

**APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE  
CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES**

**FISHER COLLEGE OF BUSINESS**

**OAA Approved December 22, 2016**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PREAMBLE .....	1
II. MISSION .....	1
III. DEFINITIONS .....	2
A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty .....	2
B. Quorum.....	4
C. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty .....	4
D. Governing Document for Promotion and Tenure Reviews.....	4
IV. APPOINTMENTS .....	5
A. Criteria.....	5
B. Procedures .....	8
V. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES.....	11
A. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty.....	11
B. Tenured Faculty .....	14
C. Clinical Faculty.....	14
D. Associated Faculty .....	15
VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS.....	15
A. Criteria.....	15
B. Procedures .....	16
C. Documentation .....	17
D. Appeals.....	18
VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS.....	18
A. Criteria.....	18
B. Procedures .....	28
C. Documentation .....	42
VIII. APPEALS.....	42
IX. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS .....	42
X. STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING.....	43
A. Student Evaluation of Teaching .....	43
B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	43
XI. AFFIRMATION BY FISHER COLLEGE AFFILIATED TIUs .....	47

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS - continued**

Appendix A: Dossier Elements and Requirements .....	48
Appendix B: Responsibilities of the Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) for the Department (D-POD) and the College (C-POD) .....	57
Appendix C: Ballots .....	61
Appendix D: Sample Letters to Evaluators .....	70
Appendix E: Additional TIU-specific Guidelines .....	74

## **I. PREAMBLE**

This document sets forth criteria and procedures for appointments, promotion, tenure, and rewards for faculty in each department (also referred to as tenure-initiating unit, or TIU) of the Fisher College of Business. It 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 found in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#); and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the college, its departments, and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the college will follow the new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document is reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, on the appointment or reappointment of the dean. On those occasions, the document, with any proposed revisions, is considered by the college faculty at the level of the tenure-initiating unit. A vote is taken by the tenure-track faculty of each TIU to determine whether its faculty is willing to operate under a college-wide Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) document. The TIUs are also permitted to provide additional TIU-specific guidelines (an appendix to this document provides the TIU-specific guidelines for departments that chose this option).

This document is approved by OAA prior to implementation. In approving this document, OAA accepts the stated criteria and procedures of the college and its tenure-initiating units and delegates to the college and the TIUs the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to university, college, and TIU missions.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-01](#). 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 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 Office of Human Resources policy on equal opportunity, [HR 1.10](#).

## **II. MISSION**

The mission of the Fisher College of Business is to achieve excellence in teaching, research, and related service. Through its thought leadership and innovative programs, the college seeks to impact academic peers and the practice of business.

The college creates and disseminates knowledge in an environment that is inclusive and collaborative, allowing students, faculty, and staff to excel. As an international leader in

research, the college aggressively pursues cutting-edge inquiry influencing theory and practice. As an international leader in teaching, the college strives to deliver academic and professional programs that produce highly valued and ethical individuals for the worldwide business community. The college's educational and research programs lead to a proactive outreach agenda, connecting with alumni through life-long learning, partnering with businesses, leveraging the comprehensive strengths of The Ohio State University, and advancing the welfare of the people of Ohio and the global community.

This college mission is achieved through the efforts of the college's five TIUs, each of which has also detailed department-specific missions in their respective Pattern of Administration. The standards for appointments, promotion, and tenure presented in this document, implemented with judicious professional judgment of the faculty, contribute to the ability of the college and its TIUs to realize their missions.

### **III. DEFINITIONS**

#### **A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty**

##### **1 Tenure-track Faculty**

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

The eligible faculty for an appointment at senior rank, promotion and tenure, and promotion reviews of tenure-track faculty is all tenured faculty of equal rank to or higher than that under consideration for the candidate, whose primary appointment is in the candidate's 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 reappointment of probationary tenure-track faculty, eligible faculty is tenured faculty whose primary appointment is in the candidate's 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 Clinical Faculty**

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

The eligible faculty for an appointment at senior rank and promotion of clinical faculty is all tenured faculty of equal rank to or higher than that under consideration for the candidate, whose primary appointment is in the candidate's department, and all non-

probationary clinical faculty of equal rank to or higher than under consideration for the candidate, whose primary appointment is in the candidate's 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 reappointment of probationary clinical faculty and contract renewal of non-probationary clinical faculty, eligible faculty is all tenured faculty of equal rank to or higher than that under consideration for the candidate, whose primary appointment is in the candidate's department, and all non-probationary clinical faculty of higher rank than under consideration for the candidate, whose primary appointment is in the candidate's 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. 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.

In the event a faculty member withdraws from the review process, the faculty member can opt (but is not required) to provide a letter to the department chair that notes his or her experience of working with the candidate; this letter is shared with the eligible faculty in the department and the dean.

If there is any possibility that an eligible faculty member may have a conflict of interest with the candidate, it is that faculty member's responsibility to report the relationship to the department chair and chair of the College Personnel Committee (CPC). Recognizing that subjective judgment may be required in some circumstances to determine whether it is appropriate for a faculty member to recuse himself or herself, the final decision on this matter will rest with the dean, who will consult with the department and college procedures oversight designees, department chair, the CPC chair, and others as appropriate.

### **4 Minimum Composition**

The committee of eligible faculty must be composed of at least three faculty members. In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the department chair, after consulting with the dean, will appoint faculty from another department within the college to reach the minimum membership.

## **B. Quorum**

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions (new appointments, reappointments, contract renewals, Fourth-Year reviews, promotion and tenure, and promotion reviews) is two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-campus assignment. Faculty members who are recused because of a conflict of interest are not counted when determining quorum.

## **C. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty**

In all votes taken on personnel matters, only votes cast (e.g., “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. Only eligible faculty members present at the meeting or participating by teleconferencing may vote. A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty on personnel matters is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast is positive.

For new appointments, when more than one candidate achieves majority support, the department faculty can choose to rank order acceptable candidates. For offers at senior rank, the eligible faculty members also vote on the appropriateness of the rank being considered; such a vote is a precursor to, not a replacement for, a complete promotion and tenure evaluation.

## **D. Governing Document for Promotion and Tenure Reviews**

All tenure-track faculty members undergoing Fourth-Year reviews, mandatory or non-mandatory promotion and/or tenure reviews, and all clinical faculty members for promotion reviews (hereafter, referred to as reviews), will be reviewed using the college’s current APT document (as approved and posted on the OAA website). However, faculty members may instead ask to be reviewed under the document that was in effect when they signed their letter of offer, contract renewal, or the date of their last promotion, whichever is more recent.

A faculty member who chooses to use an earlier document will notify his or her department chair of this intent by submitting the applicable APT document when submitting his or her dossier and other materials for review. The deadline for doing so will be the department’s regular deadline for receiving the dossier and other materials for the review in question.

The current document must be used if the letter of offer, contract renewal, or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than ten years before April 1 of the review year.

## IV. APPOINTMENTS

### A. Criteria

Faculty appointments in each TIU of the Fisher College of Business are made with a strong commitment to promoting high academic standards. Important considerations include the candidate's record in teaching, research, and service; the potential for growth in each of these areas; and the potential for interacting with colleagues, students, and the business community in ways that will enhance the academic and professional standing of the TIU and the college, and attract other outstanding faculty and students. 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 TIU and the college. In that event, the search is cancelled or continued, as appropriate given the circumstance.

#### 1 Tenure-track Faculty

**Instructor.** Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but the candidate has not completed requirements for the doctoral degree (or equivalent degree) at the time of the appointment. An appointment to the rank of instructor is probationary and may not exceed three years. If 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.

When an instructor receives the rank of assistant professor upon receipt of the doctoral degree, the tenure clock is set in motion. Service credit for time spent as an instructor does not count against the period of time during which tenure is evaluated unless the faculty member indicates in writing at the time of promotion to assistant professor that he or she wishes such credit. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the dean, and OAA. On approval, the tenure review schedule is adjusted accordingly. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked without a formal request for an extension of the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to request to be considered for early promotion. For further information see [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03](#).

**Assistant Professor.** An earned doctorate (or equivalent degree) is a minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential for high impact scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the department, the college, and the profession is assessed in the weighing of the appointment decision. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory promotion and tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the eligible tenured faculty of the faculty member's department determine such a review to be appropriate.

**Associate Professor and Professor.** Appointment at a senior rank (associate professor or professor) requires that the candidate meet the college's criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at senior rank generally 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 OAA, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a senior rank and approved for tenure, if appropriate, but the university will not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency.

## **2 Clinical Faculty**

Clinical faculty members in the college are engaged primarily in instructional activities, in outreach, and in academic program leadership and support. Instructional activities include effective teaching, extensive interaction with students, the application of knowledge to practical problems, the development and dissemination of new teaching materials, experimentation and development of new instructional methodologies, and active participation in curriculum discussions.

Individuals appointed to clinical faculty normally will have an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field, and a proven track record in: a) supervising students in a skills acquisition setting; b) working productively with leaders/managers of organizations in client relationships; c) classroom teaching; d) expanding understanding of business practice through preparation of written materials such as publishable case studies; and e) exemplifying and teaching the ethical standards of the profession.

Appointment of clinical faculty entails an initial probationary contract with a term of three to five years, with reappointment considered annually. As with tenure-track appointments at senior ranks, clinical appointments at the associate and professor ranks will be reviewed by the CPC using the criteria set in Section VII of this document. Tenure is not granted to clinical faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the department wishes to consider 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](#).

**Assistant Professor – Clinical.** An earned doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree in his or her specialty is usually a minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor – clinical.

**Associate Professor – Clinical and Professor – Clinical.** Appointment at the rank of associate professor – clinical or professor – clinical normally requires that the individual

have an earned doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree in his or her specialty and meet, at a minimum, the college's criteria – in teaching and service – for promotion to these ranks.

### **3 Associated Faculty**

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a couple of weeks to assist with a focused project, semester-length 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 titles are used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to tenure-track faculty of equivalent rank, who provide significant, uncompensated service to the instructional and/or research programs of the college and who need a faculty title to perform that service. Adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty.

**Lecturer and Senior Lecturer.** Appointment as lecturer or as senior lecturer is determined by the extent of prior teaching experience, the quality of that prior teaching experience, and the nature of the candidate's academic credentials and work experience in the field in which the teaching is to occur. Lecturers and senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion.

**Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%.** Appointment as an associated faculty member with a tenure-track title is for an individual at 49% FTE or below, either compensated (1 to 49% FTE) or uncompensated (0% FTE). The rank of associated faculty with tenure-track titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Associated faculty members with tenure-track 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 uncompensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. They may not be reappointed for more than three consecutive years at 100% FTE.

### **4 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty**

Occasionally the active academic involvement in one academic department by a faculty member from another department in the Fisher College of Business or the involvement in this college by a faculty member from another college at The Ohio State University warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in a department within this college. 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. The decision to make a courtesy appointment rests with the eligible faculty of the appropriate department within the college, with the approval of the dean. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current rank at The Ohio State University, with promotion in rank recognized.

## **B. Procedures**

See the Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments in OAA's [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/international 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 OAA in advance. Search procedures must be consistent with the university policies set forth in the most recent update of the [Guide to Effective Searches](#).

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

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

The department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty members who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the department. In cases of research and teaching overlap across departments, the dean, in consultation with the department chair, may also appoint one or more advisory member from another department to the search committee.

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 Employment Services](#) and external advertising, subject to the department chair's approval. The

announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.

- Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must advertise using at least one 30-day online ad in a location likely to be read by qualified potential applicants. 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 national professional journal.
- Screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents to the full faculty a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. If the faculty agrees with this judgment, the search committee chair, assisted by the department office, arranges on-campus interviews. If the faculty does not agree, the department chair in consultation with the faculty determines the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, cancel the search for the time being).

On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee; graduate students; the department chair; and the dean or designee. Generally, all candidates make a presentation to the faculty on their research. In some cases, candidates may be asked to teach a class – either an actual class or a mock instructional situation. All candidates interviewing for a particular position follow the same general interview format.

Following completion of on-campus interviews, the eligible faculty meet to discuss perceptions and preferences, and to vote on each candidate. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on each candidate to the department chair. In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the department faculty can also choose to rank order acceptable candidates.

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members also vote 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 and the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair.

Based on the recommendation of department faculty and, in consultation with the department chair, the dean makes the decision of which, if any, candidate should be

extended an offer. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the department chair and the dean. 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 Clinical Faculty**

Searches for clinical track faculty members generally proceed as for tenure-track faculty members, a national/international search being strongly preferred to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates. Likewise, campus visits should be similar in structure to those used for tenure-track positions, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the on-campus interview is on classroom teaching rather than research. As per OAA policy, the dean can approve waiving a requirement for a national search for clinical track faculty if special circumstances warrant. This should, however, not be general practice.

