

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

APPROVED BY OAA: JULY 28, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Preamble	4
II.	Department Mission.....	4
III.	Definitions	5
A.	Committee of the Eligible Faculty	5
1.	Tenure-track Faculty	5
2.	Teaching Faculty	6
3.	Associated Faculty	6
4.	Conflict of Interest.....	7
5.	Minimum Composition.....	7
B.	Promotion and Tenure Committees	8
C.	Quorum	8
D.	Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty	8
1.	Appointment.....	8
2.	Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion.....	8
IV.	Appointments: Criteria and Procedures	8
A.	Criteria for Offering an Appointment	9
1.	Tenure Track Faculty	9
2.	Teaching Faculty	10
3.	Associated Faculty	11
4.	Regional Campus Faculty	11
5.	Emeritus Faculty	12
6.	Joint Appointments.....	12
7.	Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	12
B.	Procedures for Offering Appointments.....	12
1.	Tenure Track Appointments on the Columbus Campus.....	13
2.	Teaching Faculty Appointments on the Columbus Campus	15
3.	Transfer from the Tenure Track	15
4.	TIU Transfer.....	15
5.	Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	15
6.	Regional Campus Faculty	16
7.	Joint Appointments.....	16
8.	Courtesy Appointments.....	16
V.	Annual Performance & Merit Reviews.....	17
A.	Documentation.....	18
B.	Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	18
1.	Fourth Year Reviews.....	19
2.	Extension of the Tenure Clock.....	20
C.	Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	21
1.	Annual Reviews of Associate Professors	21
2.	Annual Reviews of Professors.....	21

D. Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus	22
E. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	22
F. Regional Campus Faculty	22
G. Salary Recommendations.....	23
1. Criteria.....	23
2. Procedures	23
VI. Promotion & Tenure and Promotion Reviews.....	24
A. Criteria & Evidence that Support Promotion.....	24
1. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure	25
2. Promotion to Rank of Professor	29
3. Promotion of Teaching Faculty	31
4. Promotion of Associated Faculty	31
5. Promotion of Regional Campus Faculty	31
B. Procedures.....	32
1. Tenure-Track and Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus	32
2. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	36
3. Regional Faculty	36
4. External Evaluations.....	37
VII. Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals	39
VIII. Seventh Year Reviews	39
IX. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	39
A. Student Evaluation of Teaching	39
B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching	40
Appendix 1: Annual Performance and Merit Reviews Documentation.....	42
Appendix 2: Mentorship Plan	44

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

I. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the [Rules of the University Faculty](#); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion in Chapter 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#); and other policies and procedures of the college and University to which the Department and its faculty are subject.

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

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

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

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

II. DEPARTMENT MISSION

The Philosophy Department of The Ohio State University has both undergraduate and graduate teaching missions. Our undergraduate teaching mission divides into one for undergraduates at large and a special mission for our majors and honors students. For undergraduates at large, our goal is to provide rigorous and intellectually stimulating courses that allow them to develop critical and creative thinking skills along with the cultural knowledge of distinguished philosophers, and philosophies, in our history. For our majors and honors students, we have the additional goal of providing an undergraduate experience and atmosphere comparable to that of the finest liberal arts colleges. We recognize and reward faculty members who are especially effective in helping us reach our goals for our undergraduate teaching mission. Our graduate teaching mission is to be the major institution in Ohio granting doctoral degrees in philosophy. Our goal for our graduate teaching mission is to develop one of the best philosophy Ph.D. programs in North America. We are building a program that will place those who earn an Ohio State

Ph.D. in philosophy in the most prestigious colleges and universities of North America. Part of this goal for our graduate teaching mission is to recruit into our program the most promising faculty, who will play a crucial part in our undergraduate teaching mission and who will stimulate and participate in faculty research.

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

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

The department embraces and seeks to implement the university's shared values initiative. We are committed to academic freedom, to ensuring responsible research practices, to building a nurturing culture, to fostering an ethic of care and mutual respect, and to promoting justice.

III. DEFINITIONS

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

The eligible faculty for all appointment (hiring), reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure reviews must have their tenure home or primary appointment in the department.

The department chair, the dean, divisional deans, and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president may not participate as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure.

1. Tenure-track Faculty

Appointment Reviews

- **Initial Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring) review of an assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the department.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

By longstanding practice, The Department of Philosophy uses the working title “Senior Council” for the tenured associate professors and professors of the Department.

2. Teaching Faculty

Appointment Reviews

- Initial Appointment Review. For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an assistant teaching professor, an associate teaching professor, or a teaching professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all teaching faculty in the department.
- Rank Review. A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all nonprobationary teaching faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

3. Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- Initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of associated faculty members is decided by the department chair following a recommendation from the search committee.
- Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by the eligible faculty (all nonprobationary teaching faculty and tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the dean or designee.
- The reappointment of associated faculty members is decided by the department chair in consultation with the Executive Committee, as needed.

Promotion Reviews

- Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have adjunct titles, tenure-track titles with service at 49% FTE or below, and lecturer titles.
- For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Sections III.A.1 and 2 above.
- For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with tenure-track titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section III.A.1 above.
- For the promotion review of a lecturer to senior lecturer, the eligible faculty shall be all tenure-track and nonprobationary teaching faculty at the rank of associate professor and professor.

4. Conflict of Interest

• Search Committee Conflict of Interest

A member of a search committee must disclose to the committee and refrain from participation in any of the interviews, meetings, or votes that comprise the search process if the member:

- decides to apply for the position;
- is related to or has a close interpersonal relationship with a candidate;
- 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 extensively with the candidate or is currently collaborating with the candidate.

• Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest

A member of the eligible faculty has a conflict of interest when he/she/they are or have been to the candidate:

- a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor;
- a co-author on more than 50% of the candidate's publications since appointment or last promotion, including pending publications and submissions;
- a collaborator on more than 50% of projects since appointment or last promotion, including current and planned collaborations;
- in a consulting/financial arrangement with the candidate since appointment or last promotion, including receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services) or is dependent in some way on the candidate's services; or
- in a family relationship such as a spouse, child, sibling, or parent, or other relationship, such as a close personal friendship, that might affect one's judgment or be seen as doing so by a reasonable person familiar with the relationship.

Such faculty members will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of that candidate.

5. Minimum Composition

In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the department chair, after consulting with the dean or designee, will appoint one or more faculty

members from another department within the college so that the minimum of three faculty members is reached.

B. Promotion and Tenure Committees

A group of three tenured members of the eligible faculty are appointed for each tenure and/or promotion review for the purpose of assembling documents concerning the candidate. When considering cases involving teaching faculty, a Promotion and Tenure Committee may be augmented by one nonprobationary teaching faculty member at the rank of associate teaching professor or teaching professor. The committee's chair and membership are appointed by the department chair. The term of service is *one* year, with reappointment possible.

C. Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. If an eligible faculty member is unable to be present in-person at a meeting, they may request the Chair's permission to attend remotely – e.g. via Zoom. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted.

1. Appointment

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

In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment TIU prior to his or her appointment.

2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion

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

In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment TIU prior to his or her reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure.

IV. APPOINTMENTS: CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

A. Criteria for Offering an Appointment

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

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, teaching, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment.

