

**DEPARTMENT OF
EVOLUTION, ECOLOGY, AND ORGANISMAL BIOLOGY**

**APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE
OAA Approved 7/26/2018**

CONTENTS

I Preamble.....	4
II Department Mission.....	4
III Definitions.....	5
A Committee of the Eligible Faculty.....	5
1 Tenure-Track Faculty	5
2 Research Faculty.....	5
3 Conflict of Interest.....	5
4 Minimum Composition.....	6
B Quorum	6
C Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty (CEF).....	6
Appointment	6
Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal	6
IV Appointments	6
A Criteria	7
1 Tenure-Track Faculty	7
2 Tenure-Track Faculty—Regional Campus.....	8
3 Tenure Track Faculty—Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments	8
4 Research Faculty.....	8
5 Associated Faculty.....	9
6 Courtesy Appointments for Tenure-Track and Research Faculty	10
B Procedures.....	10
1 Tenure Track Faculty.....	10
2 Tenure Track Faculty—Regional Campus	12
3 Tenure Track Faculty—Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments	13

4	Research Faculty.....	13
5	Transfer of Track	13
6	Associated Faculty.....	14
7	Courtesy Appointments for Tenure-track and Research Faculty	14
8	Emeritus Appointments for Tenure-track and Research Faculty	14
V	Annual Reviews—Procedures	15
A	Probationary Tenure Track Faculty	15
1	Probationary Tenure Track Faculty—Regional Campus	16
2	Probationary Tenure Track Faculty—Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments	16
3	Fourth-Year Review	16
4	Exclusion of Time From the Probationary Period.....	16
B	Tenured Faculty	17
1	Tenured Faculty—Regional Campus	17
2	Tenured Faculty—Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments.....	17
C	Research Faculty	17
D	Associated Faculty.....	18
VI	Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards	18
A	Criteria	18
B	Procedures.....	18
C	Documentation.....	19
D	Regional Campus Faculty.....	19
E	Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments.....	20
VII	Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	20
A	Criteria	20
1	Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	20
2	Promotion to Professor	22
3	Regional Campus Faculty.....	23
4	Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments	24
5	Research Faculty.....	24
6	Associated Faculty.....	24
B	Procedures.....	24

1 Candidate Responsibilities	24
2 Committee of Eligible Faculty Responsibilities	25
3 Department Chair Responsibilities	27
4 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty	28
5 Procedures for Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments.....	28
6 External Evaluations.....	28
C Documentation.....	30
Teaching	30
Scholarship	31
Service	31
VIII Appeals	32
IX Seventh-Year Reviews	33
X Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching	33
A Student Evaluation of Teaching.....	33
B Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	33
1 University Policy on Peer Evaluation of Teaching	33
2 Types of Peer Evaluation of Teaching	34
Probationary Faculty.....	36
Post-Tenure Faculty.....	36
Addendum: What Is Good Teaching?	37
Appendix: EEOB Mentoring Guidelines.....	38

This document was approved by the faculty of the Department of Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology on May 10, 2018.

I Preamble

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

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

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

II Department Mission

The mission of the Department of Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology (henceforth, the department) is to discover, derive, and disseminate an understanding of biodiversity. This includes understanding how evolutionary and ecological processes create variation and pattern in organisms, populations, species, communities, and ecosystems as well as the effects of interactions among that diversity. We fulfill this mission through research and teaching; through collaborations across disciplines; in the context of laboratory, museum, field, and modeling studies; and from molecular to global scales. We are dedicated to the application of our basic research to solving applied local and global problems and to promoting understanding of the natural world; we have a rich tradition of blending basic and applied research. Our faculty and staff strive to produce the highest quality research and to prepare a diverse population of excellent scientists, leaders, and well-informed citizens through undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral education and public outreach. We strive for leadership in our scholarly disciplines combined with excellence in the classroom. To those ends, our service to the university and the

community is built on the strength of a diverse, collegial workplace and the free flow of ideas.

As necessary components of this mission, the department is committed to continuous improvement through regular scrutiny of the undergraduate and graduate curricula; the hiring of tenure-track faculty and other personnel who enhance or have the strong potential to enhance the department's quality in the areas of teaching, research, and service; the recruitment and retention of a diverse workforce and student body; the creation of a welcoming climate in regard to diversity; and the development and maintenance of a physical and intellectual environment that fosters those activities.

III Definitions

A Committee of the Eligible Faculty

1 Tenure-Track Faculty

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

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

For tenure reviews of probationary professors, eligible faculty are tenured professors whose tenure resides in the department excluding the department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President.

2 Research Faculty

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of research faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty whose tenure resides in the department, and all research faculty whose primary appointment is in the department.

The eligible faculty for reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of research faculty consists of all tenured faculty of equal rank to or higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in the Department, and all non-probationary research faculty whose primary appointment is in the Department excluding the Department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President.

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 (e.g., dissertation advisor), or has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an objective review of the candidate's work is not possible. Generally, faculty members who have collaborated with a candidate on at least 50% of the candidate's published work since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of that candidate.

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 consulting with the divisional dean, will appoint one or more faculty members from another unit within the college for the review so that the minimum number of three can be reached.

B Quorum

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

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

C Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty (CEF)

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

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted.

Appointment: A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast are positive.

Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal: A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast are positive.