## **3 Transfer from the Tenure Track**

Tenure-track faculty may request transfer to a clinical appointment if appropriate circumstances exist. 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.

Tenure is lost upon transfer, and transfers must be approved by tenured faculty in the candidate's department, department chair, the dean, and the executive vice president and provost.

Transfers from a clinical appointment to the tenure-track are not permitted. Clinical faculty members may apply for tenure-track positions and compete in regular national searches for such positions.

## **4 Associated Faculty**

The appointment, review, and reappointment of associated faculty are decided by the department chair, who consults with the department faculty as needed, with the approval of the dean. Initial appointment for a lecturer or a senior lecturer position is usually made on a semester-by-semester or an annual basis. After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment of up to three years may be offered. Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three consecutive years. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Adjunct appointments may be renewed only when the uncompensated academic service for which the initial appointment was made continues.

## **5 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty**

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a faculty member from another department in the Fisher College of Business or another college at The Ohio State University. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to the department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular department faculty meeting. If the eligible faculty approves the proposal, 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 non-renewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

## **V. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES**

The college and its academic departments follow the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in OAA's [Faculty Annual Review Policy](#).

The annual reviews of every faculty member are based on performance in teaching, research, and service as set forth in the college'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 in Section VI of this document. This material must be submitted to the department chair and to the dean's office according to procedures and schedules established and communicated annually to faculty.

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

### **A. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty**

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually. Until the Fourth-Year review, the process is conducted primarily for the purpose of providing feedback to the candidate. In these early review years, renewal is expected barring compelling circumstances. The annual review process for probationary tenure-track faculty utilizes materials which faculty prepare for the compensation review process described in Section VI, and takes into account the probationary faculty member's academic and scholarly development over the duration they have been employed at The Ohio State University. The key steps in the annual review of probationary tenure-track faculty are as follows.

Probationary faculty members being reviewed submit the documentation required for annual performance review to their department chair and the dean's office by the established and announced deadline. While the precise nature and format of the review form may evolve over time, Section VI of this document lists the key elements.

All eligible faculty members in a department examine the annual performance review documents and narratives of each probationary tenure-track faculty in that department and discuss, with the department chair, the strengths and weaknesses of the record and plans.

The department chair prepares a written evaluation of the candidate's research, teaching and service record as part of the annual review process; in conjunction with this evaluation, the chair offers a recommendation to the dean about whether the candidate should be reappointed. The department chair's evaluation is shared with the eligible faculty in the department, and the eligible faculty has the option to provide written advice and feedback supplementing that communicated by the department chair. Such a letter by the eligible faculty is permissible for providing additional developmental feedback to the probationary faculty member but is not part of the information that is provided to the dean as part of the annual review nor does it become part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure.

The department chair meets with the candidate being reviewed to discuss the faculty's evaluation of the candidate's record and plans, and the department chair's written evaluation and recommendation. The candidate may provide written comments on the review. All annual review letters to date shall become a part of the faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure.

The department chair's written evaluation (along with the faculty member's comments) is forwarded to the dean. If the department chair's recommendation is to reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year of service, that recommendation is final. A recommendation from the department chair to not reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year requires a review that follows the procedures (not the standards) laid out for Fourth-Year review (per [Faculty Rule 3335-6-04](#)) and the dean shall make the final decision in the matter.

## **1 Fourth-Year Review**

Beginning in the spring of the third year after a probationary tenure-track faculty member is appointed (accounting for any approved exclusion of time from the probationary period, per [Faculty Rule 3335-6-02](#)), and continuing through the fourth year, each probationary tenure-track faculty member goes through a mandatory Fourth-Year review. The Fourth-Year review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluations are not required and the dean makes the final decision regarding renewal or non-renewal of the probationary appointment. Thus, the Fourth-Year review process requires selection of a department Procedures Oversight Designee (D-POD) and an eligible faculty member to draft the initial review report, as is the case in promotion and tenure reviews (detailed in Section VII).

The purpose of the Fourth-Year review is to provide a systematic mechanism through which the candidate becomes aware of the department and college assessment of the quality and impact of his or her research, teaching, and service activities. This process is

both developmental and evaluative in nature. For candidates whose records are evaluated as being partially consistent with meeting requirements for promotion and tenure review at the mandated time due to some weaknesses, the eligible faculty should elaborate on the nature of concerns and what needs to be done to address weaknesses. In some circumstances, a Fourth-Year review can lead to a decision not to extend the probationary appointment of the faculty member being reviewed.

Tenure-track faculty members undergoing Fourth-Year reviews are required to use the university's on-line scholarly activities management system (Research in View or its successor) to generate their core dossier. Appendix A of this document provides a complete list of dossier elements and requirements for Fourth-Year reviews.

The eligible faculty in the department conducts a review of the candidate. The department chair attends the meeting. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment. Specifically, the voting options on the Fourth-Year review ballot (presented in Appendix C) are:

- *Reappoint – on track*

This choice denotes that the candidate's record is currently progressing in ways that are consistent with meeting requirements for promotion and tenure review at the mandated time.

- *Reappoint – with reservations*

This choice denotes that aspects of the candidate's record are currently progressing in ways that are partially consistent with meeting requirements for promotion and tenure review at the mandated time, but some weaknesses will need to be addressed.

- *Do not reappoint*

This choice denotes that the candidate's record is currently progressing in ways that are inconsistent with meeting requirements for promotion and tenure review at the mandated time, and it is unlikely that weaknesses can be addressed in a timely manner.

The D-POD counts and records the votes of the eligible faculty. A simple majority of "Reappoint" votes (inclusive of both "on track" and "with reservations") is necessary for the vote to be considered positive. As noted above, in deciding whether or not to reappoint, the probability of a candidate presenting a case that will succeed at the tenure review in about two years is taken into account. A decision to reappoint, however, does not imply that a positive tenure will necessarily follow; that decision will be contingent on progress and thorough evaluation at the time the candidate is considered for tenure. While every reasonable opportunity should be provided for the candidate to achieve tenure, faculty should vote to decline reappointment if they judge that there is only a slim

(remote) chance a candidate would be able to present a case that is near the standard for achieving promotion and tenure at the mandated time.

The eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote, and the 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 (beginning with the CPC) for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or non-renewal.

The dean makes the final decision regarding renewal or non-renewal of the probationary appointment in the Fourth-Year review. Fourth-Year review dossiers are not submitted to OAA. Positive reviews do not need to be reported to OAA but non-renewal decisions are communicated via the “Report of Non-Renewal of Probationary Appointment of Regular Faculty” along with a copy of the non-renewal letter to the faculty member.

## **2 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period**

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

### **B. Tenured Faculty**

Tenured faculty members are reviewed annually through the process described in Section VI of this document. In the annual review process, the department chair prepares a written evaluation of each faculty member’s performance, after which he/she meets with the faculty member to discuss performance and future plans. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review that will be included along with the department chair’s evaluation in the faculty member’s personnel file.

### **C. Clinical Faculty**

The annual review process for clinical probationary and non-probationary faculty is identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty respectively.

The initial clinical contract is always probationary, and the faculty member will be informed at the end of each probationary year as to whether he or she will be reappointed for the following year. During and until the end of the second and subsequent contract terms, clinical faculty appointments may only be terminated for cause (see [Faculty rule 3335-5-04](#)) or financial exigency (see [Faculty rule 3335-5-02.1](#)) and the termination decision for either of these reasons shall result from procedures established by faculty rules. In addition, a contract may be renegotiated during a contract period beyond the initial contract period only with the voluntary consent of the clinical faculty member.

In the penultimate contract year of a clinical faculty member's appointment, the department chair and the dean, in consultation with the eligible faculty, determine whether the position held by the clinical faculty member will continue. If the position 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](#) are observed.

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the clinical faculty member will be offered a new contract. If the reappointment of the faculty member is being considered at the same rank as the initial appointment, the determination is made by the eligible faculty and chair of the department, with the final decision made by the dean. If the reappointment of the clinical faculty member entails a promotion to a higher rank, then the promotion process for clinical faculty outlined in Section VII is followed.

#### **D. Associated Faculty**

Compensated associated faculty members are reviewed annually by the department chair, who consults with the department faculty as appropriate. The department chair prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. The department chair's recommendation on reappointment is final. In the case of an associated faculty member on a multiple year appointment, the chair will decide whether or not to reappoint no later than October 15 of the final year of the appointment.

## **VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS**

### **A. Criteria**

Except when the university dictates any across-the-board salary increases, 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 are made for non-continuing activities and performance that deserve reward but do not justify permanent salary increases; at times, financial constraints too may necessitate the use of such one-time payments. When appropriate, recognition can also be provided in the form of a boost in research support and/or travel funds with amount subject to periodic review. Such payments and rewards are considered at the time of annual salary recommendations

The college seeks to support accomplishment of its mission by motivating and rewarding excellence in scholarly performance; providing rewards to faculty making major contributions in additional priority areas; and responding to market forces in order to retain high performing faculty. Consistent with these goals, individual faculty members are annually evaluated for merit in the following areas – scholarship encompassing teaching, research, and service as well as contributions to additional college priorities.

The college establishes distinct pools of annual increase funds for these areas, distributing from each according to faculty performance.

### **1 Scholarly Performance (Teaching, Research, and Service)**

Scholarly performance in teaching, research, and service is judged according to department and college missions, with consideration given to a faculty member's specific balance of responsibilities. Performance over the preceding three calendar years is evaluated. Assessment of scholarly performance focuses on accomplishment and impact. Performance norms are those judged appropriate and consistent with department and college aspirations and performance at business schools with similarly high standards.

### **2 Contributions to Additional College Priorities**

Enhancing scholarship is the primary college priority. In addition, the college also rewards faculty contributions in other priority areas beyond those that are embodied in scholarly performance. The strategic plan of the college reflects these priorities and the dean, in consultation with the executive committee, identifies specific such activities at the beginning of each calendar year. Traditionally, this category has recognized faculty contributions outside the classroom that enhance student experience and learning in the undergraduate and master-level programs. While the priority areas will likely be fairly stable, some change over time is possible. The time frame for assessing contributions to priority programs is primarily the past calendar year.

## **B. Procedures**

### **1 Scholarly Performance (Teaching, Research, and Service)**

The department chair uses the annual report required of each faculty member to assess the scholarly performance of the faculty member in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The department chair also receives input from program chairs, and appropriate associate dean(s) for programs, in evaluating teaching performance. Unresolved differences are handled by the dean or a designated associate dean.

Accounting for teaching, research, and service contributions, the outcome of the annual merit process results in a categorization of each faculty member's scholarly performance as "substantially beyond the norm," "beyond the norm," "meeting the norm," or "below the norm." In appropriate instances, a finer "beyond plus" or "meets plus" rating may also be used. Faculty members with the same rating are treated identically in terms of recommended salary percentage increases.

### **2 Contributions to Additional College Priorities**

Associate deans for programs and chairs responsible for priority areas use annual report forms to evaluate faculty member contributions to their respective priority areas.

Assessments are shared with the department chair. Unresolved differences are handled by the dean or a designated associate dean.

The outcome is a categorization of each faculty member's contributions as "substantially beyond the norm," "beyond the norm," "meeting the norm," or "not applicable." In appropriate instances, a finer "beyond plus" or "meets plus" rating may also be used. Faculty members with the same rating are treated identically in terms of recommended salary percentage increases.

The performance review process will conclude with a meeting of the dean with all associate deans and department chairs. Agenda items for this meeting include review of the ratings given to individual faculty members, and the justifications for these ratings. This college level review of faculty performance will be thorough to assure that performance has been evaluated according to appropriate norms. The university determines market equity, and the college will adhere to standards and approval process as required by the university.

### **C. Documentation**

For annual performance review purposes, all faculty members will complete and update two documents: (a) a curriculum vitae and (b) an annual faculty activity report. The faculty activity report will typically summarize the following information:

- **Teaching**
  - Classroom teaching, noting major changes or new preparations to coursework
  - Academic advising, directed individual/independent study, non-degree/non-credit instruction
  - Other student services
- **Intellectual Contributions**
  - Refereed research publications
  - Non-refereed publications
  - Invited presentations
  - Research in progress
  - Other scholarly activities
- **Service**
  - Department, college, and university service
  - Service to academic discipline
  - Professional service
- **Honors and Recognitions**
- **Contributions to Additional College Priorities**

The required documentation (curriculum vitae and annual report) must be delivered to the department office by the due date established annually by the college. Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation for an annual review by the due date will not receive a salary increase in the year for which documentation was not provided, except in extenuating circumstances, and should not expect to recover the foregone raise at a later time.