All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university's system of record for faculty and staff. A formal review and selection process, including interviews using pre-designed evaluation rubrics, is required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in [Workday](#) to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

1. Tenure Track Faculty

a. *Instructor:* Appointment at the rank of Instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of Assistant Professor, but requirements for the doctoral degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. Procedures for appointment are identical to those for an assistant professor. The Department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the Instructor level is limited to three years. Promotion to assistant professor occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year, or the appointment will not be renewed and the third year is the terminal year of employment.

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

b. *Assistant Professor:* Minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor Include an earned terminal degree in an appropriate field of study, evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, potential to develop into an internationally recognized scholar, potential for high quality teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels, a willingness to high quality service to the Department, the institution, and the profession, and a strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the ranks in a timely fashion. Appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the 7th year will be the final year of employment. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Promotion and Tenure Committee determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved

request to extend the probationary period.

c. *Associate Professor and Professor:* Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor with or without tenure, Professor with tenure, and offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs.

Appointment at the associate professor and professor ranks requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the Department's criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to these ranks.

Appointment the rank of associate professor normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at rank of associate professor is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional—*i.e.*, terminal—year of employment is offered. Appointments at the rank of professor without tenure are not possible.

Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

2. Teaching Faculty

Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all other teaching faculty members must be for a period of five years. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for assistant and associate teaching professors must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for teaching professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. Tenure is not granted to teaching faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance.

The Department of Philosophy supports Teaching Faculty. These appointments exist for faculty members who focus principally on the education needs of students in the department or college. Teaching Faculty members are expected to contribute to the department's research and education mission as reflected in undergraduate and graduate program development and teaching. Teaching Faculty appointments are made in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-7. Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the department.

a. *Teaching Instructor:* Appointment is normally made at the rank of teaching instructor when the appointee has not completed the requirements for the terminal degree. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. As noted above, an appointment at the instructor level is limited to a three-year contract. In such cases, if the instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the penultimate year of the three-year contract period, a new contract will not be considered even if performance is otherwise adequate, and the position itself will continue.

b. *Assistant Teaching Professor:* An earned doctorate in his/her/their specialty is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant teaching professor. Evidence of ability to teach is highly desirable.

c. *Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor:* Appointment at the rank of associate teaching professor or teaching professor requires that the individual have an earned doctorate in his/her/their specialty and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at the rank of teaching professor requires production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice.

3. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a few weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. Associated faculty may be reappointed. Appointments of all associated faculty must be reviewed and approved by the College of Arts and Sciences.

a. *Lecturers:* Lecturers are appointed to serve temporary teaching needs and they must be judged competent to fill those needs by the Department Chair or by a committee appointed by the Chair. Appointment as lecturer requires, at a minimum, that the individual have a Master's degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, have passed the general examination leading to the PhD., and demonstrate evidence of ability or potential to provide high-quality instruction. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for lecturers cannot exceed three years.

b. *Senior Lecturer:* Appointment as Senior Lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a doctorate in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide high quality instruction; or a Master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience with documentation of high quality performance. Senior Lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The initial appointment for a senior lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for senior lecturers cannot exceed three years.

c. *Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%:* An earned terminal degree is the minimum requirement for appointment of tenure-track titles at 49% FTE or below. Appointment with tenure-track titles is for individuals at 49% FTE or below, either compensated 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 with tenure-track titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure track faculty.

d. *Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor:* Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Visiting faculty on leave from a regular academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure track faculty. Visiting faculty are not eligible for tenure or promotion. They may not be reappointed for more than three consecutive years at 100% FTE.

e. *Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor:* Adjunct titles are used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to tenure-track or teaching faculty of equivalent rank. The term of appointment is for one year with renewal contingent on continued significant contributions. Adjunct faculty are either compensated or uncompensated for their contributions to the missions of the department. Nevertheless, the Department must judge that association of these faculty with the Department enhances the reputation of the Department in ways which help it attain its goals for its teaching and research mission. The adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

4. Regional Campus Faculty

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

Regional campus criteria for the appointment of teaching faculty and associated faculty are the same as those for Columbus campus faculty in each of these categories.

5. Emeritus Faculty

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

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the department chair (regional campus dean for associated faculty on regional campuses) outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-3) will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair. The department chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean or designee. Should the department chair deny the request, the faculty member may appeal the decision to the dean.

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

6. Joint Appointments

Joint appointments are created to leverage a faculty member's unique expertise to advance the mission areas of the academic units involved and promote cross-disciplinary collaboration. To establish a joint faculty appointment, a [memorandum of understanding \(MOU\)](#) is developed by all affected TIUs, centers, and/or institutes. The MOU will clearly define the distribution of the faculty member's time commitment to the different units. The MOU will also state the sources of compensation directed to the faculty member, distribution of resources, the planned acknowledgement of the academic units in publications, the manner in which credit for any grant funding will be attributed to the different units, and the distribution of grant funds among the appointing units. Unless other arrangements are specified in the MOU, the TIU in which the faculty member's FTE is greater than 50% will be considered that faculty member's TIU. Joint-appointed faculty may vote on promotion and tenure cases only in their TIU.

7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

B. Procedures for Offering Appointments

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, teaching, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment. All

faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university's system of record for faculty and staff. A formal review and selection process, including interviews using pre-designed evaluation rubrics, is required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in Workday to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

See the [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#) and the [Policy on Faculty Appointments](#) for information on the following topics:

- recruitment of tenure track, teaching, and associated 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 Appointments on the Columbus Campus

A national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. This includes all external candidates for all faculty positions. The only exception is for dual career partners, as described in Chapter 5, section 4.1 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

The dean of the college, in consultation with the divisional deans, 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 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 in which the position is interdisciplinary in nature, it is expected that members of the search committee will be drawn from other TIUs as well.

Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo the trainings identified in the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment. In addition, all employees/faculty involved in the hiring and selection process must review and acknowledge the EEO Recruitment and Selection Guidelines in the BuckeyeLearn system.

The [SHIFT](#) Framework serves as a centrally coordinated guideline and toolkit to support the entire process of faculty recruitment with clear engagement from all participating stakeholders involved in the faculty hiring process. This framework is intended to provide faculty engaged in search committees and staff providing support services with the tools and support needed to attract excellent applicant pools, conduct consistent and equitable evaluations, and successfully hire and properly onboard new faculty members who will continue our tradition of academic excellence. This framework consists of six phases, each targeting a specific stage of the recruitment process:

- “Phase 1 | Search Preparation & Proactive Recruitment” is the earliest stage in the search process. Key steps during this phase include determining faculty needs for the unit, creating a search strategy (including timeline), establishing a budget, and identifying additional partners to include in the process. The steps in this phase provide guidance on forming committees, detail training requirements for search committee members, and innovative approaches to advertising and outreach. This section also includes ideas and resources for developing qualified talent pools to ensure alignment with the university’s commitment to EEO principles and advance the eminence of the institution.
- “Phase 2 | Preliminary Review of Applicants” focuses on best practices for the application review and candidate screening processes. The guidelines and resources in this section support consistency and fairness in the review, assessment, and selection of candidates moving forward in the recruitment process. This section also outlines how to select a list of candidates for on-campus interviews.
- “Phase 3 | Finalists Interviews & Evaluations” provides guidance and tools for conducting interviews and campus visits, requesting reference letters (if not requested earlier in the application stage), and collecting feedback from everyone who interacted with the candidates. Adherence to the guidelines outlined in this section has a direct impact on enhancing the candidate experience and ensuring a consistent evaluation process. This phase concludes with the submission of a letter from the search committee to the TIU chair/director.
- “Phase 4 | Extend Offer” provides guidance and resources related to effectively selecting the most qualified candidate(s) for the position(s) and successfully negotiating to result in an accepted offer.
- “Phase 5 | Preboard and Onboard” offers resources to help prepare and support new faculty as they transition to Ohio State. The suggestions in this phase focus on creating a seamless transition for incoming faculty and their partners/families, if applicable.
- “Phase 6 | Reflect and Assess the Search” is a process supported by OAA to reflect on the hiring cycle each year and evaluate areas that may need improvement and additional support.

