

**Appointments, Promotion, and
Tenure
Criteria and Procedures for
The Ohio State University**

**Department of
Near Eastern and South Asian
Languages and Cultures**

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: February 19, 2024

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	6
5 Minimum Composition	7
B Quorum.....	7
C Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty	7
1 Appointment.....	8
2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion	8
IV Appointments.....	8
A Criteria.....	8
1 Tenure-track Faculty	8
2 Teaching Faculty	9
3 Associated Faculty	10
4 Emeritus Faculty	11
5 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty.....	11
B Procedures.....	12
1 Tenure-track Faculty	12
2 Teaching Faculty	14
3 Transfer from the Tenure Track.....	14
4 Associated Faculty	14
5 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty.....	15
V Annual Performance and Merit Review	15
A Documentation.....	16
B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty.....	16
1 Fourth-Year Review.....	17

2 Extension of the Tenure Clock.....	18
C Tenured Faculty.....	18
D Teaching Faculty.....	18
E Associated Faculty.....	18
F Salary Recommendations	19
VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews.....	19
A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion	20
1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	20
2 Promotion to Professor	25
3 Teaching Faculty.....	26
4 Associated Faculty.....	26
B Procedures.....	27
1 Tenure-track and Teaching Faculty	27
a Candidate Responsibilities	27
b Eligible Faculty Responsibilities	30
c Department Chair Responsibilities	31
2 External Evaluations	32
VII Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals.....	34
VIII Seventh-Year Reviews.....	35
IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching	35
A Student Evaluation of Teaching	35
B Departmental Narrative Evaluations	35
C Peer Evaluation of Teaching	35

I Preamble

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

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

This document must be approved by the 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 department 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 affirmative action and equal employment opportunity](#).

II Department Mission

The Department of Near Eastern and South Asian Languages and Cultures (henceforth NESAs) aims to build and cultivate a community of colleagues, which includes faculty, lecturers, graduate students, undergraduates, staff, and friends, to further our research, teaching, and service missions, stated below.

Geographically, NESAs's scope of concern spans the overlapping and historically connected areas of the Near East, Middle East, northern Africa, South Asia, and Central Asia. These areas will be collectively called the "NESAs region."

Linguistically, NESAs is concerned with the Afroasiatic, Semitic, Turkic, and Indo-Aryan languages spoken in that region. These include Arabic, Hebrew (modern and biblical), Persian, Turkish, Uzbek, and Hindi; as well as a range of ancient Semitic languages such as Akkadian, Aramaic, Syriac, Ugaritic, and Phoenician – an offering unmatched by the majority of U.S. universities. These will be collectively called "NESAs languages."

Chronologically, NESAs is concerned with the entire time span from prehistory to the present, bridging the ancient, late antique, medieval, and modern periods.

Topically, NESAs is concerned about language, culture, religion, scriptures, literary and scientific works, law and society. We study these topics from an interdisciplinary range of approaches from the humanities

and social sciences. One distinctive value of NESAs is our conviction that these concerns are best understood through careful analysis of sources in original languages in their cultural-historical contexts.

Our *research mission* is to produce and disseminate new knowledge and fresh perspectives concerning the social, political, cultural, and intellectual currents running through the NESAs region and beyond. Our goal is to create a departmental culture of regular, substantive intellectual exchange that also intersects wider academic circles on campus and beyond.

Our *teaching mission* is to inspire generations of students to become excited and knowledgeable about this region and the internationally vital issues that have emerged from it. We seek to teach a broad undergraduate audience to think critically about the NESAs region through deep knowledge of the languages and cultures, encouraging some of them to pursue our major or minor programs, and preparing them to apply their training to the professions or graduate work. We also endeavor to recruit bright cohorts of graduate students and equip them with the methodologies and theories for study and research. We train students for a wide range of careers, including international business, law, journalism, communications, translation, language teaching, government foreign service, military service, development, nongovernmental organizations, religious vocation, and academia.

Our *service mission* is to apply regional knowledge for the campus, central Ohio, U.S. nation, and beyond through various work for schools, organizations, institutions, and other parties. Columbus, for example, harbors large communities from the NESAs region, who use our translation services and attend our public talks. We believe knowledge of this region has paramount importance to public interests, including issues facing the local communities and world today.

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, promotion and tenure, or contract renewal.

1 Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **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, 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.

2 Teaching Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **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. All teaching faculty may participate, but they may not vote.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must then be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of teaching assistant professors, the eligible voting faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors. All nonprobationary associate teaching professors and professors may participate but may not vote.
- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of teaching associate professors, and the reappointment reviews of teaching professors, the eligible voting faculty consists of all tenured professors. All nonprobationary teaching professors may participate but may not vote.

3 Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- For the initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members, the search committee makes recommendations directly to the department chair, with no faculty vote. The chair makes the appointment in consultation with appropriate faculty.
- Reappointments happen at the discretion of the chair, in consultation with appropriate faculty.