#### **D. Appeals**

Appeals pertaining to performance and compensation decisions are addressed to the Faculty Appeals and Investigations Committee of the college. This committee provides its report and recommendations to the dean.

## **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.*

While research, teaching, and service activities are defined individually next, the college is cognizant and encouraging of meaningful overlap and synergies between these activities. Following [Faculty Rule 3335-6-02](#), these activities are defined as follows.

**Research** is broadly defined to include discovery, scholarly and creative work, applied studies, and the scholarship of pedagogy. The results of research will most often appear as articles in peer-reviewed research journals. In some cases, they may also appear as articles in non-peer-reviewed research journals, books or book chapters, or as articles in practice-oriented journals. Research activities can also be indicated by editorship and service on editorial boards of important research journals, presentations in academic meetings and at other universities, contributions to research seminars and workshops, and

receiving prestigious research grants.

**Teaching** is broadly defined to include didactic classroom, non-classroom and distance instruction, extension and continuing education, advising, and supervising or mentoring students or postdoctoral scholars. The results of teaching can appear in a variety of forms, including classroom teaching, one-on-one teaching, serving on doctoral dissertations, publishing text books, articles in refereed and non-refereed journals on teaching, cases, instructional software and videos, contributions to teaching seminars and workshops, publications in practice-oriented journals, and so forth.

**Service** is broadly defined to include providing administrative assistance to the university, engaging in professional activities that promote the faculty member's discipline, and providing disciplinary expertise to public or private entities beyond the university. Accepting service roles in a department, the college, or the university is a necessary but not sufficient condition for being judged to have demonstrated a rank-appropriate level of service. Faculty members must be judged to have made appropriate impactful contributions through their service activities. In general, making significant contributions in a few service roles will be valued more highly than making minor contributions in a large number of service roles.

As part of their service obligation, faculty members at all ranks are expected to demonstrate professional collegiality. Collegiality includes, but is not limited to, participating in meaningful and positive ways in the activities of the college and university, interacting with others in respectful ways, supporting the intellectual and professional development of colleagues, acting with integrity, and so forth.

### **1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**

The award of tenure is a commitment of continuous employment for the purpose of enhancing discovery and engaging in creative teaching. It is therefore essential to evaluate and judge the probability that faculty members, 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. A decision to promote to associate professor with tenure, however, does not imply that a promotion to professor will eventually follow; that decision will be contingent on progress and thorough evaluation at the time the candidate is considered for promotion to professor.

Every candidate is held to high standards in all aspects of performance. Accepting weakness in any aspect of performance in making a tenure decision is tantamount to deliberately handicapping the ability of the department and college to perform and progress academically. A high standard of performance includes ethical professional conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the [American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

The number of years spent in the Fisher College of Business can vary across candidates, including the possibility of one or more formally approved extensions of the tenure clock. Congruent with [Faculty rule 3335-6-03](#), the standards for tenure are applied uniformly in

each case regardless of the candidate's length of service in the college. The eligible faculty in the department retains discretion as to assigning credit for the candidate's research record developed prior to joining the Fisher College of Business. Such decisions by the eligible faculty should be made in consistent fashion and communicated both to potential candidates and to deliberating bodies at each level of review. This can be done, for example, through the initial offer letter, annual reviews, the department Pattern of Administration, or TIU-specific guidelines in this document. Regardless of the choice, following university guidelines, promotion is based primarily on activity conducted after joining the Fisher College of Business.

Successful candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure must demonstrate that they have attained potential for excellence in research, achievement in teaching, and rank-appropriate service. These standards are described in greater detail below.

**Potential for Excellence in Research.** A faculty member is judged to demonstrate potential for excellence in research when he or she is engaged in the creation of new ideas that are beginning to influence scholarship and thinking in their field, and whose impact can reasonably be expected to grow over time. To this end, 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 can either be thematically focused or contribute to multiple areas. In either case, the work must be likely to be impactful. While the quality of the ideas is a key determinant, the quality and ranking of the journal (or other outlet) in which the research is published is an informative indicator of likely impact. Archival journal publications are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published research more than unpublished research, and original works more than edited works. Further, the expectation for promotion to associate professor is that the successful candidate's work will appear in the journals recognized as being of the highest quality by the individual's academic department, though such top journals need not necessarily all be focused on a single academic discipline; high-quality work by faculty that bridges disciplines is valued. It is noted that an adequate quantity of publications in top journals will generally be viewed as a necessary but not sufficient condition for granting tenure. Quality and impact are critical to establishing sufficiency.
- Started developing a national/international reputation in the field as evidenced by external evaluations, invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals, memberships in editorial boards, a trend of positive citations in research publications, evidence of influence on the work of others, as well as significant applications of research insights in practice. A reputation based on the quality of the research contribution is distinguished from one based mainly on familiarity through the faculty member's frequent attendance at conferences.

- 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 behavior with undergraduate, masters, and PhD students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators. The college's culture values diversity and inclusion in people and ideas. With the changing face of the nation itself, the terms "diversity" and "inclusion" have expanded over time to include individuals from a growing array of backgrounds, cultures, identities and experiences. It is expected that the actions of a candidate being considered for tenure have been and will continue to be consistent with such a culture.

**Achievement in Teaching.** A faculty member is judged to demonstrate achievement in teaching when he or she is engaged in successful communication of ideas to students. To this end, for promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- Demonstrated consistently solid classroom teaching, with student evaluations (relative to appropriate comparison group) and peer evaluations serving as informative indicators.
- Provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in instructional situations and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge.
- Demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create a desirable learning environment.
- Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process, treating students with respect and courtesy.
- Contributed to department and college teaching programs through engagement in curriculum revision and development as and when appropriate for rank.
- Engaged with doctoral education. This can include serving as an advisor or a member of PhD dissertation committees, teaching doctoral seminars, and/or guiding doctoral students.
- Engaged in infusing research insights in teaching at all levels, and served as advisor and mentor to students in the college's 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.

**Rank-Appropriate Service for Promotion to Associate Professor.** Assistant professors should focus their internal service efforts on attending departmental and college faculty meetings; contributing to student welfare through service on student-faculty committees

when assigned; membership on departmental committees and task forces and; occasionally, membership on college committees and task forces. Assistant professors should focus their external service efforts on activities that will facilitate their scholarly work, e.g., serving as a reviewer for high-quality journals or academic association national or international conferences and memberships in editorial boards. As is true with faculty members at other ranks, assistant professors are expected to demonstrate professional collegiality as part of their service obligation. Indicators of collegiality include appropriate interaction with students, staff and faculty members in both verbal and written communications; attending, participating in and showing respect for others in departmental meetings and research seminars; and engaging appropriately with organizations and groups outside the college and in so doing contributing positively to the reputation of the college and university.

## 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.*

There are two paths that candidates for promotion to professor may follow. The primary path to promotion to professor (denoted, for expositional convenience, Path 1) requires excellence in research and sustained achievement in teaching and service over the length of their career. Whereas the granting of tenure is based on potential for excellence, candidates for professor on this path must demonstrate excellence in research with a national or international reputation in their research field.

The college is also receptive to an alternative path to promotion to professor (denoted Path 2) that requires excellence in teaching and service while also maintaining a sustained level of achievement in research. For a faculty member to be promoted on this path, the contributions in teaching and service must be substantial, sustained, and of exceptional quality, as demonstrated, for example, by recognitions at the university or national and international levels.

Greater detail is provided below.

- **Path 1:** This primary path to promotion to professor requires demonstrated excellence in research, and sustained achievement in teaching and service.

**Excellence in Research.** Publishing research articles in leading research journals is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for demonstrating excellence in research. That is, publishing numerous papers and/or writing several books, does not, by itself, indicate that a person has demonstrated excellence in research. Instead, in

addition to publications in top-tier journals that continue to play a key role, determining excellence in research requires thoughtful assessment of the quality of the candidate's work, and the impact and influence of the ideas that support the work. In effect, in judging the excellence of research activities, faculty need to ask themselves whether or not knowledge in a candidate's field would be significantly different if the candidate's research activities had not occurred.

To be judged as demonstrating excellence in research, a candidate's record must demonstrate sustained accomplishment and increasing quality of contributions since promotion to associate professor; show that the work has had a significant impact in a field; and that he/she has established a national or international reputation in the field. Some indicators of significant impact include:

- Successfully addressing fundamental questions in a field.
- Identifying important new questions in a field.
- Helping shape the direction of research in a field.
- Being known and respected by numerous leading scholars, and influencing their thinking.
- Mentoring students who subsequently develop into leading scholars in the field.
- Creating ideas that significantly impact management practice in a field.
- Developing ideas that significantly impact student learning as evidenced by inclusion of research in textbooks, cases, and professional and practitioner articles.

Relevant quantitative indicators of impact (which could include, for example, Google Scholar citations, h-indices, or citations/downloads in SSRN) should be provided by the candidate as evidence supporting achievement of excellence in research. These indicators should be provided for the candidate as well as for comparable other faculty in peer institutions who are currently professors or being considered for promotion to professor. Other evidence of excellence in research includes statements provided by external letter writers, appointments to high-quality journal editorial boards and editor positions, and editing research-based monographs and books. Considering both qualitative and quantitative indicators of research excellence are needed to establish a case for promotion to professor on Path 1.

**Sustained Achievement in Teaching.** A faculty member is judged to have demonstrated sustained achievement in teaching when he or she demonstrates consistently good classroom teaching and appropriately contributes to the college

teaching programs through quality engagement in curriculum development, participation on program policy and/or ad hoc committees, involvement in student recruitment and placement, and so forth. Sustained achievement in teaching involves:

- Student evaluations that are consistently at or above the mean score relative to the appropriate comparison group.
- Advising and serving on PhD dissertation committees, and engaging with doctoral education.
- Up-to-date course content.
- Demonstrated ability to organize and present class material effectively.
- Creativity in the use of various modes of instruction.
- Engaged and respectful interaction with students across degree programs.
- Appropriate and timely feedback to students.
- Engagement in curriculum development.
- Providing meaningful advising services to students.
- Documented efforts to sustain and improve performance in teaching.

**Sustained Achievement in Service.** To demonstrate sustained achievement in service senior faculty members are expected to:

- Engage in the full range of service activities including attending departmental and college faculty meetings; advising students at all levels; contributing to student welfare through service on student-faculty committees; serving as an advisor to student organizations; involvement in the promotion and tenure review process of faculty in their department.
- Contribute in departmental, college, and university committees and task forces and, at times, in specified faculty leadership roles such as directors of centers or academic programs.
- Meaningfully participate in activities that enhance profession, including membership and/or leadership in academic and professional organizations.
- Demonstrate professional collegiality. Indicators of collegiality include appropriately interacting with students, staff and faculty members in both verbal and written communications and engaging appropriately with

organizations and groups outside the college, thereby contributing positively to the reputation of the college and university.

- **Path 2:** This path to promotion to professor requires a sustained long-term record of excellence in teaching and service and sustained achievement in research. It is expected that candidates considered for promotion using this path will have served in the associate professor rank at the Fisher College of Business for a number of years to establish a proven record of excellence in teaching and service; thus, this path is not available for new hires at the professor rank. This approach is also not accessible through self-nomination; it is initiated through nomination by eligible faculty of the candidate's TIU.

**Excellence in Teaching and Service.** Consistently good classroom evaluations and consistently good senior faculty level service are necessary, but not sufficient, conditions for demonstrating excellence in this category. A case for excellence in teaching and service should include evidence that accomplishments have made a measurable difference in academic programs, enhanced student development, and improved college and university operations.

Evidence of excellence in teaching can include, but is not limited to:

- Activity that has had significant impact on programs and peers in the college, and results in the college being a major draw for students.
- Development of curriculum that contributes to the college being nationally or internationally recognized.
- Activity that has made a significant contribution to specific courses, students, and management practice.
- Contributions that impact teaching pedagogy in the college and similarly regarded institutions via published books, articles, resource guides, and programmatic materials.
- Efforts to significantly enhance diversity and climate both in and out of the classroom.

Evidence of excellence in service can include, but is not limited to:

- Activity that has had a significant impact on the work of the college, university, or profession. This may include serving in a critical administrative capacity, engaging in program development and significant redesign, and undertaking corporate outreach activities that impact student recruitment and placement.

- Contributions that significantly enhance programs and management practice.
- Evidence that the service activity has significantly enhanced diversity efforts and accomplishments.
- Activity that has served the professional and academic community in notable and broad ways, leading to extraordinary accomplishment.