If the vote for appointment is successful, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members also vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor, with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs. A two thirds majority is required for an appointment recommendation. This vote is advisory to the Department Chair.

A vote to offer a position to a candidate requires a two thirds vote of all eligible faculty who are present at the meeting where the vote is taken. The vote is to be by confidential, written ballot. The vote of the eligible faculty is advisory to the search committee and the department chair, who will report his/her recommendation to the Dean or designee.

In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the department chair decides, in consultation with the divisional dean, which candidate to approach first. The department chair discusses the details of the offer, including compensation, with the divisional dean and receives approval before extending an offer.

The department is advised to discuss potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status with the Office of International Affairs. An MOU must be signed by faculty eligible for tenured positions who are not U.S. citizens or nationals,

permanent residents, asylees, or refugees.

2. Teaching Faculty Appointments on the Columbus Campus

Searches for teaching faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the virtual or on-campus interview is on teaching, rather than scholarship.

3. Transfer from the Tenure Track

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a teaching appointment if appropriate to the individual's circumstances and to department and college needs, and if funding for the salary has been identified. Tenure or tenure eligibility is lost upon transfer, though rank is retained. Such transfers must be approved by the department chair, the college dean, and the executive vice president and provost.

The request for transfer must be initiated by the faculty member in writing and must state clearly how the individual's career goals and activities have changed.

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

4. TIU Transfer

Faculty requests to move from one TIU to another must be approved by a simple majority of the eligible faculty in the receiving TIU, by both TIU heads, the college dean(s), and the Office of Academic Affairs. The eligible faculty in such cases are the tenure-track faculty eligible to vote on faculty appointments at the transferee's rank. Approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements for the change have been made and requires the establishment of mutually agreed-upon arrangements among the affected TIU heads, college dean(s), and the faculty member. An MOU signed by all parties, including the Office of Academic Affairs, must describe in detail the arrangements of the transfer. Since normally the transferring faculty member will fill an existing vacancy in the receiving unit, the MOU will describe the resources supporting the position, including salary, provided by the receiving unit. The College of Arts and Science and the Office of Academic Affairs can provide guidance to non-tenure-track faculty about the process for transferring from one TIU to another.

5. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

The appointment of compensated associated faculty follows a formal search following the [SHIFT Framework](#), which includes a job posting in [Workday](#) (see Section IV.B above) and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the department chair based on recommendation from the search committee.

The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair in consultation with the Executive Committee, where required.

Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one to three years.

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the TIU and are decided by the department chair.

Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three years.

Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are made on a semester or annual basis. After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment may be offered.

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

6. Regional Campus Faculty

The appointment of all compensated regional campus faculty follows a formal search following the [SHIFT](#) Framework, which includes a job posting in [Workday](#) and candidate interviews.

In the case of a tenure-track faculty search on a regional campus, the regional campus Dean has primary responsibility for determining the need for a position and the position description but should consult with and seek agreement with the department chair before the search begins. The chair of the department and the regional campus dean will agree on a single search committee for the position consisting of members of both units. Candidates should, as a minimum, be interviewed by the regional campus dean, the Chair of the Department, the divisional dean in the College of Arts and Sciences or their designee, the search committee and representatives of both faculties. Candidates will be evaluated on both campuses, with the faculty on the Columbus campus taking primary responsibility for evaluating the candidate's record and potential as a scholar. In its evaluation of the candidates for a regional campus appointment at assistant professor, associate professor, or professor rank, the Department will follow the same procedures for appointment of a faculty member in the Columbus department at one of those ranks. These procedures are detailed above in (B.2.a) – c.)

A decision to hire requires agreement on the part of the department chair and of the regional campus dean. Negotiations with a candidate should not begin without such agreement and a letter of offer must be signed by the chair of the department and the dean of the regional campus. In the case of appointment of a tenured associate professor or professor, agreement is also required from the Office of Academic Affairs.

Searches for regional campus teaching faculty are the same as those described above for tenure-track faculty.

Procedures for the appointment of regional campus associated faculty are described in the regional campus governance documents.

7. Joint Appointments

The department may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another OSU TIU as described in Section IV.A.6. The potential for a joint appointment is typically evaluated during the recruitment process and, as such, is subject to all criteria outlined above for each faculty category.

Approval of the joint appointment by the Office of Academic Affairs and the College of Arts and Sciences is dependent on establishing a mutually agreed-upon arrangement between the TIU heads, college dean(s), and the faculty member. An [MOU](#) signed by all parties, including the Office of Academic Affairs, must describe in detail the arrangements of the joint appointment. Administrative approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements have been made.

8. Courtesy Appointments

Any Department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track or

teaching faculty member from another Ohio State department. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this Department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the faculty, the Department Chair extends an offer of appointment. The Department Chair reviews all courtesy appointments annually to determine whether they continue to be justified and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEWS

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the [Policy on Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment](#), which stipulates that such reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all probationary faculty, an opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all other compensated faculty members, as well as a written assessment. According to the policy, the purposes of the review are to:

- Assist faculty in improving professional productivity through candid and constructive feedback and through the establishment of professional development plans;
- Establish the goals against which a faculty member's performance will be assessed in the foreseeable future; and
- Document faculty performance in the achievement of stated goals in order to determine salary increases and other resource allocations, progress toward promotion, and, in the event of poor performance, the need for remedial steps.

The department chair may designate the responsibility for annual performance and merit reviews to appropriate unit administrators. The designee or a subcommittee of the eligible faculty may provide a written assessment to the department chair. However, unless the Office of Academic Affairs has granted an exception to a large unit, the department chair must schedule a face-to-face meeting with all probationary faculty as part of the review. An opportunity for a face-to-face meeting with the department chair or the chair's designee must be provided to all tenured and non-probationary faculty.

In all cases, accountability for the annual review process resides with the department chair.

Every newly appointed probationary tenure-track professor is assigned a tenure-track faculty member to advise on strategic approaches to meeting expectations in research, teaching, and service and to offer regular, candid, and supportive feedback on the full scope of the mentee's responsibilities in as a faculty member in the department. See Appendix 2 for details.

Depending on their appointment type, the annual reviews of faculty members are based on expected performance in teaching, research, and/or service as set forth in the department's Guidelines on Faculty Duties, Responsibilities, and Workload; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.