IV Appointments

Types of faculty appointments in EEOB include tenure-track faculty, research faculty, and

associated faculty, the latter including visiting faculty, lecturers, and adjunct faculty.

A Criteria

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

With respect to appointments that include an instructional role, EEOB is consistent with OAA policy in that instructors must possess an academic degree that is at least one level above the level at which they teach. Graduate-level courses must be taught by Graduate Faculty.

1 Tenure-Track Faculty

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

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the Executive Dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate, since prior service credit cannot be revoked without a formal request for an extension of the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the possibility of being considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor. The minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor is an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in a relevant area of the biological sciences or related discipline, teaching or equivalent experience, evidence of having brought research through to completion as publications in peer-reviewed outlets, and the potential to obtain extramural funding in support of a productive research program. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Committee of the Eligible Faculty determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked without a

formal request for an extension of the probationary period.

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. The individual will normally be a nationally or internationally recognized researcher with a high-quality body of scholarship, demonstrated excellence in teaching undergraduate and graduate students, and demonstrated excellence in service/outreach to their profession and field as well as to the university. 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 or tenure, if appropriate, but the university does not 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 rank to teaching experience and quality. Nevertheless, faculty are expected to conduct an active research program.

3 Tenure Track Faculty—Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments

The criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty holding less than 100% full time equivalent appointments in EEOB are the same as those for other tenure-track faculty.

4 Research Faculty

Appointment of research faculty entails one- to five-year contracts. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to research faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. For contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see [Faculty Rule 3335-7](#). The primary duty of research faculty is to conduct research.

Research Assistant Professor. Appointment at the rank of research assistant professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and a record of high-quality publications that strongly indicate the ability to sustain an independent, externally funded research program.

Research Associate Professor and Research Professor. Appointment at the rank of research associate professor or research professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria for promotion to these ranks.

Appointments at the rank of research assistant professor require approval of the College of Arts and Sciences. Appointments at the rank of research associate professor or research professor require approval of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs.

5 Associated Faculty

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a few weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. With the exception of visiting faculty, associated faculty may be reappointed.

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct appointments may be non-compensated or compensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give considerable uncompensated or compensated 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. The initial appointment for a lecturer should generally not exceed one year.

Senior Lecturer. Appointment as Senior Lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a doctorate in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction; or a Master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience with documentation of high quality. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion.

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

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 a regular academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non tenure-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.

6 Courtesy Appointments for Tenure-Track and Research Faculty

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

B Procedures

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

- recruitment of tenure-track, clinical, and research faculty
- appointments at senior rank or with prior service credit
- hiring faculty from other institutions after April 30
- appointment of foreign nationals
- letters of offer

1 Tenure-Track Faculty

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

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

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

The department chair appoints a search committee consisting of four or more faculty who reflect

the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the Department. The committee's makeup is described in detail in the Department's Pattern of Administration.

Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo inclusive hiring practices training available through the College of Arts and Sciences in consultation with the Office of Diversity and Inclusion. Implicit bias training, also strongly encouraged, is available through the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity.

The search committee:

- Appoints a Diversity Advocate who is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants.
- Develops a search announcement for internal posting in the university job postings through the Office of Human Resources and external advertising, subject to the department chair's approval. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, or salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.
- Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must advertise using at least one 30-day online ad in a national professional journal. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency ("green card"), and strict U. S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their appointment to a tenure track position included an advertisement in a field-specific nationally prominent professional journal.
- Screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents to the full faculty a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. If the faculty agrees with this judgment, on-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the Department office. If the faculty does not agree, the Department chair in consultation with the faculty and Divisional Dean determines the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, cancel the search for the time being).
- Presents the proposed slate of on-campus interviewees for approval by the divisional dean for natural and mathematical sciences through the Arts and Sciences Faculty Search Diversity Recruitment Report (<https://ascintranet.osu.edu/faculty/recruitment-hiring>).

On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee, with graduate student, the department chair and the

Executive Dean, Divisional Dean or their designee. In addition, all candidates present a research seminar to the faculty and graduate students, and provide evidence of their ability to teach. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format.

At least one of the candidates invited to campus must contribute to increasing the diversity of the unit. If the search committee judges that in the pool of candidates there is no qualified person who can contribute to the diversity of the TIU, it will explain at a meeting of the faculty its efforts to attract a diverse pool of applicants and will describe the pool of applicants and the pool of finalists before asking the faculty to vote on inviting the finalists to campus for an interview. Vigorous efforts to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates are required.

Following completion of on-campus interviews, the eligible faculty and EEOB graduate student representative meet to discuss perceptions and preferences, vote on each candidate and rank those candidates judged acceptable. Attendance at meetings and voting via video conference link is permitted.

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs. After the department deliberations have been concluded, the chair will then contact the divisional dean to provide a summary of the interviews and recommendation for hiring. The position will be offered to the candidates in the order indicated by the ranking of acceptable candidates with approval by the dean.

Only members of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty and the appointed representative of GEES will vote on decisions regarding the filling of new positions. For faculty recommendations on initial appointment, the committee of the eligible faculty includes assistant professors. A second vote is taken when an appointment at senior rank is under consideration. Senior-rank faculty under consideration, regardless of type (tenure-track, research, associated) may be reviewed only by faculty of the rank at or above consideration (associate and professor for associate, and professor for professor).