**Sustained Achievement in Research.** It is expected that a faculty member who has developed a record of excellence in both teaching and service may have devoted somewhat less effort and time in recent years on research than a faculty member who has focused on developing a record of sustained excellence in research. Nonetheless, under a Path 2 promotion, the record needs to show sustained achievement in research. A faculty member is judged to have demonstrated sustained achievement in research when he or she demonstrates continued engagement in research activities such as authoring and co-authoring research-oriented publications, active participation in research seminars and academic conferences, involvement in sponsored research, service on journal editorial boards, active engagement in facilitating the research work of students, and peer reviewing of manuscripts and promotion and tenure cases. Assessment of impact is the critical determinant on which sustained achievement should be judged. In the case of published work, the quality or ranking of the journal or other outlet in which the research is published is only one indicator of impact.

Faculty members will be required to submit copies of articles, books and other research documents, and a summary of their research activities indicating that they have maintained sustained achievement in research. Similar to research standards for other promotions, candidates must present evidence of both research activity and impact. As in Path 1 promotion reviews, letters from external evaluators will be solicited to evaluate the candidate's research record and impact; consistent with the standards of Path 2 promotion, the letters will also solicit evaluation of the candidate's teaching and/or service contributions (see Appendix D).

### **3 Clinical Faculty**

For promotion to associate professor – clinical, a faculty member must demonstrate that he/she has attained excellence in teaching and achievement in service. For promotion to professor – clinical, a faculty member must demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching as well as excellence in service. A notable requirement for promotion to professor – clinical, one that can span both teaching and service dimensions, is the production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice to external audiences, such as faculty at other universities. Thus, the standard for promotion to professor – clinical versus associate professor – clinical is expected to be substantially higher and consist of a sustained record over a period of several years, as well as

enhanced contributions on the service dimension.

Excellence in teaching includes high-quality performance in classroom teaching as well as provision of effective student services and instructional support, including meaningful contributions to programs. High quality performance in classroom teaching is a critical component of this requirement, and is evidenced by the following activities:

- Consistently good student evaluations.
- Development and use of up-to-date course content.
- Demonstrated ability to organize and present class material effectively.
- Creativity in the use of various modes of instruction.
- Respectful interaction with students across degree programs.
- Appropriate and timely feedback to students.
- Engagement in curriculum development.
- Providing meaningful advising services to students.
- Documented efforts to sustain and improve performance in teaching.

Exceptional classroom teaching is necessary but not sufficient for demonstrating excellence in teaching through the clinical track ranks. Effective student services and instructional support are also required. Indicators of effective student services and instructional support relevant to promotion decisions include:

- Highly visible and successful leadership in multiple student service activities in the college; these may include attending and organizing outside-of-class events with students; supervision and collaboration with student organizations; participation in student competitions as a judge; engagement with faculty and staff, both from the college and the university as well as with parties external to the university to develop initiatives, classes, and programs.
- Development and dissemination of important new approaches to teaching.
- Adoption of teaching innovations.
- Development of integrated offerings/curriculum that contributes to Fisher being nationally or internationally recognized.
- National or international recognition for shaping the direction of teaching.

- Participation in “train-the-trainer” programs that attract external faculty to the college.
- Development of teaching programs and materials that serves as a major draw for new students and companies coming to Fisher.
- Demonstrated efforts to significantly enhance and support diversity in the college.

Effective service for a clinical faculty member entails contributions at the college and university level, but also demonstration of a high level of competence in professional practice. Such service effectiveness can be demonstrated by, for example:

- Development of long-term working relationships with highly visible companies, trade and professional associations, and other related organizations.
- Notable contributions to client relationships and development of offerings delivered through executive education programs.
- Professional advising or consulting activities that both improve the curriculum and classroom experience and provide meaningful support to the business community.
- Leadership and other major contributions to academic programs that enhance the reputation of the college. This may include serving in an administrative capacity, engaging in program development or redesign, and undertaking corporate outreach activities that impact student recruitment and placement.
- Development of meaningful course materials that enhance education both within the college and the broader business and academic community, including publishing materials such as teaching cases, articles, and popular trade books.

Achieving a service record worthy of consideration for clinical promotion does not rest on documenting activities consistent with a fixed number of items from this list, nor is this list to be viewed as all inclusive. Rather, the final determination of whether a promotion standard has been reached rests with the evaluative bodies involved in promotion and annual review processes and is a matter of individual and collective professional judgment. This judgment is expected to entail a broad consideration of the college mission and how the candidate can and does uniquely contribute to achieving college goals.

## **B. Procedures**

The college’s procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are consistent with those set forth in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-04](#) and OAA’s annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

Candidates for promotion and tenure or for promotion are reviewed at four levels: the eligible faculty in the candidate's TIU, the chair of the candidate's TIU, the dean of the college, and the executive vice president and provost of the university. The college has a standing faculty promotion and tenure committee that is advisory to the dean. In the college, this committee is the College Personnel Committee (CPC). The following sections state the responsibilities of each party to the review process.

## **1 Candidate Responsibilities**

The responsibilities of the candidate are as follows:

- To submit a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with OAA guidelines. Candidates should not sign the OAA Dossier Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the OAA core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist. Dossier requirements are outlined in Appendix A.
- To define his or her field of work since activities and accomplishments are assessed within that context. The college currently recognizes thirteen fields of work: Accounting, Business Law, Decision Sciences, Entrepreneurship, Finance, Human Resources, International Business, Logistics, Management Information Systems, Marketing, Operations Management, Organizational Behavior, and Strategy. The college recognizes that this list may not fully describe all fields of work that are relevant in the study of the theory and practice of business. For example, newly developed fields of work and inter-disciplinary fields of work may not be included in this list. With this in mind, candidates can choose to define their own field of work (within the guidelines provided below). The candidate's statement and the department's action with regard to the proposed field of work should be communicated to the dean no later than when the department chair conveys the list of suggested letter writers to the dean for approval.

Self-defined fields of work must meet the same quality standards as each of the thirteen fields of work currently recognized by the college: they must be broad-based, widely recognized, and they cannot be a sub-field of any one of the thirteen fields currently recognized by the college. To be used in a review process, three-fourths of the eligible faculty members in a department must agree that a faculty member's self-defined field of work meets the defined standard. The determination must be made prior to the beginning of the review process, and prior to the seeking of external letters (in reviews for which such letters are required) via the ballot listed in Appendix C. If the candidate's self-defined field of work is not accepted by three-fourths of the eligible faculty members, the candidate must choose from among the thirteen fields of work currently recognized by the college.

- To submit a copy of the college's APT document that was in effect at the time of his or her hire, contract renewal, or last promotion, whichever is more recent and applicable, if he or she wishes to be reviewed under that document's criteria and procedures. This must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the department. See Section III for details.
- To review the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department eligible faculty and chair. The extent to which candidates can supplement or request deletions from the list is noted in the "External Evaluations" section later in this section.
- To review and respond to the TIU review report and the department chair's recommendation letter. To do so, the candidate will be given 10 business days following delivery of each letter. The university provides forms for such comments and also provides forms for a candidate to decline comment. It is required that whichever form is appropriate be completed for each review level and included in the dossier materials submitted to OAA.

## **2 Eligible Faculty Responsibilities**

The responsibilities of the eligible faculty in the department are as follows:

- **Spring Semester**
  - Consider requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review for promotion and tenure to associate professor, a Path 1 promotion to professor, or a clinical promotion in the following academic year, and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. In addition, eligible faculty members of the rank of professor discuss whether any department faculty member should be considered for Path 2 promotion to professor. In each case, a simple majority vote is required for the review to proceed. In the case of a vote favoring consideration of a Path 2 promotion, the department must gain the permission of the would-be candidate before the process can proceed.
    - In the case of non-mandatory promotion and tenure to associate professor or a Path 1 promotion to professor, the eligible faculty base its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's curriculum vitae; his or her research, teaching, and service statements; and student and peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching. In the case of clinical promotions, other than a separate research statement, the same documents are evaluated. Lack of documentation is sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
    - A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under [Faculty Rule 3335-6-04](#) for one year. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review

go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.

- Consistent with OAA policy, only faculty members who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non-mandatory tenure review. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are not to be considered for promotion.
- A decision by the eligible faculty 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 make a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Select from among its members an individual to serve as the Department Procedures Oversight Designee (D-POD) for all mandatory and non-mandatory cases for the upcoming year. The D-POD cannot subsequently serve as author to draft a report for any case on behalf of the eligible faculty. A description of the role of the D-POD is provided in Appendix B.
- Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair.
- **Autumn Semester**
  - The department chair coordinates with the eligible faculty in scheduling one or more meetings for the eligible faculty to review and analyze all tenure and promotion cases in the department, making every effort to schedule the meetings at times when all eligible faculty members can attend. A faculty member being reviewed does not attend the meeting wherein his or her case is being considered.
    - Prior to the meeting to discuss a candidate's record, the department chair, the D-POD, and the assigned CPC representative review the dossier and materials to ensure that it meets all requirements and is ready for distribution to the eligible faculty. Copies of the verified review documents and copies of received evaluation letters are distributed to all eligible faculty members in the department in sufficient time to prepare for the meeting (normally no later than one week prior to the meeting). In addition, the eligible faculty is also informed of any member who will not be in attendance due to a conflict of interest, and any letter the recused faculty member may have provided. The eligible faculty review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's materials in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
    - In the meeting, conducted under the direction of the department chair, the first agenda item is the election of one of the present eligible faculty

members (other than the D-POD or the department chair) to author the departmental promotion or promotion and tenure review report (hereafter referred to as TIU review report). If more than one person is being reviewed, a different eligible faculty member present can be elected to author each separate TIU review report.

- The role of the author of the TIU review report, in addition to participating in the discussion as a member of the faculty, is to take careful notes of the discussion. This individual will also typically represent the department in presenting the case to the CPC (detailed later). The role of the departmental D-POD is to assure that the department's process follows departmental, college, and university guidelines and is fair and unbiased. If the D-POD observes any significant deviations from these guidelines, he or she submits a report to the department chair and to the dean.
  - The eligible faculty should consider the strengths and weaknesses of the record of the candidate(s) being evaluated. Discussion should be open and frank and focus on whether or not a candidate's research, teaching, and service activities meet the criteria for promotion and tenure described in this document. The department chair should not make substantive contributions to this discussion given that he or she has an independent opportunity to state views via a written evaluation and recommendation to the dean that accompanies the eligible faculty's evaluation and recommendation document. Among other matters, the faculty should discuss each of the papers sent to the reviewers. The department discussion of the candidate's research should not be limited to referencing the external letter writers' opinions about the papers. The discussion should be an independent assessment of those papers by the eligible faculty. Similarly, the evaluation of teaching should not be limited to only Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) data, but also include other dimensions listed in this document.
  - After faculty members at the departmental promotion and tenure review meeting (including the assigned CPC representative) feel satisfied that both the strengths and weaknesses of a candidate's record have been thoroughly discussed and evaluated, a formal vote is taken. This vote uses the appropriate ballot presented in Appendix C. A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast is positive.
- Upon completion of its deliberations of each case, a TIU review report is authored and, along with the completed ballots, forwarded to the department chair. The TIU review report summarizes the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's record, providing an in-depth analysis of the case as discussed in the departmental promotion and tenure review meeting. This report also describes the outcome of the vote of the eligible faculty members taken at this meeting.

The faculty member assigned the task in the department promotion and tenure meeting completes an initial draft of the report. The draft report is distributed by its author to all eligible faculty members in the department no more than one week after the conclusion of the departmental promotion and tenure meeting. The department chair also receives a copy. Only eligible faculty members that attended the department promotion and tenure meeting where the case was discussed can suggest revisions to the draft and have one week to do so; however, eligible faculty members who were unable to attend the meeting do receive copies of the TIU review report drafts and its revisions. The department chair does not suggest substantive revisions to the TIU review report draft. Any disagreements about the content of the report must be resolved, with the aid of the department chair and D-POD if necessary, no later than one week after the report draft is first distributed to the eligible faculty. After the TIU review report is finalized, its author distributes it to all eligible faculty members in the department, the department chair, and to the CPC representative for the case.

- The final TIU review report and the department chair's letter are provided to the candidate by the department chair by *October 15*, and the candidate is given 10 business days to respond. Thereafter, the eligible faculty has the opportunity to provide a written reply to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- A senior faculty member from the department (typically the author of the TIU review report) presents the case to the CPC at the beginning of its deliberations. The department representative summarizes the strengths and weaknesses of the case as seen through the eyes of the department faculty and responds to any CPC questions regarding norms in the particular field/discipline.

### **3 Department Chair Responsibilities**

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- **Spring Semester**

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

department faculty member should be considered for Path 2 promotion to professor. The department chair works with candidates to ensure review materials are provided to the eligible faculty in reasonable advance of the meeting.

- To avert and help resolve potential issues of conflict of interest that may arise during the review process.
- To solicit evaluation letters from a list suggested by the eligible faculty and the candidate.