The review of faculty with budgeted joint appointments must include input from the joint appointment TIU head for every annual evaluation cycle. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on goals specific to the individual in the joint unit.

The Department Chair is required (per Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#)) to include a reminder in the annual

review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#)) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

Annual review letters should not merely be descriptive summaries of activities but should evaluate performance in relation to the unit's mission and the faculty member's assigned workload and previously articulated goals and expectations for the year. The annual review should also describe, when appropriate, actions the unit or its head will undertake to support the faculty member in achieving goals. When relevant, annual review letters should recognize engagement with partners beyond the university, which may take the form of research/creative work, teaching, or service. Department chairs may also comment upon and/or recognize ways in which individual faculty members exemplify and reinforce the university's shared values, including creating unit cultures that are supportive and characterized by civility and mutual respect. The full range of activities assigned to a faculty member should be formally recognized and, when done well, rewarded.

A. Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit, the following documents to the Department Chair:

- Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, [dossier outline](#) (*required for probationary faculty*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (*non-probationary faculty*)
- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)

Other documentation for the annual performance and merit review will be the same as that for consideration for promotion and/or tenure. That documentation is described in Section VI of this document. The submission deadline occurs in the spring semester and is specified annually by the Department Chair.

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

B. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Each probationary faculty member will be reviewed annually by the Senior Council. The Senior Council consists of the tenured associate professors and professors of the department. The purpose of these annual reviews is to determine whether a recommendation is to be made that a probationary appointment be renewed; to evaluate the performance of a non-tenured faculty member in the areas of teaching, research, and service with regard to expectations for continued employment; and to encourage and advise candidates in their professional development.

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

materials. In addition, the faculty member will be provided at the time of appointment with all relevant documents that detail the tenure and promotion policies and criteria of the Department, the College, and the University. If changes are made to any of these documents during the faculty member's probationary period, he or she will be provided with updated documents in a timely fashion.

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

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

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

As noted in Section III.C above, two thirds of the Senior Council must be present for a recommendation vote to be taken. A motion to recommend continuation of a probationary faculty member requires an affirmative vote by a majority of Senior Council members present at the meeting for passage. The vote of the Senior Council is advisory to the Department Chair, who will make a recommendation to the Dean or designee.

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is also reviewed annually by the department chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals; and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

The results of Senior Council's review and the Chair's recommendation will be made known to the probationary faculty member in writing by the Department Chair and in a meeting between the Department Chair and the faculty member. If the Department Chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review and the department chair may respond in writing if warranted. The Department Chair's letter (along with written comments, if received) is forwarded to the Dean of the college or designee. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the written comments, if provided).

If the chair recommends nonrenewal at the conclusion of the first, second, third, or fifth annual review of a probationary faculty member, the Fourth-Year Review process will be followed as set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#) and described below. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. Faculty members who believe a nonrenewal decision was made improperly may appeal that decision, if they wish, under the procedures outlined in Section VII, below.

1. Fourth Year Reviews

During the fourth year of the probationary period, the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exceptions that external evaluations are optional, and it is the dean (not the department chair) who makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

External evaluations are solicited only when either the department chair or the eligible faculty determine that they are necessary to conduct the Fourth-Year Review. This may occur when the candidate's scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input.

a) The fourth-year review will be more thorough than other annual reviews, including (if deemed necessary or desirable by the chair because the eligible faculty need additional expertise in order to evaluate the scholarship) outside letters of evaluation. The department chair may also solicit written evaluations from colleagues at the university to provide feedback about service activities if relevant and important to the review.

b) Senior Council conducts a review of the candidate. Upon completion of the review, the Senior Council votes by written, confidential ballot. A recommendation to renew the probationary appointment requires a two-thirds majority of Senior Council members present at the review meeting. (To have binding votes, a quorum of eligible members of the department must be present. See the department's Pattern of Administration, Section VIII.B.)

c) The Senior Council forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department chair, who conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The review thus results in two letters of evaluation: one from Senior Council, and a separate letter from the department chair. At the conclusion of the departmental review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

d) Renewal of the appointment of a probationary faculty member for the fifth year requires the approval of the divisional dean. In cases where the divisional dean concurs with the department's recommendations to approve the renewal of the appointment, review by the Arts and Sciences divisional Promotion and Tenure review panel is optional and at the divisional dean's discretion. The divisional review panel, however, must review negative reappointment recommendations. If either the department chair or the divisional dean recommends nonrenewal of a faculty member's probationary contract, the case will be referred to the college's Promotion and Tenure Committee, which will review the case, vote and make a recommendation to the dean. The dean, in consultation with the divisional dean, makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

e) The Dean reports to the candidate whether there is re-appointment for a fifth year or whether the fifth year is a terminal year. Appointment for a fifth year is no guarantee of continued reappointment or of promotion and tenure.

2. Extension of the Tenure Clock

[Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 \(D\)](#) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure track faculty member may extend the probationary period. [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 \(E\)](#) does likewise for reducing the probationary period. A faculty member remains on duty regardless of extensions or reductions to the probationary period, and annual reviews are conducted in every probationary year regardless of time extended or reduced. Approved extensions or reductions do not limit the department's right to recommend nonrenewal of an appointment during an annual review.

C. Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus

1. Annual Reviews of Associate Professors

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

The department chair shall participate in the review discussions.

The department chair conducts an independent assessment; meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review and the department chair may respond in writing if warranted.

2. Annual Reviews of Professors

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

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

The Department Chair meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the tenure initiating unit, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the college, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, in civil and collegial interaction with colleagues and students, and

in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest-ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty.

If an associate professor or professor has an administrative role, the impact of that role and other assignments will be considered in the annual review. The department chair prepares a written evaluation of performance against these expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review and the department chair may respond in writing if warranted.

D. Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus

The annual performance and merit review process for probationary and nonprobationary teaching faculty is identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty respectively, except that non-probationary teaching faculty may participate in the review of teaching faculty of lower rank.

In the penultimate contract year of a teaching faculty member's appointment, the department chair must determine whether the position held by the 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](#) must be observed. If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review generally proceeds in the same manner as the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure track faculty.

All reappointment decisions are at the discretion of the college dean. There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

E. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals.

The department chair's decision on renewal of the appointment is final. If the decision is to renew, the department chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

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

F. Regional Campus Faculty

Regional campus tenure-track faculty members are reviewed according to the process established on that campus, with the review focusing mainly on teaching and service. Following the review by the regional campus, the regional campus dean of each regional campus faculty member meets with the department chair for evaluation of the faculty member's research and creative activity during the review period. The regional campus dean provides an annual performance and merit review letter. The Department review will focus on the candidate's scholarly work, but will consider all aspects of his/her record. The

department chair should give a written review to the faculty member and a copy to the regional campus dean. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice. For probationary tenure-track faculty, in the event that the regional campus dean recommends renewal and the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the case shall be reviewed by the college dean or their designee, with the college dean's or their designee's judgment prevailing.

The department will conduct its annual review of regional campus probationary tenure-track and tenured faculty members by following the same procedures for annual reviews of probationary tenure-track and tenured faculty members, respectively, on the Columbus campus. These procedures are detailed above.