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

2 Tenure-Track Faculty—Regional Campus

The regional campus has primary responsibility for determining the position description for a tenure-track faculty search, but the dean/director or designee consults with the department chair

to reach agreement on the description before the search begins. The regional campus search committee must include at least one representative from the department.

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, Executive Dean, divisional dean or designee, department chair, department eligible faculty and regional campus search committee. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. The committee will arrange for visits to the department, organize a research seminar to be given to the department, arrange personal interviews as appropriate with faculty colleagues and administrators, and make a recommendation to the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. At the end of the evaluation process, the Committee of the Eligible Faculty will vote to establish suitability of candidates and then to rank those judged to be suitable. The outcome of this voting will constitute a recommendation to the department chair and the Regional Campus dean/director. A decision to make an offer requires agreement by the department chair and regional campus dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin. The letter of offer must be signed by the department chair and the regional campus dean.

3 Tenure-Track Faculty—Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments

In the case of a tenure-track position where a 100% FTE appointment is split between EEOB and another unit, some of the appointment procedures vary from those for other tenure track positions. The search committee will comprise members of both EEOB and the joint hiring unit, the position description must be approved by both EEOB and the joint hiring unit, and both units must approve the candidates to be interviewed and any to be offered the position. The details of the appointment, including identification of the tenure initiating unit, the allocation of resources to salary and setup costs, the recovery of indirect costs and student enrollment credit hours generated by the faculty member, provision of space and administrative support, faculty rights and responsibilities, evaluation, and problem resolution will be spelled out in a memorandum of understanding to be approved and signed by both hiring units. Joint appointments require close coordination with the college(s) involved, as well as final approval of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) by the Office of Academic Affairs.

4 Research Faculty

Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure track faculty, with the difference that exceptions to a national search require approval only by the college executive dean.

5 Transfer of Track

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a research faculty appointment if appropriate circumstances exist. Tenure is lost upon transfer although rank is retained, and transfers must be approved by the department chair, the Executive Dean, and the Executive Vice President and Provost.

The request for transfer must be initiated by the faculty member in writing and must state clearly how the individual's career goals and activities have changed. Transfers from the research faculty to the tenure track are not permitted. Research faculty members may apply for tenure-track positions and compete in open national searches for such positions.

6 Associated Faculty

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

Associated 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. Appointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department. The proposal is considered at a departmental faculty meeting and if approved by the faculty, the department chair extends an offer. 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. Lecturer appointments are usually made on a term by term or annual basis.

Associated faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for regular faculty (see Appointment Criteria above), with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is negative, and does not proceed to the university level if the dean's recommendation is negative.

7 Courtesy Appointments for Tenure-track and Research Faculty

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track or research faculty member from another Ohio State department. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the faculty, the department chair extends an offer of appointment. The department chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

8 Emeritus Appointments for Tenure-track and Research Faculty

Retiring faculty initiate emeritus appointment requests using the [*Request for Emeritus Status Form*](#) (Form 207). Approval requires a majority positive vote by the eligible faculty. The request is forwarded to the divisional dean and then to the Board of Trustees for final approval. The request for emeritus status must be received by the BOT prior to the date at which the agenda is set for the last BOT meeting before the date of retirement if the prerequisites of emeritus status are

to become effective by that date.

V Annual Reviews—Procedures

The Department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the [Policy on Faculty Annual Review](#).

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

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

A Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed each Spring Semester by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. Copies of the probationary faculty members' Faculty Activity Reports, Dossier and SEIs are made available to the CEF. The CEF is convened and the individual cases are presented and discussed, after which a vote is taken by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

The CEF forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department chair. The 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 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 college office via a shared Box folder. 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 Fourth Year Review process (per [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03](#)) is invoked. This process is described below. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the executive dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

Annual peer evaluations of teaching will be conducted for all Columbus campus probationary faculty. See “Procedures for Peer Evaluation of Teaching” section of this document.

1 Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty—Regional Campus

Annual review of the probationary faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then moves to the department and proceeds as described above. The department review will focus on the candidate’s scholarly work, but will consider all aspects of his/her record. 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 Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty—Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments

Probationary faculty with less than 100% full time equivalent appointments in EEOB will be evaluated in the same fashion as other probationary faculty, with any exceptions to this guideline detailed in the approved memorandum of understanding for their appointment.

3 Fourth-Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period, a review is conducted that 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 CEF conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

The CEF forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department chair. The department chair conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per [Faculty Rule 3335-6-04](#)) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the Department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

4 Exclusion of Time From the Probationary Period

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

B Tenured Faculty

Associate Professors and Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair. Each year each tenured faculty member will provide the chair with a current curriculum vitae, an annual report summarizing recent professional activities, and evidence of teaching effectiveness, including student evaluations and peer reviews by tenured members of the faculty at equal or higher rank. The chair will review these documents and other evidence as may be required, including consultation, as necessary, with appropriate faculty. The chair will use all of this information as the basis for an annual performance review of each tenured member in their unit. The review process requires a face-to-face meeting with the department chair. On completion of the review, the chair prepares a written assessment on the faculty member's performance, progress towards promotion if appropriate, and future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

Annual peer evaluations of teaching will be conducted for all tenured Columbus campus faculty. See "Procedures for Peer Evaluation of Teaching" section of this document.