- **Summer and Autumn Semesters**

- Provide candidates in the department with advice and counsel. Along with the designated D-POD and the CPC representative, the chair of the department serves as an advisor to the candidate on the development of the dossier, reviews the candidate's materials for completeness, accuracy, and consistency with OAA requirements; and works with the candidate to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the department promotion and tenure meeting.
- Ensure that the candidate's complete dossier and related documents are copied and distributed to all appropriate parties at least one week in advance of the department's promotion and tenure meeting in which the case will be discussed.
- Provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate upon receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation. This letter, addressed to the dean, provides the department chair's evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the record of the candidate being reviewed for promotion and tenure or promotion. The letter concludes by recommending whether or not the faculty member being reviewed should be promoted and tenured or promoted. The department chair uses the same voting categories used by the faculty in the departmental promotion and tenure review meeting. The chair may or may not respond to issues and concerns raised in the departmental promotion and tenure review meeting and report. A copy of this letter is given to all eligible faculty in the department. The department chair meets with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to its recommendation.
- Provide the candidate being reviewed a copy of both the finalized TIU review report and a copy of the department chair's recommendation letter by *October 15*.
- Inform each candidate in writing of the opportunity to submit written comments on the TIU review report and the department chair's recommendation letter within 10 business days from receipt of the letters, for

inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments. The candidate's response is attached to the TIU review report and department chair's recommendation letter, and a copy is placed in the personnel file of the candidate being reviewed.

- Provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier. The department chair and/or the eligible faculty may each write replies to a faculty member's response and are encouraged to do so if procedural problems that might reasonably have affected the outcome of a review are alleged. These responses will also be attached to the TIU review report and department chair's recommendation letter and included in the personnel file of the candidate being reviewed. Only one round of the comments process relative to the departmental level review is permitted.
- Provide the candidate's dossier, complete in all respects except for the candidate's response to letters and potential departmental reply, to the dean's office by *October 15*. Provide the candidate's response to letters and potential departmental reply to the dean's office prior to the scheduled CPC meeting.

#### **4 College Personnel Committee (CPC) Responsibilities**

The responsibilities of the CPC are as follows:

- Elect a chair in its first meeting of the year. In this same meeting, for each case, one CPC member is assigned to serve as the CPC representative; the CPC representative is not assigned a case from his or her own department.
- The CPC representative attends all meetings in which substantive discussions of the case are held, including the departmental promotion and tenure review meeting. In addition, the CPC representative:
  - Works with the candidate, along with the D-POD and the department chair, to provide guidance regarding the documentation and presentation of the case and to assure compliance with procedures. To perform this role, the CPC representative meets with the candidate as needed.
  - Ensures that the discussion in the department promotion and tenure review meeting of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's record is open, frank, and complete and focuses on a determination of impact. In this effort the CPC representative's role is not to participate in the substance of the discussion but to observe and encourage a complete discussion. This includes posing process questions to the eligible faculty to ensure that the department has addressed how the candidate has or has not met the criteria associated with the rank sought by the candidate as outlined in this APT document.

- Verifies, along with the D-POD, that the votes are correctly counted, that process follows departmental, college and university guidelines, and that the meeting is conducted in a fair and unbiased manner.
- Serves as a resource to the CPC on the case as a result of having been present at the department promotion and tenure review meeting. Any concerns as to the thoroughness or appropriateness of the departmental discussion should previously have been expressed to the department chair. These issues may possibly cause the CPC to request the department chair and the D-POD to meet with the CPC to discuss the case and to elaborate on the departmental discussion.
- Review thoroughly and objectively each candidate's dossier (except those involving a candidate from the CPC member's own department) in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed. The materials to be reviewed consist of the candidate's complete dossier and materials including letters from evaluators, the TIU review report, the department chair's recommendation letter, any responses written by the candidate being reviewed and any replies written to those responses, annual performance reviews for past five years, and SEI and peer assessment of teaching.
- The CPC chair schedules meetings of the CPC to discuss cases in a timely fashion (the meetings being held no later than the last day of November). A quorum for the CPC to conduct business is two-thirds of its eligible membership.
  - The first agenda item in the CPC meeting is the election of one of the CPC members to author the CPC report and another member of the CPC to serve as the CPC Procedures Oversight Designee (C-POD) for each of the cases. If more than one person is being reviewed at a particular meeting, more than one CPC member present can be elected to author separate CPC reports, and different CPC members present can be elected as the C-POD for different cases.
  - The C-POD ensures that the CPC's process follows college and university guidelines and is fair and unbiased. If the C-POD observes any significant deviations from these guidelines, he or she submits a report to the dean of the college. Details of POD responsibilities are presented in Appendix B.
  - In CPC deliberations of each candidate, CPC members from the same academic department as the candidate are recused, neither attending, voting or otherwise involving themselves in the process. Consideration of the case then begins with a representative from the candidate's department presenting the case to the CPC. The department representative will be a senior faculty member from the department and typically will be the author of the TIU review report. The department representative summarizes the strengths and weaknesses of the case as seen through the

eyes of the department faculty and responds to any CPC questions regarding norms in the particular field/discipline. The department representative is excused at the end of his or her presentation. The department representative remains available to the CPC through the remainder of its meeting in case further questions arise warranting the representative being recalled to the meeting.

- The CPC then proceeds with discussion on the case, with the CPC representative assigned to the case sharing his or her impressions to initiate discussion. All present CPC members express their views on the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's research, teaching, and service and outreach activities, and whether these activities meet the criteria set in this document. CPC discussions should be based solely on the documents generated through the promotion and tenure review process and discussion in the meetings described here. The meeting concludes with a vote that is advisory to the dean, verified and recorded by the C-POD.
- The CPC produces a report for the dean on each case. The CPC member elected as the author of the CPC report writes an initial draft shortly after the CPC meeting is adjourned. This report summarizes the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's record as discussed at the CPC meeting and reports the vote of the CPC. The draft report is passed among members of the CPC who were present for the discussion of a particular case for comment. In cases where the CPC feels that that it would be helpful to meet with the dean to discuss a case prior to completing its finalized report, such a meeting will take place assuming that the dean is amenable. When such a meeting occurs all reasonable effort will be made to schedule the meeting such that all CPC members can attend. Once the CPC report is finalized, it is included in the dossier materials submitted to the dean by the chair of the CPC. The CPC report should be completed no later than the last day of the Autumn semester.
- Efforts to influence CPC discussions of individual cases through e-mail, memos, conversations, or other formal or informal means outside the procedures described in this document are considered a serious breach of professional ethics and are deemed unacceptable.
- Review the college's APT document annually and recommend any proposed revisions to the dean. Any revision to the APT document must be affirmed through established process.

## **5 Dean's Responsibilities**

All documents generated through the promotion and tenure process, including the CPC report, are received by the dean. These documents are advisory to the dean.

The dean makes a recommendation concerning the promotion and tenure or promotion of the candidate and forwards this recommendation, in the form of a letter, to the candidate being reviewed, the author of the TIU review report, the department chair, member of the CPC, and OAA (as part of the official dossier by the annually determined deadline).

In accordance with university regulations, candidates have ten business days to write a response to the CPC report and the dean's recommendation letter. This response is forwarded to OAA and a copy is placed in the faculty member's file. The CPC and/or the dean may write a reply to a faculty member's response and are encouraged to do so if procedural problems that might reasonably have affected the outcome of a review are alleged. This response will also be attached to the CPC report and dean's recommendation letter and included in the personnel file of the faculty member being reviewed.

Upon notification of the final disposition of a case, the dean informs all college faculty members of the outcome.

## **6 External Evaluations**

### **Tenure-track Faculty**

External evaluations of research are obtained for all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews. In the case of candidates for promotion to professor under Path 2, consideration should be given to including those with knowledge of the candidate's teaching and service accomplishments among the letter writers. This should, however, not be done at the exclusion of external evaluation of research accomplishments.

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's research (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or 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 will normally only be solicited from full professors at highly regarded academic institutions. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory.

Since it is impossible to control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, at least twice as many letters are sought as are required, and they are solicited no later than the end of the Spring semester prior to the review year. This timing allows

additional letters to be requested should fewer than five letters result from the first round of requests.

Outside reviewers must be senior in rank to the candidate being evaluated and must be distinguished scholars who are able to evaluate the quality and impact of the candidate's activities. The candidate may add up to three additional names to the list provided by the department faculty, but is not required to do so. The candidate may also request the removal of no more than two names. The finalized list must be approved by the dean or the dean's designee.

Once the final list of outside evaluators is identified, all of them are contacted by the department chair and asked if they would be willing to serve as an external reviewer for the case. Those that agree to serve as an external reviewer receive a cover letter following OAA's suggested format (sample letter templates are found in Appendix D), along with the candidate's curriculum vitae, research statement, and up to six examples of research activities. In the case of Path 2 promotions, the materials are supplemented by the candidate's teaching and service statements.

[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. The department chair makes every reasonable effort to obtain at least one letter from someone suggested by the faculty member. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither OAA nor the college requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

Under no circumstances may a candidate or any member of the faculty 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 or other faculty member regarding the review, they must inform the evaluator that such communication is inappropriate and report the occurrence to the department chair and to the dean, who will decide what, if any, action is warranted. 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. Letters must be signed (pdf versions with signature are acceptable). E-mails are not sufficient. 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 OAA for advice.

### **Clinical Faculty**

For promotion from assistant professor – clinical to associate professor – clinical, letters from reviewers external to The Ohio State University are not required, although such letters may be requested at the discretion of the eligible faculty. However, such promotions require letters from internal evaluators. Internal evaluators include (a) clinical or tenure-track faculty of higher rank than under consideration for the candidate

in the college or in other TIUs at the university and (b) program chairs, center and institutional directors, or senior administrators in the college or university. The eligible faculty, in consultation with the department chair, creates a list of four or more internal evaluators who are likely to have had significant interactions with the candidate. The candidate may add one additional name, but is not required to do so. The candidate may also request the removal of no more than one name. A minimum of three letters is needed to begin evaluation.

For promotion from associate professor – clinical to professor – clinical, candidates are responsible for reviewing a list of four or more internal evaluators and four or more external evaluators developed by the eligible faculty in consultation with the department chair. The candidate may add one additional name to the list of internal evaluators and one additional name to the list of external evaluators, but is not required to do so. The candidate may also request the removal of no more than one name from each group. A minimum of five letters is needed to begin evaluation.

All contact with letter writers will be made only by the department chair. Those that agree to serve as reviewers receive a cover letter (see Appendix D for a sample), along with the candidate's curriculum vitae and teaching and service statements. Again, the letters are solicited no later than the end of the Spring semester prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than the required number of letters result from the first round of requests.

## **7 Reviews for External Candidates**

The criteria described for evaluating internal candidates for promotion and tenure and promotion also apply to external candidates. All external candidates must demonstrate rank-appropriate levels of research, teaching, and service/outreach.

The only significant differences between the evaluation of internal and external candidates has to do with the level of required documentation. External candidates are not required to develop a complete dossier in accordance with The Ohio State University regulations. An external tenure-track candidate, guided by the department chair, is required to submit the following promotion and tenure documentation:

- Updated curriculum vitae.
- Examples of research activities.
- An explanation of how these research activities meet college promotion and tenure criteria for their prospective rank.
- Examples of teaching activities including indicators of quality classroom instruction, use of classroom materials by other individuals, textbooks written and adoption information, cases written and adoption information, and any other indicators of teaching accomplishments.

- An explanation of how these teaching activities meet college promotion and tenure criteria for their prospective rank.

Department chairs are responsible for distributing the above information to the eligible faculty at least a week prior to the departmental promotion and tenure review meeting where the formal vote is taken.

The steps and procedures described for evaluating internal candidates apply to external candidates as well including:

- The appropriate number of letters is obtained from evaluators, with the list of names prepared by input from the eligible faculty and candidate.
- There is a formal departmental promotion and tenure review meeting, with an assigned D-POD, a report writer, and a CPC representative in attendance.
- The department chair prepares a separate recommendation letter.
- The departmental faculty report and the department chair's letter, along with the candidate's materials, are forwarded to the CPC for their evaluation.
- There is a formal CPC meeting on the case, with an assigned C-POD, a report writer, and a departmental representative who is invited for clarification.
- The dean receives all documents and reports from the department and the CPC and prepares a separate recommendation letter.

For external clinical faculty hires at the associate and professor levels, the criteria and procedures are identical to those for promotion of internal candidates to these ranks with the exception that all evaluators in such cases are external to The Ohio State University.

### **8 Procedures if New Information About a Candidate Becomes Available**

Sometimes events occur that could materially change the information in the promotion and tenure review document after the document is originally submitted. For example, submitted papers may be accepted, accepted papers may be published, awards may be won, and so forth. The faculty member being reviewed can, if he or she desires, update the promotion and tenure documents with the new information by notifying the department chair. The department chair verifies the accuracy of this new information. If it is verified, the promotion and tenure review documents are revised, and subsequent deliberative bodies in the college take the new information into account.