Regional campus teaching faculty are reviewed according to the procedures established on the regional campus, with the review focused on teaching and service. The dean/director will provide the department chair a copy of a teaching faculty member's annual performance and merit review letter.

The annual performance and merit review of regional campus associated faculty is conducted entirely on the regional campus, with the review focused on teaching and service, as applicable.

G. Salary Recommendations

1. Criteria

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

In making recommendations on merit salary increases, the department chair will assess the quality of each faculty member's teaching, service, and research. However, the chair will also take into account such equity issues as may exist and will proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in it. Assessments of quality of teaching, service, and research are to be made within the context of the department's goals as specified in its Mission statement.

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

2. Procedures

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

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

include an appraisal of Department contributions, wherein faculty are evaluated for their overall contributions to the intellectual and pedagogical vitality of the Department, as well as for their contributions to the College, the University, profession, and community.

Prior to the Committee's convening, each faculty member will provide the department chair with the required documentation, which is described in Section V.A above (for probationary and nonprobationary faculty) and in Appendix 1 (nonprobationary faculty only). Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation for an annual performance and merit review at the required time will receive no salary increase in the year for which documentation was not provided, except in extenuating circumstances, and may not expect to recoup the foregone raise at a later time.

Each faculty member is invited to submit, as well, a letter to the Department Chair summarizing the previous year's progress and highlighting the contributions she or he would most like the Committee to take into account (including evaluations by earlier Committees). Important achievements other than those covered in the required dossier or the annual review form (see Appendix 1) should also be mentioned in the letter to the Chair. If a letter to the Chair is submitted, the faculty member should indicate whether or not it is to be shared with the Salary Recommendation Committee. The Department Chair will present those letters that are intended to be shared with the Committee to the Committee members, along with the required documentation.

The Committee and the Department Chair may also seek such additional information as necessary for a fair and thorough review of each case. Salary recommendations (to the Department Chair) for each member of the Salary Committee will be made by the remainder of the committee, following the procedures outlined above. Salary recommendations by the committee are advisory to the Department Chair.

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

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

VI. PROMOTION & TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

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

Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Above all,

candidates are held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. For example, if a candidate's primary teaching role is and will continue to be undergraduate teaching, then excellence in undergraduate teaching is required. A mediocre performance in this area would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another aspect of teaching that is a significantly smaller part of the individual's responsibilities.

Excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service is moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics.

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.

Although institutional citizenship and collegiality are expected, they cannot be used as an independent criterion for promotion or tenure. The department recognizes, however, that these positive attributes define the ability of a faculty member to contribute effectively to exemplary teaching, scholarship, and service.

A commitment to these values and principles is demonstrated, for example, by participation in faculty governance and community outreach; activities related to the University's [Shared Values](#); adherence to principles of the responsible conduct of research; constructive conduct and ethical behavior during the discharge of responsibilities and authority; and the exercise of rights and privileges consistent with the [American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

1. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure

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

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

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

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

Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Above all, candidates are held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. For example, if a candidate's primary teaching role is and will continue to be undergraduate teaching, then excellence in undergraduate teaching is required. A mediocre performance in this area would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another aspect of teaching that is a significantly smaller part of the individual's responsibilities.

Consistent with these guidelines, promotion to associate professor with tenure in the College of Arts and Sciences requires excellence in both research/creative work and teaching. Evidence of service to the unit and the promise of excellence in service beyond the unit are desirable.

Excellence in research/creative work means attainment of measurable national or international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of high-quality published research and/or other relevant creative endeavors. A successful candidate will have an emerging national reputation as a scholar or creative artist. Excellence in teaching means the provision to all students of the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning and, to the most capable and motivated students, an enhanced learning experience. Excellence in service means the provision of a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more publics – including the university, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations. The service contribution during the probationary period of assistant professors is limited by design. The most important judgment is that the candidate will achieve excellence in service in the future.

The substantial probability that a high rate of quality research/creative work and excellence in teaching and service will continue needs to be established. The claim that awarding tenure to the candidate will improve the overall quality and standing of the unit needs to be supported.

TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met

<p>Demonstrated effectiveness in teaching at the graduate and undergraduate levels. Within the present context, effectiveness in teaching prototypically involves the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A strong command of the subject matter; Success in conveying to students an understanding of content in philosophy and, where relevant, allied fields, such as logic, and political theory; The use of well organized, relevant teaching materials; Teaching which focuses on course-relevant issues and involves the clear and logical communication of the course material; An interest in students' welfare and learning experience An ability to stimulate student interest in philosophical material and, where relevant, its relationship to other fields of knowledge. Skilled participation in the general advising of students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Departmental peer reviews of teaching. Student evaluation forms standardly used by the department – SEIs – including numerical scores and discursive comments. Narrative descriptions of teaching in dossier. Copies of syllabi, examinations, lecture notes, models of writing and other class materials. Textbooks, editions, anthologies, computer programs and other instructional devices may be judged as contributions to teaching. Special teaching accomplishments, awards, etc. Evidence of successful or innovative teaching techniques. Written evaluations from colleagues regarding the candidate's teaching and/or advising activity. Evidence from work of students indicating teaching effectiveness. Assessments of teaching in Annual Reviews. In cases where interdisciplinary courses are being taught, we use evaluations from the other departments involved. Evidence of course development and innovation. (This may include, e.g., the creation of new courses; but it may also involve making significant changes to pre-existing courses – such as, producing remote/hybrid versions of a course, or producing novel syllabi, notes, and other course materials.) Evidence of involvement in the supervision of high-quality student work – including, doctoral dissertations, prospectus and candidacy exams, honors theses, scholarly papers, posters, and talks.
---	---

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH

Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates are required to have a research record that demonstrates clear distinction in philosophy and the promise of prominence in the profession, as is appropriate for faculty at a major research institution. • Demonstrating clear distinction in philosophy and the promise of prominence in the field requires that the candidate has produced scholarly work which makes a significant contribution to the field and that this work is evidence of a significant developing research program or direction. • The significance of a scholarly work is judged across several dimensions, including its originality, its clarity and rigor, the extent of its potential contribution to ongoing debate, and the quality of the venue in which it is published. As such, books, chapters and articles based on original research have primary importance, whereas textbooks, editions, anthologies, digital resources, and other instructional devices will be judged as significant only to the extent that they present new philosophical ideas or incorporate philosophical research. Reviews written for professional journals will be evaluated as they reveal the scholarly knowledge and judgment of the reviewer. • While recognizing that research may take different forms, all research relevant for evaluation should clearly be philosophical and should contribute to the advancement of philosophical knowledge. Professional philosophers within, and outside, the department are those competent to judge whether work is philosophical, and whether a philosophical contribution has been made. • Because we aim to encourage and reward interdisciplinary work, it is our practice, where appropriate, to consult with scholars in related disciplines to help determine the philosophical dimensions of the work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scholars will be evaluated on both the quality and quantity of their contributions, which may include published work, presentations of scholarly papers at colloquia and professional meetings, and research grants. Special emphasis will be placed on quality. • Typically, the minimum expected quantity of work is approximately six significant pieces that have been published or accepted for publication in journals and volumes that are among the most prominent in the field. In the present context, a substantial piece is one that contributes to the advancement of philosophical knowledge. • The quality and quantity of conference or colloquia presentations will be evaluated. This may include, but is not restricted to, the presentation of papers, formal commentaries on the papers of others, and participation in symposia. • Candidate descriptions of research accomplishments in the dossier narrative. • Recognition among other scholars in the field as evidenced by, for example, citation impact, research awards, successful grant applications and speaker invitations. • External letters of evaluation by scholars outside the university.
---	--