1 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.

2 Tenured Faculty—Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments

Faculty tenured in EEOB with less than 100% full time equivalent appointments in EEOB will be evaluated in the same fashion as other tenured faculty except as modified in the approved memorandum of understanding for their appointment.

C Research Faculty

The annual review process for research probationary and non-probationary faculty is identical to that for tenure track probationary and tenured faculty. In the penultimate contract year of a research faculty member's appointment, the department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If it will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-08](#) must be observed. If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty except that external

letters are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

D Associated Faculty

Associated faculty are reviewed on a yearly basis. Adjunct faculty provide a summary of their yearly activities and contributions to the chair as part of their reappointment process. Lecturers are peer-reviewed in the classroom and these reviews and SEIs are discussed in an annual meeting of each lecturer and the chair.

VI Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards

A Criteria

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

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

Meritorious performance in teaching, research, and service are assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. The time frame for assessing performance will be the past calendar year, but with attention to multi-year patterns of increasing or declining productivity. Faculty with high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas may receive minimal or no salary increases. Faculty members contribute to the department's mission in different ways, and their contributions in each of the areas may vary over time. The chair will weigh these factors and determine each faculty member's merit salary increase accordingly.

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

B Procedures

The department chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the divisional dean, who may modify these recommendations. Salary increases are formulated with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the department chair divides a faculty member's research, teaching, and service contributions into five groups based

on continuing productivity (greatly exceeds expectations, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, below expectations, much below expectations) and considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate.

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

C Documentation

All tenure-track, research and associated faculty must file an annual Faculty Activity Report (FAR), which has categories for reporting teaching, research and service contributions in a way similar to that of a P&T dossier. A copy of this report is maintained in the department office. A current CV and copies of all SEIs must also be submitted. The FAR is the primary source of information used by the Department chair for determining merit salary increases.

Merit salary increases will be denied to faculty who submit documentation insufficient for the department chair to make an informed evaluation of their performance. Thus, careful and accurate documentation of a faculty member's activities in the areas of teaching, research, and service is essential.

At this time, EEOB does not have a department-specific, agreed-upon instrument for student assessment of teaching. Until such an instrument is in place, all instructors in formal EEOB or Biology (CLSE) courses are required to use the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) instrument each time they teach a course, including the narrative comments section. For 8000-level courses where student evaluations are expected to relate more to the latter stages of professional training, narrative evaluations may be substituted for the SEI.

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

The time period covered by the documentation for the annual merit review is the previous calendar year.

D Regional Campus Faculty

Salary decisions for regional campus faculty are made by each regional campus dean/director and are paid out of regional campus funds. Regional campus deans/directors consult with the chair regarding salary recommendations for regional campus faculty.

E Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments

Salary decisions for faculty with less than 100% full time equivalent appointments in EEOB will be made in the same fashion as other faculty except as modified in the approved memorandum of understanding for their appointment.

VII Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

A Criteria

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

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

1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

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

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

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

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

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. Excellence in teaching, research, and service is moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' [*Statement on Professional Ethics*](#).

The accomplishments listed below in the areas of teaching, research, and service are expected of faculty for promotion to associate professor with tenure. In the evaluation of untenured associate professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

Teaching

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge
- demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm
- demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment
- engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process
- provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process
- treated students with respect and courtesy
- improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs
- served as advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the department's graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise, as well as undergraduate researchers and possibly postdocs
- engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching

Research

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- Published a body of work in high-quality peer-reviewed venues that is thematically focused, contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and is beginning to be favorably cited or otherwise show evidence of influence on the work of others. The following attributes of the body of work are considered:
 - quality, impact, quantity: probationary faculty on the Columbus campus should show evidence of a sustained publication record that averages 2-3 publications per year over the course of the probationary period in journals that are appropriate to the field as determined by the CEF.

- unique contribution to a line of inquiry.
- rigor of the peer-review process and degree of dissemination of publication venues. Archival journal publications and monographs are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published research more than unpublished research, and original works more than edited works.
- While collaborative work is encouraged, and indeed is essential to some types of inquiry, the candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described to permit accurate assessment.
- A demonstrated ability to obtain and potential to sustain research program funding. Competitive peer-reviewed funding is weighted more favorably than other types, since it serves as a quality indicator of research programs, and grants requiring the exercise of intellectual creativity are weighted more heavily than those that largely dictate the work to be done. Probationary faculty on the Columbus campus are normally expected to secure at least one competitive, peer-reviewed grant prior to their sixth year review.
- A developing national or international reputation in the candidate's field as evidenced by external evaluations, invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals, and a beginning trend of positive citations in other researchers' publications.
- Demonstrated a high degree of ethics in the conduct of research including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators.

Service

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- made contributions to the business of the department, college, or the university in a manner that facilitates positive contributions by others.
- demonstrated the potential for useful contributions to the profession, e.g., serving as an ad hoc reviewer for professional journals or granting agencies, symposium organizer, and society committee member.

2 Promotion to Professor

[Faculty Rule 3335-6-02](#) establishes the following general criteria for promotion to the rank of Professor:

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

The College of Arts and Sciences takes the pursuit of scholarly excellence as its core value. The college also recognizes that a career may consist of various phases in which a concentration on scholarly activity, teaching, or administrative/professional service creates a composite

professional life. Promotion to Professor typically requires excellence in scholarship. Where a candidate has made truly extraordinary contributions in the areas of teaching or service, that record may warrant promotion in combination with a less extensive, though excellent record of continued productivity in scholarship.