If information regarding new accomplishments becomes available before department-level review documents are forwarded to the CPC but after the eligible faculty has voted, the question of reconsidering a case in light of the new information can be posed

immediately. In this situation, following dissemination of the new information (which need not take place in a meeting), the eligible faculty take a preliminary vote to determine whether or not to re-vote the case. This preliminary vote takes the form of a ballot asking each eligible faculty member who had voted originally in the case to indicate whether the new information might change his or her vote (see Appendix C for the ballot). If at least one person indicates that his or her vote might change, the eligible faculty members who had voted originally meet to discuss the case with the new information and re-vote. The originally generated TIU review report is then amended to reflect the content of the reconsideration and the new vote. In this circumstance, the previously generated report remains in the dossier. In any reconsideration, the candidates retain the right to comment on the (revised) TIU review report. Replies to these responses can also be written and are included in a faculty member's personnel file, as described earlier.

If new information becomes available after department-level review documents are forwarded to the CPC, the decision as to whether or not the case should be returned to the department for a re-vote is at the discretion of the dean. If the dean believes that the added information may likely impact the outcome, he or she can request the department and, then the CPC, re-vote.

### **C. Documentation**

Every tenure-track and clinical candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows OAA dossier outline. While the procedures oversight designees and the department chair make reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier. An outline of required documentation can be found in Appendix A.

## **VIII. APPEALS**

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

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

## **IX. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS**

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

## **X. STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

### **A. Student Evaluation of Teaching**

Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) is administered for every course offered in the college. [Faculty Rule 3335-3-35](#) requires that students be given the opportunity to evaluate the quality of instruction provided in each of their courses. The 10-item online SEI document is the official university-wide instrument provided for this purpose. The faculty member is to encourage students to complete the SEI, explaining that the evaluations will be used for both performance evaluation and feedback to the instructor. In the event the faculty member additionally chooses to provide in-class time for students to complete the evaluation using a mobile application, the faculty member should select a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high, and the faculty member must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation.

### **B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

#### **1 Timing of Evaluations**

**Voluntary Peer Evaluation:** Voluntary peer assessment is available at any time to any faculty member. A request is made to the department chair who then works with the faculty member and, if desired, the appropriate program chair. In early stages of their career, faculty are particularly encouraged to seek voluntary peer evaluation to obtain timely feedback for growth and improvement in their teaching. Information from voluntary assessment is not included in materials submitted for promotion and/or tenure reviews. Use of the services of the University Center for the Advancement of Teaching (UCAT) for developmental assistance is also encouraged. Discussions with UCAT staff are confidential and developmental feedback from UCAT is given only to the faculty member.

**Mandatory Peer Evaluation:** For full-time instructional faculty, mandatory peer assessment of teaching effectiveness occurs at least twice during the first six years of appointment in the college and at least once every five years thereafter.

In the case of untenured, full-time tenure-track faculty, mandatory peer assessments take place at least once in the first three years of appointment, and at least once in the next two years. Thus, there is at least one formal peer evaluation prior to the Fourth-Year review, and at least two formal peer evaluations prior to the sixth year promotion and tenure review.

Since the timing of reviews for tenure-track faculty is consistent with the promotion and tenure process, any exclusion of time from the tenure clock (e.g., due to a professional leave, a leave of absence) modifies the timing of the peer assessment consistent with the modification made to the tenure clock.

In the case of tenured full-time faculty, mandatory peer assessment occurs at least

once every five years. There should be at least two completed formal peer evaluations, with at least one conducted since tenure, before commencement of a case for promotion to professor.

For non tenure-track, full-time faculty, mandatory peer assessment occurs at least once during the first three years of appointment in the college, and at least once in the subsequent three years of appointment. Thereafter, mandatory peer assessments occur at least once every five years. For clinical faculty being considered for promotion to the rank of of associate professor-clinical there should be at least two formal peer evaluations; for promotion to professor-clinical, there should again be at least two peer evaluations with at least one conducted since last promotion.

Outside of mandatory peer assessments, teaching effectiveness is monitored on an on-going basis through department chair review of syllabi and department and program chair review of SEI and other relevant teaching data. For any faculty member, peer assessment can take place more frequently than stated above if the department chair and one or more program chairs decide that an assessment is warranted.

## **2 Components of Review**

Faculty members in the college strive for excellence in teaching effectiveness. Assessment of instructional effectiveness is important to continuing excellence. The college peer assessment of teaching effectiveness consists of the review of course content and delivery.

**Review of Course Content:** The objective of reviewing course content is to assess the quality and appropriateness of course materials. Included is assessment of whether materials are up-to-date, course coverage is appropriate, and student assessment is appropriate.

Review of course content is a department responsibility and is accomplished in accordance with procedures set forth by each department as detailed in its patterns of administration. The assessment is accomplished by the department chair and/or by a faculty committee, depending on department policy.

In the case of peer assessment occurring in the context of promotion and/or tenure decisions, assessment also includes review of new course design efforts, review of activities to improve teaching effectiveness, and all other items referred to in the college APT document as related to evidence of accomplishment in teaching.

Each department chair annually reports to the dean's office on the department's efforts and accomplishments regarding review of course content according to the aspects listed above and in the context of the department's review schedule.

**Review of Course Delivery:** The objective of course delivery review is to assess the quality of course delivery, including the manner in which course material is conveyed, the degree of faculty-student interaction, the use of appropriate technology and other relevant dimensions. This includes assessing course delivery for clear and effective presentation of course concepts and materials and for effective and productive interactions with students through classroom discussion.

**Classroom Observation Procedures:** The faculty member being visited provides the department chair, prior to the first week of the semester, with a list of five appropriate class sessions (not to include examinations or other times where the involvement of the faculty member being observed is minimal). The department chair identifies the class session(s) observers will attend, sharing that information with the faculty member at least one week prior to the actual visit. The department chair selects two faculty members to constitute a visitation team (with the possibility of a single visitor in some departments in the case of post-tenure reviews). The faculty member under review is informed of the composition of the team before it is finalized and has the right to request one change in the membership of the team before the formal assignment is made. Assigned faculty members may or may not visit the same class session but will visit a session from the list provided by the faculty member under review and with at least one week advanced notice to the faculty member. Whenever the assessment is related to a formal promotion and/or tenure review, members of the team must be of higher academic rank than the individual being reviewed.

In visiting class, observers sit in the rear of the classroom. An observer, if he or she deems it appropriate, can inform the students of his or her presence at the beginning of the class, stating “Consistent with the Fisher College of Business efforts to consistently improve instructional delivery, faculty regularly sit in on classes of all professors. I am/We are here to observe Professor X.” Alternatively, the faculty member being visited may introduce the observer as he or she sees fit.

The record of classroom observation includes: a list of general facts; an assessment of the instructor’s level of organization, command of material, clarity of presentation, and nature and quality of interaction with the students; and a description of any deployment of instructional technology and its impact on the engagement of students.

In the case of classroom observation related to promotion and/or tenure reviews, the report of the assessment team is included in the documentation of the promotion and tenure case.

A classroom observation report is submitted to the department chair. Whether each observer (when there are two) files a separate report or whether a collaborative single report is filed is determined by department level policy. The

department chair provides copies to the faculty member reviewed and to the appropriate associate dean for program. The faculty member has the right to file a response or reaction to the assessment report.

### **3 Responsibilities**

**Department Chairs:** It is the responsibility of the department chair to:

- Establish and maintain a schedule of mandatory peer assessments consistent with the timing articulated in this policy, to modify the schedule as changes in faculty composition occur, and to assure that an up-to-date copy of the schedule is on file with the dean or dean designee.
- Ensure that review of course content and review of course delivery within the department occurs as outlined in this policy and that all necessary reports are completed and distributed, as described, to faculty and to the dean's office. Reports consist of the visitation reports completed by faculty colleagues (given to the faculty member under review and to the appropriate associate dean for program) and the annual report to the dean on departmental activities consistent with the policy's requirements for review of course content.
- Ensure that departmental policies and procedures pertaining to the peer assessment of instructional effectiveness are included in the department's patterns of administration.
- Use the peer assessment process to provide constructive feedback to individual faculty members thereby fostering instructional development of all faculty members. Although part-time and visiting faculty are not subject to formal review under this document, department chairs are responsible for providing support and oversight to assure an acceptable level of instructional effectiveness in courses taught by this faculty.

**Program Administrators:** Program chairs and deans with program titles all share responsibility with department chairs for instructional effectiveness. As such, they work to address a variety of issues (i.e., instructional quality, cross course coordination, deployment of instructional resources) with department chairs through regular review of course content and course delivery.

It is the responsibility of the associate dean(s) for programs to work with department chairs to ensure that all reporting requirements mandated under this policy are met and that peer assessment activities in the college are focused on maintaining high standards and improving individual performance within a collegial environment.

To support continued faculty dialogue on teaching and instructional effectiveness,

the associate dean(s) for programs, working with department and program chairs will organize teaching related events/activities (e.g., faculty discussions, presentations on innovations, book discussions) as appropriate.

## **XI. AFFIRMATION BY FISHER COLLEGE AFFILIATED TIUs**

University rules state that “each tenure initiating unit is responsible for establishing criteria for appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure” and that “each tenure initiating unit shall have an appointments, promotion, and tenure document” ([Faculty Rule 3335-6-02](#)). Through TIU-based voting, the five TIUs affiliated with the Fisher College of Business agree that this document will constitute the APT document under which each TIU will operate until otherwise decided. The TIUs of the Fisher College of Business voted to support the adoption of this document as their APT document on the dates indicated below.

Department of Accounting and MIS: 09/30/2016

Department of Finance: 09/19/2016

Department of Management and Human Resources: 09/03/2016

Department of Management Sciences: 09/13/2016

Department of Marketing and Logistics: 09/16/2016

Fisher College of Business Dean: 12/09/2016

# APPENDIX A

---

## Dossier Elements and Requirements

- A-1** Dossier Requirements for Fourth-Year Reviews
- A-2** Dossier Requirements for Promotion & Tenure Review
- A-3** Dossier Requirements for Promotion to Professor – Path 1
- A-4** Dossier Requirements for Promotion to Professor – Path 2
- A-5** Dossier Requirements for Clinical Promotions

## APPENDIX A-1

### DOSSIER ELEMENTS AND REQUIREMENTS – Fourth-Year Reviews

This appendix lists elements that comprise the materials referred to as the dossier for Fourth-Year review candidates. In addition to providing either written or electronic copies of each item listed below, the candidate must also complete the electronic core dossier in the format put in place by the Office of Academic Affairs (Research In View or its successor).

1. Original Dossier Checklist signed by the candidate (this form will be provided to the candidate by the dean's office).
2. Updated curriculum vitae.
3. A statement of the candidate's area(s) of research and a description of research activities since hire. The candidate's statement should include an assessment of how his or her research activities show progress toward the college standards for promotion to associate professor with tenure.
4. Copies of representative research publications.
5. A statement of the candidate's teaching activities since hire including his or her assessment of how these activities indicate progress toward the college standards for promotion to associate professor with tenure.
6. A copy of syllabi for all courses taught by the candidate since hire.
7. Records of Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) for each course taught by the candidate since hire. Verbatim student comments are not to be included. Instead, the candidate will include a representative summary of the comments in the dossier. The TIU head will assign the task of preparing such a summary to a faculty member in the department (e.g., the D-POD). The candidate is given the opportunity to review the summary prior to inclusion in the dossier.
8. A brief statement of the candidate's service activities since hire.

The following items will be added to the dossier at the department and college level.

1. Department and college level review letters, and completed comment forms to these reviews.
2. All annual performance reviews since hire.
3. Peer assessment of teaching report(s).

## APPENDIX A-2

### DOSSIER ELEMENTS AND REQUIREMENTS – Promotion & Tenure Review

This appendix lists elements that comprise the materials referred to as the dossier for promotion and tenure. In addition to providing either written or electronic copies of each item of each item listed below, the candidate must also complete the electronic core dossier in the format put in place by the Office of Academic Affairs (Research In View or its successor).