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates are required to have a record of using their talents for the betterment of the department, the college, the university, and the profession. In some cases, candidates will also be evaluated on the basis of service beyond the aforementioned bodies, but only where such service clearly draws upon philosophically relevant professional expertise. • Excellence in service involves recognizing one's responsibilities to the organization and to carrying out these responsibilities in an effective, energetic and timely manner. • It is expected that all faculty members will be good citizens of the department, serving as required on committees and working effectively and cooperatively with colleagues and staff in managing the department. • The volume of service during the probationary period of assistant professors is limited by design, but the quality of the candidate's service contribution must be evident. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluations of the candidate's service record in chair's annual review letters. • Record of Service to the department, including as a member of departmental committees, and where relevant in the performance of assignments outside formal committee work. • Record of service on divisional, college, and university committees. • The candidate's description of their service accomplishments in their promotion dossier. • Record of service in state, regional, national, or international professional organizations in philosophy and relevantly related fields. (This may include, for example, being an office-holder, a member of a committee, a reviewer of conference papers, or performing ad hoc assignments for the organization) • Record of service to journals and publishers, such as refereeing articles, proposals and book manuscripts, and membership of editorial boards.
--	--

2. Promotion to Rank of 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.

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

The College of Arts and Sciences establishes the following criteria for promotion to the rank of professor:

Promotion to professor in the College of Arts and Sciences takes the pursuit of research and creative excellence as our core value. The college also recognizes that a career may consist of various phases in which a concentration on research/creative work, teaching, or service creates a composite professional life. Promotion to professor typically requires excellence in scholarship/creative work. Where a candidate has made truly extraordinary contributions in the areas of teaching or service, that record may warrant promotion in combination with a less extensive, though excellent, record of continued productivity in research/creative work.

Excellence in research/creative work means attainment of measurable national or international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of high-quality published research and/or other relevant creative endeavors. A successful candidate will

have achieved national distinction as a researcher or creative artist and have an emerging international reputation. Excellence in teaching means the provision to all students of the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning and, to the most capable and motivated students, an enhanced learning experience. It can be measured by the attainment of national or international recognition, as evidenced by pedagogical publications, awards, honors, and/or critical student outcomes. Excellence in service means the provision of a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more publics – including the university, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations.

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

The criteria for promotion to professor are the same as those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, except that they are strengthened in the ways indicated below. There is also an added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national or international reputation in the field. Furthermore, the teaching, service, and scholarly work upon which the evaluation is based must be subsequent to that upon which promotion to associate professor was based.

Teaching. Teaching is expected to involve, to the degree feasible given areas of specialization, significant involvement in the individualized education of graduate students as shown by such activities as beneficial service on graduate exam and dissertation committees and/or skilled and conscientious directing of graduate student dissertations. Faculty who are unable to contribute actively to the graduate program are expected to find other ways to make a distinctive contribution to the Department's teaching mission. Faculty are also expected to contribute to the intellectual vitality of the Department.

Service. Compared to service expectations for probationary faculty being considered for promotion to associate professor with tenure, those being promoted to professor are expected to have joined with the professors in engaging in more extensive service and in more significant roles at the departmental, institutional, or professional level.

Scholarship. Scholarly work must provide evidence of a significant developed research program, or programs, for which the candidate has gained a distinguished national and/or international reputation. Evidence of this may take several different forms, such as the publication of a book in a reputable press in addition to several articles and reviews in peer reviewed journals. Evidence could also take the form of a set of substantive articles in peer-reviewed philosophy journals and editor-reviewed volumes that make a significant contribution to a developed research program or programs. These examples are not exhaustive. (Significant professional presentations at conferences and colloquia will also constitute contributory

evidence of a distinguished national and/or international reputation.)

3. Promotion of Teaching Faculty

Promotion to Assistant Teaching Professor. For promotion to assistant teaching professor, a faculty member must hold an earned doctorate and be performing satisfactorily in teaching and, if relevant, service. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor. For promotion to associate teaching professor, a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service; must have a documented high level of competence in professional practice; and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of this department. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to associate teaching professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Teaching Professor. For promotion to teaching professor, a faculty member must have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching; leadership in service to this department and to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

4. Promotion of Associated Faculty

Promotion to Adjunct Associate Professor and Adjunct Professor. The relevant criteria for the promotion of adjunct faculty members shall be the same as those for the promotion of tenure-track faculty or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, above.

Promotion to Associate Professor and Professor with FTE below 50%. The relevant criteria for the promotion of associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are those for the promotion of tenure-track faculty above.

Promotion to Senior Lecturer. Lecturers may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank as described in Section IV.A.3.

Promotion of Visiting Faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for promotion.

5. Promotion of Regional Campus Faculty

Expectations for regional campus faculty differ somewhat from those for faculty on the Columbus campus. The primary mission of the regional campuses is to provide high quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic and other needs of their communities. In evaluating regional campus tenure-track faculty for promotion and tenure or promotion, the department will give greater emphasis to the quality of teaching and service relative to scholarship. The Department expects regional campus tenure-track faculty to establish a program of high-quality scholarship and publication as a fundamental requirement for promotion. The judgment whether a particular body of work meets Department standards for tenure and/or promotion will take into consideration the regional campuses' different mission, teaching expectations, and access to research resources. Furthermore, in light of the focus of the regional campuses on undergraduate teaching, there is no expectation that regional campus faculty be involved in the education of graduate students.

In evaluating regional campus teaching and associated faculty for promotion, the department will use the same criteria as described above for the promotion of faculty in each of these categories.

B. Procedures

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rules [3335-6-04](#) for tenure-track faculty, [3335-7-05](#) for teaching faculty, and the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Chapter 3 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

1. Tenure-Track and Teaching Faculty on the Columbus Campus

C. Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier and providing a copy of the APT under which they wish to be reviewed, if other than the department's current document. If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators compiled for their case according to departmental guidelines. Each of these elements is described in detail below.

Dossier. Every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#). Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs [Candidate Checklist](#) without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist. While the candidate's Promotion and Tenure Committee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by him or her.

Documentation of Teaching. The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is less, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

Teaching documentation typically includes:

- SEI forms, including a summary statement of discursive comments.
- Peer reviews of teaching and a summary statement of the peer reviews.
- Textbooks, editions, anthologies, computer software programs, and other instructional devices, if they are contributions to teaching.

Documentation of Scholarly Work. For scholarship documentation, a full history of publications and creative work should be included, as this information provides context to the more recent and relevant research record and/or demonstrates scholarly independence. Information about scholarship produced prior to the start date (for probationary faculty) or date of last promotion (for tenured or nonprobationary faculty) may be provided. Any such material should be clearly indicated. However, it is the scholarship performance since the start date or date of last promotion that is to be the focus of the evaluating parties.