Assessment takes place in relation to specific assigned responsibilities, with exceptional performance in these required responsibilities. The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Outstanding performance in the sum and balance of these three criteria will serve as the basis for the assessment. A record of continuing professional growth and evidence of established national or international reputation in the field is expected. Evidence of international reputation can be in the form of speaking invitations at prestigious international institutions or meetings, international research collaborations, or outside evaluation by eminent international scholars. Excellence in service means the provision of a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more publics – including the university, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations. Leadership in professional service can be demonstrated through significant involvement in professional societies or agencies, including activities such as editorial board member, agency panel member, or elected officer of professional societies.

External hires at the Associate Professor or Professor rank with tenure will demonstrate the same accomplishments in scholarship and/or creative activity, teaching and service as persons promoted within the university. For all, the substantial probability that a high rate of quality scholarship and/or creative activity and excellence in teaching and service will continue needs to be established. The claim that retention of the candidate will improve the overall quality and standing of the unit needs to be supported.

3 Regional Campus Faculty

Expectations for regional campus faculty differ somewhat from those for faculty on the Columbus campus. The primary function of the regional campuses is to provide high quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities. The relative emphasis on teaching and service expected of regional campus faculty will therefore ordinarily be greater. The department expects regional campus faculty to establish a program of high quality scholarship and publication, similar to that of faculty on the Columbus campus. The department recognizes that the greater teaching and service commitment of regional campus faculty requires a different set of expectations. Probationary faculty on regional campuses should show evidence of a publication record that averages at least one publication per year over the course of the probationary period in journals that are appropriate to the field as determined by the CEF. The judgment whether a particular body of work meets departmental standards for tenure and/or promotion will take into consideration the regional campuses' different mission, higher teaching expectation, and more limited access to research resources.

4 Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments

Criteria for tenure and/or promotion of EEOB faculty members with less than 100% full time equivalent (FTE) appointments at the university are proportional to the percentage FTE of their appointment. Criteria for tenure and/or promotion of faculty members with a joint appointment in another unit are the same as for other EEOB faculty, keeping in mind that faculty doing transdisciplinary work should be looked at with flexibility sufficient to accommodate other disciplines.

5 Research Faculty

Promotion to Research Associate Professor. For promotion to research associate professor, a faculty member must have a substantial record of high-quality focused research consistent with an appointment devoted solely to research. Publications must appear in high-quality peer-reviewed venues and be judged by external evaluators as having substantial positive impact on the field. A record of continuous peer reviewed funding is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation.

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

6 Associated Faculty

Associated faculty cannot attain tenure, but they can be promoted in rank if they have professorial titles. The criteria for the promotion of an associated faculty member are identical to those for a tenure-track faculty member of the same rank. Lecturers can be promoted to senior lecturer if they have five years of teaching experience with documented excellence (see appointments section above).

B Procedures

The Department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-04](#) and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty tracks in the Department.

1 Candidate Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the candidate are as follows:

- Submit a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist.
- Submit a copy of the department's APT Document that was in effect at the time of the candidate's hire or when the candidate was last promoted, whichever is more recent, if s/he wishes to be reviewed under that document's criteria and procedures. This must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the department.
- Review the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair and the CEF. 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. From the two lists of potential outside evaluators, the department chair will choose 9-12 names with a goal of including some names from both. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- Faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review should contact the chair during January prior to the academic year during which the review would occur and provide (1) narrative statements of the candidate's research program and accomplishments in teaching and in service, (2) the candidate's up-to-date CV; (3) student and peer evaluations of teaching, and (4) a cover letter outlining the case for promotion and, where applicable, for evaluation based on alternative career tracks.

Because a packet must be sent to outside reviewers, the candidate should supply the chair with a CV, selected reprints or preprints, and a 3-5 page narrative describing past, current, and planned research.

All probationary faculty in the department are required to present a departmental seminar prior to their sixth year review, preferably in the spring semester immediately preceding the sixth year review. The faculty member should check with the department's Seminar Committee well in advance to schedule this seminar.

A timeline of candidate responsibilities is as follows:

- Late winter/early spring; present department seminar.
- Late April/early May: prepare research narrative and list of potential outside evaluators.
- Late August: complete dossier and submit to the CEF
- The timeline for the fourth year review may vary from the above. The candidate should check regularly with the CEF chair.

2 Committee of the Eligible Faculty (CEF) Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the CEF are as follows:

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

- Review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- Attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.
- Consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
 - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record which includes (1) three narrative statements – similar to those required for the core dossier - by the candidate concerning his or her research program and accomplishments in teaching and in service; (2) the candidate's CV; (3) student and peer evaluations of teaching, and (4) a cover letter outlining the candidate's case for promotion. The CEF will also have access to the candidate's annual review letters going back five years or to last promotion, whichever is more recent. An updated core dossier is not required for the screening meeting. 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 members who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non-mandatory tenure review. The committee must confirm with the department chair that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident (has a "green card"). Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.
 - A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late Spring through early Autumn Semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.

Late Spring Semester:

- Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.
- Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair.

