that is to say a decision on promotion should occur within six years of the beginning of the promotion time clock. A negative decision would not typically lead to termination in employment. Instead, the appointment would be changed from a split faculty- staff position to a full time staff position. The change in appointment would lead to an appropriate redistribution of teaching/service activities commensurate with the responsibilities of the new position. Going forward their appointment would be managed as any other staff member.

Associated Associate Professors

Once an associated faculty member achieves the rank of Associated Associate Professor he /she is entitled to keep the associated faculty status as long as he/she is employed in the department. However, if an associated faculty member is not meeting the expectations for externally recognized scholarship/research activity, as determined in the course of their annual review, he/she will be placed on a one-year appointment to correct the deficiency. At the end of this period if the chair, in consultation with the associated faculty mentoring committee, feels that the associated faculty member is still not meeting expectations, his/her job duties will be restructured so that the time that was set aside for research/scholarship is used to meet additional duties.

Associated Professors

With continued scholarly activity, Associated Associate Professors are eligible for promotion to Associated Professor. Promotion from Associated Associate Professor to Associated Professor would follow similar guidelines to the equivalent tenure track faculty process for promotion to Professor.

7. External Evaluations

External evaluations of research and scholarly activity are obtained for all promotion reviews. These include all tenure track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews, and the promotion reviews of all associated faculty with tenure-track titles.

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's research (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or 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 only solicit evaluations from professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and/or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters are sought as are required, and they are solicited no later

than the end of the spring semester prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

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

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs [suggested format](#) for letters requesting external evaluations.

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

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

C. Dossier

As noted above under CANDIDATE RESPONSIBILITIES, every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. While the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee 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.

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

The time period for scholarship documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to present. All scholarship outcomes will be reviewed for evidence of increasing

independence over time, and an upward trajectory of significant scholarly outcomes over time.

The time period for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to present.

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

- Any published materials presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or other final form that documents actual publication. An author's manuscript does not document publication.
- Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

1. Teaching

a. Considerations

The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry has a broad teaching mission. This includes introductory basic education courses, special Chemistry and Biochemistry courses for professional students, four undergraduate major curricula, and extensive graduate offerings in which instruction in scholarly research is of utmost importance. In addition, faculty may participate in interdisciplinary teaching efforts and professional programs in other departments or outside the university. All of these teaching efforts will be considered in Annual Reports and in the promotion and tenure review.

Contributions to the teaching program such as the development of new learning resources, the development of a new course or instructional laboratory experiment will also be evaluated. It is understood that the strengths of individual faculty will vary, and particular success in one category may balance perceived deficiencies in others.

Teaching Quality encompasses the breadth and depth of the courses and course content for which the faculty member accepts teaching responsibility and the effectiveness with which knowledge is communicated to the students. Peer evaluation will be the primary basis upon which success in these endeavors shall be measured.

Success in directing the research of graduate and undergraduate students under the faculty member's supervision must be considered in the evaluation

of teaching effectiveness. Evidence of success in this form of teaching is demonstrated by publication of student research in high impact peer reviewed journals, timely progress of students to graduation and to appropriate employment and or additional training of the student upon graduation. The chair may solicit letters of evaluation from current and former graduate and undergraduate students and teaching assistants to measure the effectiveness of the faculty member in leading student research.

b. Documentation

Examples of documentation include:

- cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class or departmentally approved reports
- peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in Section X of this document)
- list of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.
- candidate's Self-Evaluation. This includes a statement of the instructor's approach to and goals for teaching, self assessment, and description of specific strategies for improvement—past, current, and planned. The self-evaluation should be included in the annual report prepared by the faculty member.
- other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.

2. Research and Scholarship

a. Considerations

A faculty member is expected to develop a coherent program of independent research which serves to create new chemical and/or biochemical knowledge, and to provide a vehicle for instruction of graduate students in their Thesis or Dissertation work. Of primary importance for the favorable evaluation of the faculty member's research efforts are significant contributions to published chemical knowledge that can be attributed to the research programs directed by the faculty member. Engagement with business entrepreneurship, including (but not limited to) invention disclosures, patents, corporate licensing, startup

companies, and other business activities, is also valued.

- Collaborative Research

Faculty engage in both wholly independent and collaborative research. Independent research is defined as that conducted primarily (but not necessarily exclusively) on the Columbus campus of The Ohio State University with undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral students. Faculty do not collaborate with students, rather they instruct and mentor them. Collaborative research is defined as research conducted with at least one other faculty member at The Ohio State University or at another institution, or with a senior scientist in an academic, government, or industrial laboratory. Collaborative research may or may not involve students. Research conducted solely with OSU undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral students is considered as independent research.

To be considered for promotion and tenure, faculty must demonstrate excellence in either independent or collaborative research. This is documented by independent publications and/or significant independent contributions to collaborative publications in peer-reviewed journals, being the principal investigator on externally funded grant applications, and by invited lectures and presentations.

The importance of collaborative research is increasing because of the rising costs of scientific research, pressures from federal funding agencies, increasing specialization and complexity of research instrumentation and techniques, and a trend towards interdisciplinary research. The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry is reluctant to recommend for promotion and tenure a faculty member engaged solely in collaborative research unless there is a clear demonstration that the faculty member has made a significant independent contribution to that research. The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry will recommend for promotion and tenure only those candidates who have demonstrated excellence in independent research and/or clearly independent contributions to collaborative research.