Scholarship documentation typically includes:

- Books and articles based on original research.

- Textbooks, editions, anthologies, digital resources, and other instructional if they present new philosophical ideas or incorporate philosophical research.
- Reviews written for professional journals.
- Papers and participation in panels or symposia at philosophical conventions.
- Prizes, awards, grants, fellowships, invitations to deliver public lectures or colloquia, invitations to teach at other institutions, frequency of citation in footnotes of other scholars.

Documentation of Service. The time period for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

Service documentation may include any documentation that describes service to the Department, the College and University, and to the profession.

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

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document. Candidates must indicate the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. A candidate may be reviewed using the department's current APT document, or they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion (or last reappointment in the case of teaching faculty), whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, for tenure track faculty the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year.

If a candidate wishes to be reviewed under an APT other than the current approved version available [here](#), a copy of the APT document under which the candidate has elected to be reviewed must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the department.

External Evaluations (see also External evaluations below). As noted above, if external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed according to department guidelines. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names. The department chair decides whether removal is justified.

D. Promotion and Tenure Committees Responsibilities

As noted in Section III.B, three members of the eligible faculty are appointed for each tenure and/or promotion review. The responsibilities of these promotion and tenure committees are as follows:

- **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section VI.B.4 below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.

- **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
- Meet with the candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.
- Consider the interdisciplinary work of a candidate across multiple units as part of the whole work, especially if the candidate has a joint appointment in another unit.
- Following the meeting of the eligible faculty, prepare a written report of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service, including the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
- Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit. The eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

c. Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

Each Fall, when appropriate, the Department Chair convenes the eligible faculty, which is described in Section III of this document. The Department Chair may not vote in deliberations of the eligible faculty. The Department Chair appoints a chair for the committee.

The responsibilities of the eligible faculty are as follows:

- To review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
 - The eligible faculty bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.

- A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) only once. Faculty Rule [3335-7-08](#) makes the same provision for nonprobationary teaching faculty. 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.
- 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 making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described [here](#).
- **Early Autumn:** To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed; to attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.

b. Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. Such questions will be asked of all candidates in a non-discriminatory manner. For tenure-track assistant professors, the department chair will confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an [MOU](#) at the time of promotion with tenure.
- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this department. The department chair will seek a letter of evaluation from the TIU head of the joint appointment unit as well as from an interdisciplinary center or institute in which the candidate plays an active role. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.

- To charge each member of the eligible faculty to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To explain to the eligible faculty any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the eligible faculty.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the departmental review process:
 - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair
 - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair
 - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten calendar days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline.
- To receive the Promotion and Tenure Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the TIU head of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

2. Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Adjunct faculty and associated faculty with tenure-track titles for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed in Section VI.B above, with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is negative (a negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases), and does not proceed to the executive vice president and provost if the dean's recommendation is negative.

3. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

The responsibilities of regional campus candidates are the same as those of a Columbus campus candidate as described above.

Regional campus tenure-track faculty who are candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on each campus, and then by the Regional Campus Dean/ This review focuses on teaching and service. The Regional Campus Dean forwards the reports of these reviews and a recommendation to the Chair of the Department for inclusion in the candidate's dossier and for the guidance of the Department's eligible faculty. From this point the review follows the same procedures as described for the Columbus campus faculty above. A request to promote requires agreement by the dean and the Department Chair.

Regional campus teaching faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean. Following the review, the dean consults with the department chair. A request to promote follows the same procedures as tenure-track faculty except that external letters are not needed unless scholarship is a component of the assigned role.

Associated faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean. The decision of the regional campus dean is final.

4. External Evaluations

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews and all teaching faculty promotion reviews to the rank of teaching professor. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for promotion to teaching associate professor or for associated faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations in these cases will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the candidate's Promotion and Tenure Committee.

A conflict of interest for external reviewers exists if the reviewer is or has been to the candidate: a) a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor; b) a research collaborator, which includes someone who has been a coauthor on a publication within the past 3 years, including pending publications and submissions; c) a collaborator on a project within the past 3 years, including current and planned collaborations; d) in a consulting/financial arrangement with the candidate within the past 3 years, including receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services); e) a relative or close personal friend; or f) in any relationship, personal or professional, that could reduce the reviewer's objectivity. Also excluded are reviewers from the same institution, or those who had previous employment in the same institution within the past 12 months, or those who are being considered for employment at that institution.

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

- Is written by a person at an appropriate peer or aspirational institution. In keeping with college guidelines, the department will generally obtain evaluations from faculty at R01 institutions that are members of the [Association of American Universities \(AAU\)](#) and the [Big Ten Academic Alliance \(BTAA\)](#). The department further defines peer or near-peer institutions to include: City University of New York Graduate Center, Florida State University, Syracuse, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, University of Cincinnati, and University of Connecticut, Storrs. Justification will be provided in each case in which a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.
- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or

post-doctoral mentor of the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will solicit evaluations only from professors with institutional affiliations predominately in the programs listed above. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.

- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters are sought than are required, and they are solicited no later than the end of the spring semester prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by a candidate's Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. All potential evaluators must be approved by the College of Arts and Sciences. No written justification is required for tenured professors at peer or near peer institutions as defined above. If the potential evaluator is from an academic institution that is not clearly a peer or aspirational peer for Ohio State, or if the potential evaluator is from a nonacademic institution (e.g., a public policy think tank, a private art academy or music conservatory, a museum, a biomedical company, or a governmental agency), a brief written justification is required. The department's justification should be based on the prestige of the institution, the credentials and experience of the evaluator, and/or the specific relevance of the evaluator's expertise to the candidate's activities. International evaluators from strong institutions are allowed. The research credentials of the evaluators should generally mirror those of a professor at the professor rank at Ohio State.

In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors. The department should provide justification if more than a minority of the evaluations are from associate professors (e.g., candidate's work is in a small or new field for which more senior people are not available, evaluators have gained prominence as national or international experts in the field). For reviews of associate professors, all evaluators must be professors (or equivalent). Emeritus professors are acceptable as long as they are active researchers.

If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that none of the person(s) suggested by the candidate agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format for letters requesting external evaluations. A sample letter for tenure-track faculty can be found [here](#). A sample letter for teaching faculty can be found [here](#).

Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit external evaluations or initiate contact in any way with external evaluators for any purpose related to the promotion review. If an external evaluator should initiate contact with the candidate regarding the review, the candidate must inform the evaluator that such

communication is inappropriate and report the occurrence to the department chair, who will decide what, if any, action is warranted (requesting permission from the Office of Academic Affairs to exclude that letter from the dossier). It is in the candidate's self-interest to assure that there is no ethical or procedural lapse, or the appearance of such a lapse, in the course of the review process.

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

VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS

Faculty members who believe they have been evaluated improperly for tenure, promotion, or reappointment may appeal a negative decision to the University Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

Performance that is adequate for annual reappointment may not be adequate for the granting of promotion or tenure with promotion for faculty on the tenure track or, in the case of clinical/teaching/professional practice or research faculty, for securing a reappointment.