1. Original Dossier Checklist signed by the candidate (this form will be provided to the candidate by the dean's office).
2. Updated curriculum vitae.
3. A statement of the candidate's area(s) of research and a description of research activities since hire. The candidate's statement should include an assessment of how his or her research activities meet the college standards for promotion to associate professor with tenure.
4. Copies of representative research publications.
5. A statement of the candidate's teaching activities since hire including his or her assessment of how these activities meet college standards for promotion to associate professor with tenure.
6. A copy of syllabi for all courses taught by the candidate since hire.
7. Records of Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) for each course taught by the candidate since hire. Verbatim student comments are not to be included. Instead, the candidate will include a representative summary of the comments in the dossier. The TIU head will assign the task of preparing such a summary to a faculty member in the department (e.g., the D-POD). The candidate is given the opportunity to review the summary prior to inclusion in the dossier.
8. A statement of the candidate's service activities since hire that includes an assessment of how his or her service activities meet the college standards for promotion to associate professor with tenure.
9. Candidates have 10 business days to provide comments or decline to comment on reports and or recommendation letters generated at each level of review. The Ohio State University form for this purpose will be provided to you by the department or dean's office. Complete and return to the appropriate office for inclusion in the dossier.

The following items will be added to the dossier at the department and college level.

1. Department and college level review letters, and completed comment forms to these reviews.
2. Annual performance reviews from the past five years.
3. Peer assessment of teaching report(s).
4. At least five letters from external reviewers, no more than half being from reviewers suggested by the candidate. A cover sheet indicating the qualifications of each letter writer will be completed by the department chair and placed on top of the corresponding letter. A summary of responding and non-responding external evaluators will also be completed and included by the department chair.

## **APPENDIX A-3**

### **DOSSIER ELEMENTS AND REQUIREMENTS – Promotion Review (Path 1)**

This appendix lists elements that comprise the materials referred to as the dossier for Path 1 promotion review. In addition to providing either written or electronic copies of each item of each item listed below, the candidate must also complete the electronic core dossier in the format put in place by the Office of Academic Affairs (Research In View or its successor).

1. Original Dossier Checklist signed by the candidate (this form will be provided to the candidate by the dean's office).
2. Updated curriculum vitae.
3. A statement of the candidate's area(s) of research and a description of research activities. The candidate's statement should include an assessment of how his or her research activities meet the college standard of excellence in research required for promotion to professor on Path 1.
4. Copies of representative research publications.
5. A statement of the candidate's teaching activities including his or her assessment of how these activities meet college standard of sustained achievement in teaching required for promotion to professor on Path 1.
6. A copy of syllabi for all courses taught by the candidate over the last five years or since the last promotion, whichever is less.
7. Records of Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) for each course taught by the candidate over the last five years or since the last promotion, whichever is less. Verbatim student comments are not to be included. Instead, the candidate will include a representative summary of the comments in the dossier. The TIU head will assign the task of preparing such a summary to a faculty member in the department (e.g., the D-POD). The candidate is given the opportunity to review the summary prior to inclusion in the dossier.
8. A statement of the candidate's service activities that includes an assessment of how his or her service activities meet the college standards of sustained achievement in service for promotion to professor on Path 1.
9. Candidates have 10 business days to provide comments or decline to comment on reports and or recommendation letters generated at each level of review. The Ohio State University form for this purpose will be provided to you by the department or dean's office. Complete and return to the appropriate office for inclusion in the dossier.

The following items will be added to the dossier at the department and college level.

1. Department and college level review letters, and completed comment forms to these reviews.
2. Annual performance reviews from the past five years.
3. Peer assessment of teaching report(s).
4. At least five letters from external reviewers, no more than half being from reviewers suggested by the candidate. A cover sheet indicating the qualification of each letter writer will be completed by the department and included in the dossier that is forwarded for CPC review. A summary of responding and non-responding external evaluators will also be completed and included by the department.

## APPENDIX A-4

### DOSSIER ELEMENTS AND REQUIREMENTS – Promotion Review (Path 2)

This appendix lists elements that comprise the materials referred to as the dossier for Path 2 promotion review. In addition to providing either written or electronic copies of each item of each item listed below, the candidate must also complete the electronic core dossier in the format put in place by the Office of Academic Affairs (Research In View or its successor).

1. Original Dossier Checklist signed by the candidate (this form will be provided to the candidate by the dean's office).
2. Updated curriculum vitae.
3. A statement of the candidate's area(s) of research and a description of research activities. The candidate's statement should include an assessment of how his or her research activities meet the college standard of sustained achievement in research required for promotion to professor on Path 2.
4. Copies of representative research publications.
5. A statement of the candidate's teaching activities including his or her assessment of how these activities meet college standard of excellence in teaching required for promotion to professor on Path 2. The statement should highlight the candidate's portfolio of teaching contributions including (but not limited to) detailing curriculum innovations; developments in teaching pedagogy; improving academic and professional skills of students; and creating and publishing programmatic materials, books, articles, resource guides, and cases.
6. A copy of syllabi for all courses taught by the candidate over the last five years or since the last promotion, whichever is less.
7. Records of Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) for each course taught by the candidate over the last five years or since the last promotion, whichever is less. Verbatim student comments are not to be included. Instead, the candidate will include a representative summary of the comments in the dossier. The TIU head will assign the task of preparing such a summary to a faculty member in the department (e.g., the D-POD). The candidate is given the opportunity to review the summary prior to inclusion in the dossier.
8. A statement of the candidate's service activities that includes an assessment of how his or her service activities meet the college standards of excellence in service for promotion to professor on Path 2.

9. Candidates have 10 business days to provide comments or decline to comment on reports and or recommendation letters generated at each level of review. The Ohio State University form for this purpose will be provided to you by the department or dean's office. Complete and return to the appropriate office for inclusion in the dossier.

The following items will be added to the dossier at the department and college level.

1. Department and college level review letters, and completed comment forms to these reviews.
2. Annual performance reviews from the past five years.
3. Peer assessment of teaching report(s).
4. At least five letters from external reviewers, no more than half being from reviewers suggested by the candidate. A cover sheet indicating the qualification of each letter writer will be completed by the department. A summary of responding and non-responding external evaluators will also be completed and included by the department.

## **APPENDIX A-5**

### **DOSSIER ELEMENTS AND REQUIREMENTS – Clinical Promotions**

For clinical promotion cases, in addition to complying with any formal dossier requirements by OAA, documentation must include:

1. Updated curriculum vitae.
2. A statement of teaching activities that includes an assessment of how these teaching activities meet the college standards for promotion.
3. A copy of syllabi for all courses taught by over the last five years or since the last promotion, whichever is less.
4. Examples of published books, articles, resource guides, programmatic materials and other teaching materials.
5. Records of Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) for each course taught by the candidate over the last five years or since the last promotion, whichever is less. Verbatim student comments are not to be included. Instead, the candidate will include a representative summary of the comments in the dossier. The TIU head will assign the task of preparing such a summary to a faculty member in the department (e.g., the D-POD). The candidate is given the opportunity to review the comments prior to inclusion in the dossier.
6. A statement of service activities that includes an assessment of how these service activities meet the college standards for promotion.
7. Candidates have 10 business days to provide comments or decline to comment on reports and or recommendation letters generated at each level of review.

The following items will be added to the dossier at the department and college level.

1. Department and college level review letters, and completed comment forms to these reviews.
2. Annual performance reviews from the past five years.
3. Peer assessment of teaching report(s).
4. Letters from evaluators. The department chair will complete a cover sheet that notes the qualification of each letter writer. A summary of responding and non-responding evaluators will also be completed and included by the chair.

# APPENDIX B

---

Responsibilities of the Procedures Oversight  
Designee (POD) for the Department (D-POD) and  
the College (C-POD)

## APPENDIX B

### RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PROCEDURES OVERSIGHT DESIGNEE (POD)

The Procedures Oversight Designees (POD) are appointed by the eligible faculty at the department level and by the CPC at the college level. A summary by OAA of the duties of the POD is found [here](#).

#### Duties of the Department POD (D-POD)

- The eligible faculty of each department selects one of its members as D-POD in the Spring semester prior to discussing all mandatory and non-mandatory Fourth-Year, promotion and tenure, and promotion cases. The D-POD should not be the department chair or the report writer for a case.
- The D-POD must be familiar with the written guidelines on the promotion and tenure process at the department, college, and university levels.
- Prior to the departmental promotion and tenure meeting the D-POD, along with the department chair and the assigned CPC representative, reviews the dossier to ensure that it meets all requirements and is ready for distribution to all eligible faculty. This includes:
  - Assuring that the dossier is prepared correctly using the applicable format, verifying any included SEI comments, asking the candidate to make any needed changes, and verifying that requested changes have been completed; and
  - Affirming the accuracy of all publications listed in the dossier. If anyone other than the D-POD performs this function it must be noted on the Dossier Checklist.
- The D-POD works with the department chair to address and resolve any conflicts of interest.
- The D-POD assures that proper criteria are applied when candidates are considered for early review or have an approved extension of the tenure clock.
- During the review meeting the D-POD ensures that the proceedings are carried out in a highly professional manner and that the process follows college and university guidelines.
- The D-POD monitors the review process in regard to equitable treatment for women and minority candidates, including assuring that the proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions about members of underrepresented groups that could bias their review. Specifically, he or she monitors the review

process in regard to equitable treatment for candidates based upon protected status as detailed in [HR Policy 1.10](#).

- If the D-POD has concerns about a review, he or she submits a report to the department chair and to the dean (see below for a more detailed outline of steps).
- The D-POD is responsible for recording the votes of the eligible faculty of the department on the Dossier Checklist included with the dossier materials. By signing the completed form the D-POD is confirming, “I understand that if the tenure-initiating unit reviews and forwards a dossier lacking key information and/or containing less than credible external evaluation, the review process may have to begin anew.”

### **Duties of the College POD (C-POD)**

- The CPC selects one of its members to serve as C-POD for each case during the meeting scheduled to review cases. The C-POD should not be the chair of the CPC and should not be the report writer for the case.
- If more than one person is being reviewed at a particular meeting, different CPC members present can be elected as the C-POD for different cases.
- The C-POD must be familiar with the written guidelines on the promotion and tenure process at the departments, college, and university levels.
- The C-POD works with the CPC chair to address and resolve any conflicts of interest.
- The C-POD monitors the review process in regard to equitable treatment for women and minority candidates, including assuring that the proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions about members of underrepresented groups that could bias their review. Specifically, he or she monitors the review process in regard to equitable treatment for candidates based upon protected as detailed in [HR Policy 1.10](#).
- If the C-POD has concerns about a review, he or she submits a report to the department chair and to the dean (see below for a more detailed outline of steps).
- The C-POD is responsible for recording the votes of the CPC on the Dossier Checklist included with the dossier materials. By signing the completed form the C-POD is confirming, “I understand that if the college reviews and forwards a dossier to the Office of Academic Affairs that lacks key information and/or containing less than credible external evaluation, the review process may have to begin anew.”

If the D-POD or the C-POD observe any significant deviations from college or university guidelines or has any concerns about a review, these concerns should first be brought to the attention of the person or review body generating the concerns. For example, if a dossier is not prepared correctly, the POD should ask the candidate who prepared the dossier to make needed changes. If appropriate procedures are not being followed by either faculty or staff, then those individuals should be promptly informed of the problem.

If concerns cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of the POD, then they should be brought to the attention of the relevant administrator (department head, CPC chair, or dean, depending on the level of review). The administrator must look into the matter and respond in writing to the POD regarding either the actions taken or the reasons that action was judged to be unwarranted.

Although a single committee member is assigned oversight responsibility, all members of review bodies must accept personal responsibility for assuring that reviews are procedurally correct, fair, and free of bias for all faculty members. Review bodies, not the POD, are ultimately responsible for the integrity of the review process.

# APPENDIX C

---

## Ballots

- C-1** Ballot for Fourth-Year Review – Department
- C-2** Ballot for Fourth-Year Review – CPC
- C-3** Ballot for Promotion to Associate Professor – Department
- C-4** Ballot for Promotion to Associate Professor – CPC
- C-5** Ballot for Promotion to Professor - Department
- C-6** Ballot for Promotion to Professor – CPC
- C-7** Ballot for Reconsidering a Case Should New Information Become Available
- C-8** Ballot for Evaluating Self-Defined Fields of Work

## APPENDIX C-1

### Ballot for Fourth-Year Review – Department Meeting

Candidate Being Reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

As prescribed by the Fisher College of Business appointments, promotion, and tenure document, this ballot presents three options for evaluating Fourth-Year review candidates. Please select one option below that you feel most accurately represents this case:

\_\_\_\_\_ *Reappoint – on track*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Reappoint – with reservations*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Do not reappoint*

In Fourth-Year reviews it is particularly important to provide the candidate with developmental feedback. Please take the time to provide such feedback in the space below. Likewise, if you have information that you would like to share with the CPC and with the dean with regard to this case and the probability of promotion, please do so.