- b. Documentation

Examples of documentation include:

- Copies of all scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed.
- Documentation of grants submitted and contracts received, including

outcome of review for unfunded applications. Documentation of invention disclosures, submitted and awarded patents, options and commercial licenses.

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

Candidates for promotion and tenure must be able to document unambiguously their unique, independent contribution to a collaborative research project. Thus, candidates will footnote their co-authors on each publication cited in their dossier as follows:

- a. OSU undergraduate
- b. OSU graduate student
- c. OSU postdoctoral student
- d. OSU faculty collaborator
- e. non-OSU student
- f. non-OSU collaborator

For each publication with a collaborator, the candidate will provide a short explanation of his or her independent contribution to the work and an indication of the importance of that contribution to the overall intellectual significance of the work. At his/her discretion, the chair may solicit a letter from each collaborator asking him/her to detail his/her contributions and those of the candidate to the published work.

For collaborative research grants on which the candidate is listed as a co-principal investigator, the candidate should clearly document his/her unique role in the proposed program of work, his/her unique contribution to the preparation of the proposal, and the fraction of the funding that will, or has been, administered by him/her for work carried out independently in his/her laboratory. At his/her discretion, the chair may solicit a letter from each collaborator asking him/her to detail his/her contributions and those of the candidate to the design of the program of study, the preparation of the proposal, and the administration of funds.

3. Service

a. Considerations

Each faculty member has a responsibility to render service to the department, university, the profession, and the university community including other local and regional educational institutions and to the chemical and biochemical industries.

Service includes work done or duties performed for others, including faculty governance of the department, college and university, administrative and student services at all levels within the university and professional services to government, industry and professional associations. The amount of involvement and perceived importance of service activities will be considered during review for promotion and tenure, and for annual raises. The chair, at his/her discretion, may solicit letters documenting service performed outside the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry.

b. Documentation

Examples of documentation include:

- any available documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier

VII. APPEALS

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

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

This rule requires candidates who believe that they have been improperly evaluated to seek to resolve the matter informally before filing a formal appeal under that rule. The department level appeal will be heard by the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee.

VIII. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS

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

IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of an approved evaluation form is required in every course offered in the department. This individual should encourage a high completion rate by explaining to the class the significance of the evaluation. When a small proportion of the class completes the evaluation, the resulting information has little value either for improving instruction or for performance evaluation.

a. Departmentally Approved Forms

1. Student Evaluation of Instruction

Student evaluation of teaching data is an important instrument that can be used to measure student satisfaction and to uncover ineffective teaching methods. Students in all courses taught in the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry will evaluate teaching using the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI). Faculty may supplement the mandated student evaluation of teaching form with their own forms in any course offering.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The department chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process. In the spring semester, the department chair will request from the chair of the mentoring committee of each assistant and associate professor a schedule that includes who will be peer reviewed during the next academic year and who will provide the reviews. The assistant professors should be reviewed by their peers at least five times before the evaluation for promotion and tenure. The associate professors must be reviewed at least twice before consideration for promotion. The professors should have peer review of their lectures a minimum of every five years.

These reviewers should have the following goals:

- to review the teaching of probationary tenure track faculty at least once per year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over the probationary period
- to review the teaching of tenured associate professors generally once per year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a three year period
- to review the teaching of tenured professors at least once every five years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review.
- to review, 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 [Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#).

Reviews conducted upon the request of the department chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the chair or faculty member.

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 (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. As part of the review copies of the faculty member's student evaluation summaries from recent years, and where student opinion is mixed to negative, the reviewer is to ascertain the reasons. Each review should result in a written report to the department chair, copied to the faculty member. The faculty member may provide written comments on this report. All are appended to the report for inclusion in the faculty member's promotion and tenure dossier, unless the faculty member requests that the comments be excluded.

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

1. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Peer evaluation of teaching will include analysis of the teaching portfolio of the candidate. The teaching portfolio will include course materials such as syllabi, exams, quizzes, handouts and other instructional materials including textbooks. Evaluations will include internal review of contributions to curriculum and observations of classroom teaching, the development of a new instructional laboratory experiment or the maintenance of an instructional laboratory. Peer review will also include classroom visitations by senior faculty. Reviewers and times of reviews will be selected by the chair or the chair's designee. The letter of evaluation will indicate whether or not the instructor had advance warning of the evaluation visit.

The following information will be included in the evaluation report:

1. Name of instructor
2. Name and number of course being evaluated
3. Academic term and date of evaluation
4. Name of evaluator
5. Number of lectures/lab sessions attended by the evaluator.

The following topics should be addressed in the report:

Subject matter, organization, clarity, and pace of presentation; mechanics of presentation (voice, volume, speed, mannerisms); use of multi-media teaching aids (demonstrations, PowerPoint slides, animations, etc.); student interactions and innovations in teaching methods (questions/answers, clickers, active learning strategies); syllabus, handouts, and examinations (if available); suggestions for improvements.

The chair may seek other measures of the teaching effectiveness of the candidate. These could include assessment of the success of the candidate's former students and post-docs, the extent to which pedagogical materials developed by the candidate are used by other faculty here and at other institutions, the extent to which the candidate is invited to provide expertise on teaching, teaching awards, evidence of student learning based on testing or other forms of evaluation, and other innovations in instruction that enhance learning.