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) (A) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Further details on appeals alleging improper evaluation are contained in Faculty Rule [3335-5-05](#). Disagreement with a negative decision is not grounds for appeal. In pursuing an appeal, the faculty member is required to document the failure of one or more parties to the review process to follow written policies and procedures.

VIII. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS

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

IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The College of Arts and Sciences values excellence in teaching across disciplines and at all levels of instruction. Student and peer evaluations of teaching provide tools for assessing faculty teaching effectiveness and for providing faculty with regular opportunities for improvement.

Evaluation of teaching should be holistic, considering a variety of evidence of accomplishment in the classroom: for example, student evaluations (quantitative and narrative), peer evaluations, examples of curricular or pedagogic innovation, and efforts to improve teaching by taking advantage of college or university resources.

In no case should the evaluation of teaching rely exclusively on quantitative instruments (such as the SEI), which have been shown to be unreliable indicators of overall performance in the classroom and to work systematically to the disadvantage of women, non-native English speakers, and faculty of color.

Evaluation of teaching should also be contextual, taking into account the particular challenges of teaching different kinds of material to different kinds of audiences, and situating each year's performance in relation to previous years and to goals set by the department.

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

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

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Peer evaluation of teaching is required for all faculty members in the College of Arts and Sciences. Peer evaluation should fulfill two basic goals: 1) provide constructive feedback to faculty on both the content and the quality of their instruction, and 2) help faculty to continually improve the overall effectiveness of their teaching at all levels. The Department Chair oversees the Department's peer evaluation of teaching process.

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

The responsibilities of the TEAC are as follows:

- To review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and teaching faculty, and all associated faculty with multiple year appointments at least once a year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. When assistant professors are reviewed for tenure and promotion, they are required to have a minimum of five peer evaluations of teaching from the probationary period. No more than two evaluations should be prepared by the same colleague.
- To review the teaching of tenured Associate Professors, and nonprobationary assistant and associate teaching professors at least once every two years, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a six year period and of having at least three peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion review.
- To review the teaching of tenured Professors and nonprobationary teaching professors at least once every four years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over time.
- To review, upon the Department Chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.
- To review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The Department Chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the [Michael V. Drake Institute for](#)

Teaching and Learning.

- Reviews conducted upon the request of the Department Chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the Chair or faculty member.

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluation (i.e. the first three situations listed above) is comprehensive and includes, in addition to classroom visitation, review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and exams. Faculty under review should provide peer reviewers with the course syllabus and other materials well in advance of the classroom visit or visits. They should also provide reviewers with a list of preferred visitation dates. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, the college encourages the peer reviewer to first meet with the candidate to discuss the candidate's goals and expected outcomes for the course, teaching philosophy, and any challenges related to instruction including feedback from previous evaluations of teaching.

Peer review focuses particularly on aspects of teaching that students are less qualified than faculty to evaluate, such as appropriateness of curricular choices given the goals of the course (e.g., survey as opposed to required major course), implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and appropriateness of approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge.

At the conclusion of the evaluation, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give informal feedback and also submits a written report to the department chair, copied to the candidate by the end of the semester of review. Written reports of peer evaluation of teaching should focus not only on classroom performance but also on curricular choices, implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and engagement with current disciplinary knowledge. For probationary faculty, the reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if desired. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier. The comments are appended to the report for inclusion in the faculty member's promotion and tenure dossier, unless the faculty member requests the comments be excluded.

Departmental Guidelines Regarding Peer Evaluation of Teaching

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

APPENDIX 1
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEWS DOCUMENTATION
FOR NONPROBATIONARY FACULTY

Documentation for the annual performance and merit review for nonprobationary faculty is listed below and on a form provided by the Department Chair for reporting on work done in the previous year. The information collected will include at least the following:

- I. Scholarship
 - a. Written work
 - i. Books, published or accepted for publication
 - ii. Edited books, published or accepted for publication
 - iii. Papers in refereed journals, published or accepted for publication
 - iv. Papers in anthologies or conference proceedings, published or accepted for publication
 - v. Reviews, published or accepted for publication
 - vi. Translations, published or accepted for publication
 - vii. Reprintings of previously published work
 - viii. Papers under submission to journals or other scholarly publications
 - ix. Grant applications under submission or submitted and accepted/rejected this past year
 - x. Work in progress, with an indication of state of development and expected final form (book, journal article, *etc.*)
 - b. Presentations
 - i. Invited presentations
 - ii. Invitations received since last year's review
 - iii. Invited papers presented since last year
 - iv. Refereed presentations
 - v. Papers submitted for presentation since last year
 - vi. Papers accepted for presentation since last year
 - vii. Papers presented since last year
 - c. Awards (fellowships, prizes, or other awards, as well as invitations to visit institutions other than those listed above)
- II. Teaching
 - a. Courses taught during the preceding year, with a summary of enrollments for each course, nature of teaching assistance, if any, indication of special circumstances (new course, new version of old course, and so on). Student evaluations other than those collected by the University's SEI forms.
 - b. Teaching awards and other recognitions for the past year
 - c. Course development work (summary of all work for the development of new courses within the Department or elsewhere)
 - d. Advising
 - i. Graduate level advising, and committee membership
 - ii. Undergraduate advisees, indicating general advising, undergraduate thesis

advising, and so on

III. Service

- a. Departmental
 - i. Committee work
 - ii. Other departmental service
- b. College
- c. University
- d. Service to the profession
- e. Community

Each faculty member is responsible for ensuring that the Salary Recommendation Committee receives copies of all forms of student evaluation of teaching other than the University's SEI forms for all courses taught since the last review. The Chair is responsible for ensuring that the Committee receives copies of all peer evaluations of teaching since the last review.

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

APPENDIX 2

Mentorship Plan

Every newly appointed probationary tenure-track professor is assigned a tenure-track faculty member to advise the mentee on strategic approaches to meeting expectations in research, teaching, and service and to offer regular, candid, and supportive feedback on the full scope of the mentee's responsibilities throughout the entire probationary period. This may include reviews and comments on manuscripts and funding proposals, teaching plans and materials, advice on managing course loads and classroom issues, and guidance on professional skills and opportunities. Mentors should also serve as a resource partner to help their mentees navigate the procedures and policies in the department, college, and university.

Mentors should initiate meetings with their mentees at least twice each semester and are also expected to respond to additional requests from their mentees as needed. Mentors who will be on leave should ask the department chair to assign another tenure-track faculty member to the mentee until they return.

The department also constitutes a Reading Committee, chaired by the Mentor, which contains at least two additional tenured members of faculty. The primary function of this committee is to review and comment on the mentees manuscripts and to discuss all matters relating to the mentees academic research. The default assumption is that each member of the Reading Committee will carefully read the mentee's work and meet with them at least once per academic year to discuss research-related matters. Mentees should initiate these meetings.

Mentees who would like additional mentorship support or otherwise believe that their current mentoring relationship is not meeting their needs should discuss the issue with the department chair or designee (e.g., P&T committee chair). The department chair or designee will seek a resolution, which may include assigning a new mentor or adding an additional mentor to the mentorship team. If the probationary faculty member's concerns are not resolved through this process, they should schedule a meeting with the Divisional Dean or the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs in the College of Arts and Sciences.