#### Comments

## APPENDIX C-2

### Ballot for Fourth-Year Review – CPC Meeting

Candidate Being Reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

As prescribed by the Fisher College of Business appointments, promotion, and tenure document, this ballot presents three options for evaluating Fourth-Year review candidates. Please select one option below that you feel most accurately represents this case:

\_\_\_\_\_ *Reappoint – on track*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Reappoint – with reservations*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Do not reappoint*

In Fourth-Year reviews it is particularly important to provide the candidate with developmental feedback. Please take the time to provide such feedback in the space below. Likewise, if you have information that you would like to share with the dean with regard to this case and the probability of promotion, please do so.

#### Comments

**APPENDIX C-3**

**Ballot for Promotion to Associate Professor With Tenure –  
Department Meeting**

**Candidate Being Reviewed:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

The candidate meets the criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure as articulated in the Fisher College of Business appointments, promotion, and tenure document:

YES \_\_\_\_\_

NO \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments**

Note:

In the case of clinical faculty, the ballot (and criteria) for "associate professor with tenure" is re-worded as the ballot (and criteria) for "associate professor - clinical."

**APPENDIX C-4**

**Ballot for Promotion to Associate Professor With Tenure –  
CPC Meeting**

**Candidate Being Reviewed:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

The candidate meets the criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure as articulated in the Fisher College of Business appointments, promotion, and tenure document:

YES \_\_\_\_\_

NO \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments**

Note:

In the case of clinical faculty, the ballot (and criteria) for "associate professor with tenure" is re-worded as the ballot (and criteria) for "associate professor - clinical."

**APPENDIX C-5**

**Ballot for Promotion to Professor (Path 1) –  
Department Meeting**

**Candidate Being Reviewed:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

The candidate meets the criteria for promotion to professor (Path 1) as articulated in the Fisher College of Business appointments, promotion, and tenure document:

YES \_\_\_\_\_

NO \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments**

Note:

In the case of Path 2 promotions, the ballot is changed in obvious ways. In the case of clinical faculty, the ballot (and criteria) for "professor " is re-worded as the ballot (and criteria) for "professor - clinical."

**APPENDIX C-6**

**Ballot for Promotion to Professor (Path 1) – CPC Meeting**

**Candidate Being Reviewed:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

The candidate meets the criteria for promotion to professor (Path 1) as articulated in the Fisher College of Business appointments, promotion, and tenure document:

YES \_\_\_\_\_

NO \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments**

Note:

In the case of Path 2 promotions, the ballot is changed in obvious ways. In the case of clinical faculty, the ballot (and criteria) for "professor " is re-worded as the ballot (and criteria) for "professor - clinical."

## APPENDIX C-7

### Department Ballot for Reconsidering a Case Should New Information Become Available

Candidate Being Reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Brief description of new information provided by the candidate:

**Choose One:**

\_\_\_\_ Yes, the new information about this case might change my previous vote.

\_\_\_\_ No, the new information about this case does not change my previous vote.

**Note:**

In the event at least one eligible faculty member indicates that his or her vote might change, the faculty will meet to discuss the case with the new information and re-vote.

## APPENDIX C-8

### Department Ballot for Evaluating Self-Defined Fields of Work

Candidate Being Reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Brief description of self-defined field of work provided by the candidate:

Is this self-defined field of work broad-based, widely recognized, and not a sub-field of one of the thirteen fields currently recognized by the college?

YES \_\_\_\_\_

NO \_\_\_\_\_

Note:

The candidate's self-defined field of work is accepted if at least three-fourths of the eligible faculty supports the choice.

# APPENDIX D

---

## Sample Letters to Evaluators

- D-1** Letter for Promotion to Associate Professor or Professor (Path 1)
- D-2** Letter for Promotion to Professor (Path 2)
- D-3** Letter for Promotion to Associate Professor – Clinical or Professor –  
Clinical

## APPENDIX D-1

### SAMPLE LETTER TO AN EXTERNAL EVALUATOR

#### *For Promotion to Associate Professor or Professor (Path 1)*

*The format of the sample letter is not required, merely suggested. It is recommended that external evaluators be contacted to ascertain their ability/willingness to respond prior to sending the written request. If a unit wishes to use a different format or to seek different information, it should fully consider both how evaluators are likely to respond to such a request, given the time provided to respond and the Public Records Act, and how much information the evaluator has on which to base the requested assessment.*

The Department of XXX is considering Dr. Doe for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure [professor]. Dr. Doe's performance in teaching, research and service will be evaluated at the department, college, and university levels to determine whether promotion and tenure [promotion] will be granted. I am requesting you only to provide a critical assessment of Dr. Doe's research.

Enclosed you will find a copy of Dr. Doe's curriculum vitae, research statement, and copies of the following papers:

Please comment in some detail on the significance of the candidate's overall research program as well as on individual papers, including the scholarly merit of the work, its originality, and its impact on the field of study. In addition, how would you compare Dr. Doe to other researchers in this field who are being considered for promotion or have recently been promoted to the same rank as that under consideration for Dr. Doe?

In making any comparisons, please keep in mind that while the time period in a rank can vary depending on the candidate's particular circumstances, our policy states that the criteria for a promotion to a given rank are the same for all faculty members regardless of the length of time he or she has been employed at The Ohio State University.

Please do not comment on whether Dr. Doe should be promoted and tenured [promoted] at Ohio State or would or would not be promoted and tenured [promoted] at your institution. We must make this assessment based on the total record, not just on research, and on our own criteria and standards.

Under the Ohio Public Records Act all documents related to promotion and tenure reviews, including letters of evaluation, are public records subject to lawful requests to the university for viewing and/or copies. While we cannot promise confidentiality, in the event that anyone requests access to the information you provide, we will inform you in writing of the request and the source of the request.

Thank you for your time and effort in responding to this request. If for any reason you will not be able to evaluate this candidate or if you have any questions about this process, please contact me at [phone number/email address] immediately. I would appreciate receiving your letter by [date].

## APPENDIX D-2

### SAMPLE LETTER TO AN EXTERNAL EVALUATOR

#### *For Promotion to Professor (Path 2)*

*The format of the sample letter is not required, merely suggested. It is recommended that external evaluators be contacted to ascertain their ability/willingness to respond prior to sending the written request. If a unit wishes to use a different format or to seek different information, it should fully consider both how evaluators are likely to respond to such a request, given the time provided to respond and the Public Records Act, and how much information the evaluator has on which to base the requested assessment.*

The Department of XXX is considering Dr. Doe for promotion to the rank of professor. Dr. Doe's performance in teaching, research and service will be evaluated at the department, college, and university levels to determine whether promotion will be granted. I am requesting you to provide a critical assessment of Dr. Doe's research, teaching and service.

Enclosed you will find a copy of Dr. Doe's curriculum vitae, research, teaching, and service statements, and copies of the following papers:

Please comment on the significance of the overall research program as well as on individual papers, including the scholarly merit of the work, its originality, and its impact on the field of study. Also, to the extent feasible, please comment in some detail on Dr. Doe's activity and visibility in the area of development of teaching in the discipline. Similarly, please comment on the impact of Dr. Doe's service to the profession and professional societies, based on your knowledge and observation.

In making any comparisons, please keep in mind that while the time period in a rank can vary depending on the candidate's particular circumstances, our policy states that the criteria for a promotion to a given rank are the same for all faculty regardless of the length of time he or she has been employed at The Ohio State University.

Please do not comment on whether Dr. Doe should be promoted at Ohio State or would or would not be promoted at your institution. We must make this assessment based on the total record in the context of our own criteria and standards.

Under the Ohio Public Records Act all documents related to promotion and tenure reviews, including letters of evaluation, are public records subject to lawful requests to the university for viewing and/or copies. While we cannot promise confidentiality, in the event that anyone requests access to the information you provide, we will inform you in writing of the request and the source of the request.

Thank you for your time and effort in responding to this request. If for any reason you will not be able to evaluate this candidate or if you have any questions about this process, please contact me at [phone number/email address] immediately. I would appreciate receiving your letter by [date].

## APPENDIX D-3

### SAMPLE LETTER TO AN EVALUATOR

#### *For Promotion to Associate Professor – Clinical or Professor – Clinical*

*The format of the sample letter is not required, merely suggested. It is recommended that external evaluators be contacted to ascertain their ability/willingness to respond prior to sending the written request. If a unit wishes to use a different format or to seek different information, it should fully consider both how evaluators are likely to respond to such a request, given the time provided to respond and the Public Records Act, and how much information the evaluator has on which to base the requested assessment.*

The Department of XXX at the Fisher College of Business is considering Dr. Doe for clinical promotion (i.e., non tenure-track promotion) to the rank of associate professor – clinical [professor – clinical]. Dr. Doe’s performance in teaching and service will be evaluated at the department, college, and university levels to determine whether promotion will be granted. I am requesting you to provide a critical assessment of Dr. Doe’s contributions on these dimensions.

Enclosed you will find a copy of Dr. Doe’s curriculum vitae, a teaching statement, and a service statement. Please comment in some detail on the significance of the candidate’s accomplishments in regards to teaching and service. Also, to the extent you are aware of, please comment on Dr. Doe’s activity and visibility in the area of pedagogical development and contribution to the profession. Further, please comment on the impact of Dr. Doe’s service to the profession and professional societies, based on your knowledge and observation.

Please do not comment on whether Dr. Doe should be promoted at Ohio State or would or would not be promoted at your institution. We must make this assessment based on the total record in the context of our own criteria and standards.

Under the Ohio Public Records Act all documents related to promotion and tenure reviews, including letters of evaluation, are public records subject to lawful requests to the university for viewing and/or copies. While we cannot promise confidentiality, in the event that anyone requests access to the information you provide, we will inform you in writing of the request and the source of the request.

Thank you for your time and effort in responding to this request. If, for any reason, you will not be able to evaluate this candidate or if you have any questions about this process, please contact me at [phone number/email address] immediately. I would appreciate receiving your letter by [date].

# APPENDIX E

---

## Additional TIU-specific Guidelines

- E-1** Department of Finance
- E-2** Department of Accounting and MIS

## APPENDIX E-1

### DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

This appendix provides additional guidelines to supplement those provided in Section VII, page 20, as they pertain to the standard for demonstrating “Potential for Excellence in Research” when evaluating candidates in the Department of Finance who seek to be appointed to or promoted to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure. In providing these guidelines, we reiterate and fully concur with the pervasive theme in the APT that prescribed standards are intended to be guides rather than substitutes for professional judgment.

In particular, this appendix lays out typical minimum requirements to demonstrate the “Potential for Excellence in Research.” Being an expected lower bound, it follows that the faculty fully recognize that some candidates who satisfy these requirements will not be recommended for tenure, for instance, because the impact of their work is deemed insufficient. It will be in rare and easily justifiable cases, that a candidate will be promoted even when these standards are not met, for instance, because the candidate has published work that has radically transformed the way an important problem is addressed.

#### Publication Record

- Typically, at least four publications in the top-tier finance and economics journals (listed below) is viewed as a necessary but not sufficient condition for the department to recommend tenure. For candidates who have spent an entire probationary period in the department, these four publications must have been published during the probationary period. For candidates who have spent only partial probationary period in the department, these four publications must have been published in the five years before the candidate is considered for tenure.
  - Top Finance Journals: *The Journal of Finance*, *The Journal of Financial Economics*, and *Review of Financial Studies*.
  - Top Economics Journals: *American Economic Review*, *Econometrica*, *Journal of Political Economy*, *Review of Economic Studies*, and *Quarterly Journal of Economics*.
- To be considered for tenure, a candidate should have at least one single-authored publication in a high quality refereed journal in finance or a related field (i.e., economics or accounting).
- As noted upfront, exceptions to the above requirements can only be made for truly exceptional candidates with a scholarly contribution that is widely recognized as having exceptional impact in the field.

## APPENDIX E-2

### DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING AND MIS

This appendix provides modification and clarification to guidelines provided in the APT when evaluating candidates in the Department of Accounting and MIS (AMIS). This appendix supersedes the relevant sections on pages 13 and 22 – 26. As the appendix governs the Department of AMIS, the Department of AMIS reserves sole authority to amend this appendix at its discretion and without approval of other departments in the Fisher College of Business, although amendments are subject to the approval of the Dean.

- The selection of the “do not reappoint” option in the Fourth-Year review and in the associated ballot (Appendix C-1) is viewed as stating that the candidate’s academic record is currently progressing in ways that are inconsistent with meeting requirements for promotion and tenure review at the mandated time, and the chance of addressing the weaknesses in a timely manner is remote.
- The Department of Accounting and MIS supports a single path for “promotion to professor.” In particular, the research, teaching, and service expectations of a promotion to professor rank are as noted for Path 1 promotions to professors on pages 22 – 25 (the “path” label is no longer used given our approach). In addition, following the guidance of [Faculty Rule 3335-6-02](#), the department also recognizes that reasonable flexibility shall be exercised in balancing research, teaching, and service such that heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area are weighed against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another.