Early Autumn Semester:

- Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements
- 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 provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- Write a letter for each case following the CEF 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 eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and vote in the case of joint appointees whose tenure-initiating unit is another department.

3 Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Department chair are as follows:

- 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 Semester:

- Solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the CEF, the chair and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- Make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the CEF at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- Remove any member of the CEF from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting.

Mid Autumn Semester:

- Provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the CEF's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- Meet with the CEF to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of

- the committee.
- Inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
 - of the recommendations by the CEF and department chair
 - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the CEF 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 the candidate expects to submit comments.
 - Provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier.
 - 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.
 - Receive the CEF's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure initiating units, and forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the head of the other tenure initiating unit by the date requested.

4 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

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

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

5 Procedures for Less Than 100% and Joint Appointments

Review for tenure and/or promotion of faculty with less than 100% full time equivalent appointments in EEOB follows the same procedure as other faculty except as modified in the approved memorandum of understanding for their appointment.

6 External Evaluations

External evaluations of research and scholarly activity are obtained for all promotion reviews in which research must be assessed. These include all tenure track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews, all research faculty promotion reviews, and all adjunct faculty promotion reviews. External evaluations are optional in other reviews and will be obtained as needed. When obtained, they should meet the criteria described below.

A minimum of five credible and useful evaluations must be obtained. A target of 6-8 is desirable. A credible and useful evaluation:

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's research (or other performance, if relevant) who can give an “arms’ length” evaluation of the research record and is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. Evaluations from associate professors should be a minority of the total and are typically requested only for promotion to associate professor reviews.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters are sought than are required (generally at least nine), and they are solicited no later than the end of June 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 CEF, 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 College of Arts and Sciences’ suggested format, provided at <https://ascintranet.osu.edu/Promotion-Tenure>, for letters requesting external evaluations.

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

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

C Documentation

As noted above under Candidate Responsibilities, every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. While the CEF 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 complete dossier, including the documentation of teaching noted below, is forwarded when the review moves beyond the department. The documentation of scholarship and service noted below is for use during the department review only, unless reviewers at the college and university levels specifically request it.

- Any published materials presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints, PDFs or 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.

Teaching

- The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, to present. 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 -- required
 - peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details, including number, provided in Section X below) -- required
 - copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.
- teaching activities as listed in the core dossier including
 - involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research
 - mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers
 - extension and continuing education instruction
 - involvement in curriculum development
 - awards and formal recognition of teaching
 - presentations on pedagogic and teaching at national and international conferences
 - adoption of teaching materials at other colleges or universities
- other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate

Documentation must include:

- cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries

- prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class
- peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in the “Procedures for Peer Evaluation of Teaching” section of this document).

Scholarship

The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to present.

Examples of documentation include:

- copies of all books, articles, and 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 and contracts received
- 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)
- scholarship activities as listed in the core dossier including
 - documentation of creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus including
 - artwork, choreography, collections, compositions, curated exhibits, moving images,
 - multimedia, performances, radio, recitals, recordings, television, and websites
 - documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options and commercial licenses
 - list of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work

Service

The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the date of hire to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to present.

Examples of documentation include:

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

Sources of Help and Information during the Tenure Process

Untenured Assistant Professors must, in a relatively short period of time, establish themselves as productive members of the department and the university if they are to be tenured and promoted. It is essential that these faculty members understand clearly the criteria for tenure and promotion within the department and their progress towards meeting these criteria. Assistant Professors having questions regarding the criteria or their progress towards meeting such criteria are urged to seek assistance via one or more of the following mechanisms.

Each Assistant Professor will meet with the CEF each year to discuss his/her progress in the department. Should the need arise at other times during the academic year, Assistant Professors can request additional conferences with individual members of the CEF. Probationary faculty are urged to discuss their progress with the chair at regular intervals.

Each new faculty member in the department is assigned a mentor and Launch Committee by the Department chair. Mutual agreement of all parties involved is required before such an assignment is made. The mentor will follow the progress of the new faculty member in meeting the criteria for promotion and tenure, and provide advice when necessary. The Launch Committee meets with the probationary faculty member during the first three academic year semesters of their position to provide guidance. See the Appendix in this document for mentoring guidelines and additional information about the Launch Committee.

Assistant Professors are encouraged to talk with their colleagues in EEOB or in other departments of the university. Of course, the ultimate responsibility of meeting the criteria for tenure and promotion lies with the probationary faculty member.

Sources of Help and Information for Promotion to Professor

Associate Professors should discuss their progress towards promotion to Professor at some length with the department chair each year during their annual evaluation and face-to-face meeting. The Promotion and Tenure Committee chair and other Professors in the Department also can provide useful advice.

VIII Appeals

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

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. Disagreement with a negative decision is not grounds for appeal.

IX Seventh-Year Reviews

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

X Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) is required in every course offered in this department. If providing in-class time for students to complete the evaluation on their mobile devices, faculty members should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high. The faculty member must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation. The faculty member should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and to provide feedback that can be taken into account in future teaching.

B Peer Evaluation of Teaching

1 University Policy on Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Periodic peer evaluation is required for both probationary and tenured faculty (at all ranks). The Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) describes peer evaluation of teaching as follows:

Peer review of teaching aims to apply appropriate disciplinary (peer) standards to the teaching performance of faculty members. TIUs should provide opportunities for and mechanisms that support both formative and summative evaluation of teaching. The TIU must set forth detailed guidelines for peer evaluation of teaching to be used in faculty performance reviews that is appropriate for the unit's instructional situation(s). Peer evaluation should focus on those aspects of teaching that students cannot evaluate, such as appropriateness of curricular choices given the goals of the course (survey, major required course), implicit and explicit goals of instruction, choice of examination/evaluation materials by the faculty member, and consistency with current disciplinary knowledge. Assessment of these aspects can be made by peers within the unit or external reviewers as determined by procedures established by the TIU.

The Ohio State University Committee on Peer Review of Teaching (CPRT), an Ad Hoc Committee of the University Senate, articulated the following principles for peer review (November 7, 2000):

- Evaluation of the quality of university teaching is a complex, multifaceted process that should include student, peer, administrative and self-evaluation;
- Both the criteria and the appropriate procedures for judging the quality of teaching must

- be embedded in disciplinary cultures and informed by departmental missions;
- Development and implementation of specific criteria and procedures is a faculty role and responsibility; and
- Models of effective and responsible evaluation plans, both within OSU and in peer and benchmark institutions exist; research on these practices and a scholarly awareness of these models and this body of research can assist Ohio State in designing effective programs of peer review.

2 Types of Peer Evaluation of Teaching

EEOB recognizes that peer evaluation comes in different forms and that these enhance teaching abilities in addition to “traditional” peer evaluations (see Comprehensive Peer Review of Instruction below). Therefore the Department provides the following annual options for peer evaluation.

Formative evaluation of instruction is designed to contribute to the development of teaching. This type of evaluation is conducted during both the planning and the implementation of a program or a course. Formative evaluation helps find the strengths and weaknesses in a program while it is still going on. The purpose of formative evaluation is to validate or ensure that the goals of the instruction are being achieved and to improve the instruction, if necessary, by means of identification and subsequent remediation of problematic aspects. Formative evaluations **are not** included in promotion dossiers or personnel files.

Options for formative review:

1. Attend a workshop on some aspect of teaching (either within the university or at a professional society meeting) and demonstrate changes or new ideas that have been/will be incorporated into teaching based on the ideas presented in the workshop.

Evidence required: Date, topic, and sponsor of the workshop. Summary of aspects of teaching learned at the workshop and how they have been/will be incorporated into teaching.

2. Review of course materials. When materials (e.g., grading rubrics, assignments, projects) have been developed for a course, these can be reviewed by inter-professional or intra-professional faculty peers. This review also can be done with a consultation from the University Center for the Advancement of Teaching (UCAT). Whenever possible, this review should occur face-to-face and provide specific and concrete feedback to the faculty member being evaluated. *Note:* when an off-campus reviewer is selected, the selection of the reviewer must be done in conjunction with the faculty member’s EEOB faculty mentor.

Evidence required: Name, rank, institution, and subject area of reviewer. Summary and analysis of strengths identified, areas for improvement, and changes made as a result and reflections on the process of the review.

3. Development/refinement of philosophy of pedagogy.

Evidence required: Report of activities engaged in (e.g., workshops attended, books or articles read, consultations with experts) to support the process, reflections on how the experience enhanced the philosophy of teaching, and the completed product.

4. Observe an expert teacher. Arrange to watch another faculty member teach a class. The faculty member should be selected either because s/he has received distinction for teaching or because s/he has more experience in instruction. Make arrangements to meet with that faculty member prior to the class period to gain an understanding of the goals, purposes, and proposed teaching methods. Meet again after the completion of the class for debriefing.

Evidence required: Name, rank, institution, and subject area of expert teacher. Summary and analysis of what was learned and what changes were made/will be made as a result, and reflections on the process.

5. Videotape yourself teaching. Arrange to have a class period videotaped. Identify a faculty peer or professional from UCAT with whom to watch the videotape, and use both self-reflection and the process of watching with another, to identify strengths and areas for growth.

Evidence required: Name, rank, institution, and subject area of selected peer. Date, course number, and topic of selected class period. Summary and analysis of strengths identified, areas for improvement, and changes made as a result and reflections on the process.

6. Classroom observation by professional from UCAT.

Evidence required: Name of UCAT professional, course observed, date. Summary of changes made as a result and reflections on the process of the observation.

7. Classroom observation by an EEOB faculty peer. Current EEOB policy regarding process of this review should be utilized. This includes (at a minimum):

- a. Peer evaluations of teaching should be detailed and should provide an analysis of the candidate's instructional skills.
- b. Reports of observations should specify which courses were observed and at what point in the term the observations took place.
- c. The peer-observer should provide a copy of the evaluation to the faculty member and should meet with the faculty member to review the evaluation.
- d. The peer-observers should be selected by the Department chair

Evidence required: Name of reviewer, course observed, date. Summary of changes made as a result and reflections on the process of the observation.

8. Participating in a University Institute for Teaching and Learning program and earning the corresponding teaching credential.

Evidence required: Name of program and specification of credential earned.

Summative evaluation of instruction is evaluation whose goal is to assess the quality of teaching performance/effectiveness. A summative review results in documentation that can be reviewed by others. Summative evaluations **are** included in promotion dossiers and hence are part of a faculty member's permanent record.

Summative evaluations of instruction include

Comprehensive peer review of instruction. Comprehensive peer evaluations are included in fourth-year, tenure, and promotion to full professor dossiers. These evaluations include, in addition to classroom visitation, review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and exams. To initiate a peer evaluation of instruction, the faculty member must request in writing to the chair that s/he has selected this option as part of the annual peer review and would like the chair to select an EEOB faculty peer reviewer.

Summary of reflective statements. In addition to regular peer evaluations, we require for the sixth year review a summary and analysis of the probationary faculty member's two reflective statements based on their formative review activities. This is to be written as a peer evaluation by a tenured faculty member and included with the three standard evaluations in the sixth year review dossier, bringing the total required number to four.

Probationary Faculty

Probationary faculty on the Columbus campus must have at least **two comprehensive peer evaluations of instruction** before their fourth-year review and at least **one more during the remainder of the probationary period**. These reviews are summative and thus included in the promotion dossiers. During years when probationary faculty do not have peer reviews of instruction, they can choose from the above list of formative evaluation options. Annually, with the completion of the faculty activity report, EEOB probationary faculty members shall, in consultation with the chair, select an appropriate evaluation option for the following year.

Upon completion of the evaluation activities and with the submission of the following year's annual activity report, the faculty member shall provide a written narrative that provides evidence of changes to teaching practice, course content, or other teaching-related endeavors based on the evaluation, thereby "closing the loop." Unless otherwise specified, evidence provided should be in the form of a brief (one-two paragraph) narrative summary.

~~Probationary faculty must complete a Capstone Narrative (see above) for both the fourth year and tenure review.~~

Post-Tenure Faculty

As noted in the OAA [*Policies and Procedures Handbook*](#), periodic peer evaluation is required for

tenured faculty at all ranks. In accordance with this mandate, and in recognition of the necessity of on-going personal and professional development in the area of instruction, all EEOB faculty engage in annual evaluation of instruction activities. Each year, every tenured, Columbus campus EEOB faculty member shall select one of the formative evaluation options presented above. EEOB faculty recognize that engagement in instructional enhancement of any type can improve instruction. Thus, *in addition to* the choices listed above, tenured EEOB faculty also may select from the following options, each of which represents a service role to one of the earlier options (shown in parentheses):

- a. Review the course materials of another faculty member (serves #2).
- b. Be observed by another faculty member (serves #4).
- c. Watch a videotape of another faculty member's teaching and provide input and reflections (serves #5).
- d. Observe another faculty members teaching and engage in the process of peer observation of instruction (serves #7).

Tenured faculty members should provide as evidence, to be included with their annual Faculty Activity Report, a brief description of the activity engaged in, with identifying dates, names, and courses, and a brief narrative of how the activity enhanced their own instruction.

Associate Professors on the Columbus campus must have at least **two comprehensive peer evaluation of teaching** included in the dossier for promotion to Professor, ~~in addition to a Capstone Narrative.~~

Addendum: What Is Good Teaching?

Ramsden (1992) identified 13 characteristics of good teaching from an individual instructor's point of view:

1. a desire to share your love of the subject
2. an ability to make the material stimulating and interesting
3. a facility for engaging with students at their level of understanding
4. a capacity to explain the material plainly and helpfully
5. a commitment to making it absolutely clear what has to be understood, at what level, and why
6. demonstration of concern and respect for students
7. a commitment to encouraging student independence and experiment
8. an ability to improvise and adapt to new demands
9. use of teaching methods and academic tasks that require students to learn actively, responsibly, and through cooperative endeavor
10. use of valid and fair assessment methods
11. a focus on key concepts and students' current and future understanding of them, rather than just covering the ground
12. a commitment to give high quality feedback on students' work
13. a desire to learn from students and others about the effects of your teaching and how it can be improved

Appendix: EEOB Mentoring Guidelines

These guidelines are intended to foster a strong mentoring environment for all probationary faculty within EEOB.

Establishing the mentor-mentee relationship

- On arriving at the OSU Columbus campus, a new probationary faculty member will be assigned a Launch Committee whose role over the first three semesters will be to provide practical information on the workings of the Department, college, university, and community. One member of that committee will be designated as the mentor, who shall serve until the Sixth-Year Review. The longer-term role of the mentor will be to emphasize career advancement and success at OSU.
- Post-Launch Committee mentoring meetings should occur at least once per semester, or more frequently as desired. Either person may initiate these meetings, but the mentor is responsible for seeing that the minimum meeting frequency is met.

Assessing and updating the mentor-mentee relationship

- To allow constructive changes to be made in this relationship, annual written updates will be filed with the chair by both mentor and mentee.
- Updates will be filed at the same time as the annual Faculty Activity Report but will not be part of either faculty member's personnel file or be considered in annual or promotion reviews.
- Written updates are in the form of short memos to the chair describing the frequency of meetings over the past year and the general level of satisfaction with the relationship by each party.
- Informal communications with the chair or other faculty members regarding the usefulness of the relationship are always encouraged.

Special issues

- *Regional campus probationary faculty.* Assigning mentors for providing local practical skills and for teaching and service mentoring is handled by individual regional campuses. At the beginning of their first year, regional campus probationary faculty will be assigned a research and scholarship mentor by the chair and that relationship will be assessed as with Columbus campus faculty. These mentors may be from either the home campus, another regional campus, or the Columbus campus.