Promotion Reviews

- Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have lecturer titles.

The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the department chair in consultation with the relevant Area Officers and Vice-Chair (if appointed).

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 25% 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, will appoint a faculty member from another tenure-initiating unit within the college.

B 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. 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.

C Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters only “yes” and “no” votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. However, faculty members are strongly discouraged from abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter, because the unit needs full participation in the review process.

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted, but participating fully in discussions and voting via remote two-way electronic connection are allowed.

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/her/their 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/her/their reappointment, promotion and/or tenure, or contract renewal.

IV Appointments

A Criteria

The department is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance the quality of the department. Important considerations include the individual's record to date in teaching, scholarship 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. Formal interviews are 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

Instructor. Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but requirements for the terminal degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. Procedures for appointment are

identical to that of 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, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to exclude time from the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor. An earned terminal degree is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the department and the profession is highly desirable. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. 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 Committee of Eligible Faculty determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to exclude time from the probationary period.

Associate Professor and Professor. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor and offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

Appointment at the rank of associate professor normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at the 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 (terminal) year of employment is offered.

Appointments at the rank of professor without tenure should not occur.

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 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.

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.

Assistant Teaching Professor. An earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field or equivalent experience and the required licensure/certification in his/her/their specialty are the minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of assistant teaching professor. Evidence of ability to teach is essential.

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 the relevant field or equivalent experience and the required licensure/certification in his/her/their specialty, and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria—in teaching, professional practice and other service, and scholarship—for promotion to these ranks. These materials can include a combination of publications in academic journals or edited collections, conference presentations, authorship or co-authorship of pedagogical materials such as textbooks/websites (print or open access), and development of pedagogical materials for classroom use. Appointment at the rank of teaching professor additionally 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.

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

Senior Lecturer. Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a doctorate in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with

evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction; or a Master's degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught and a significant record of service to the department. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The initial appointment for a senior lecturer should generally not exceed one year.

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for only three consecutive years.

4 Emeritus Faculty

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

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the Department chair outlining academic performance and citizenship. The 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. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered.

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

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

5 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

Such faculty may be appointed to the Graduate Faculty of NESAs graduate programs by the department's Graduate Studies Committee, pending approval of the chair and the granting of M or P status, as the case may be, to the faculty member by the Graduate School. These NESAs Courtesy Graduate Faculty may serve on advisory committees, exam committees, and dissertation committees for NESAs graduate students without case-by-case approval. In special circumstances

(for example, if no appropriate NESAs faculty member is available), the Graduate Studies Committee and chair may approve a NESAs Courtesy Graduate Faculty member to serve as the exam committee chair or main dissertation advisor for a NESAs graduate student.

B Procedures

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. Formal interviews are 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 Faculty

A national search is required to ensure a diverse 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 Volume 1, Chapter 4, section 5.1 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 OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

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

The department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the department.

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 AA/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 and diverse 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, diverse talent pools to ensure alignment with university and unit AA/EEO goals 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, fairness, and equity 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.

Following completion of virtual/on-campus interviews, the chair shall convene a special meeting of the eligible faculty. After due deliberation, eligible faculty members who have reviewed the candidates’ dossiers shall vote on the candidates in a confidential ballot. The search committee will consolidate the feedback report and the results of the faculty vote into the SHIFT search report highlighting each candidate’s strengths and weaknesses and submit the report to the department chair. A two-thirds vote is normally expected before the chair can recommend the appointment to the divisional dean. If the top candidate receives less than two-thirds of the positive votes, the chair, in consultation with the divisional dean, will decide whether to make an offer to the top-ranked candidate on the basis of a simple majority or to end the search and begin again. If the chair decides to make an offer, she/he/they will write a letter of explanation of the circumstances to the faculty with a copy to be sent to the divisional dean.

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the

appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the department chair decides which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the department chair.

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

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 circumstances exist. Tenure or tenure eligibility is lost upon transfer, and 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 Associated Faculty

The appointment of compensated associated faculty members 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 departmental Area Officers holding relevant expertise, and with the Vice-Chair (if appointed).

Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one to three years, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances.

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department and are decided by the department chair in consultation with departmental Area Officers holding relevant expertise, and with the Vice-Chair (if appointed).

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 an annual basis and rarely semester by semester. 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.

5 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track, clinical/teaching/professional practice, or research faculty member from another Ohio State tenure-initiating unit. 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 eligible faculty, the department chair extends an offer of appointment. The department chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

V Annual Performance and Merit Review

The department follows the requirements for the annual performance and merit review 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 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.

Depending on their appointment type, the annual performance and merit review of faculty members is based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, 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 performance and merit review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#)) to

view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

A Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to the Department chair no later than the final day of autumn semester classes:

- Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), Volume 3 (*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.

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

All tenure-track faculty are initially offered employment with the expectation that earning tenure is feasible for the newly appointed faculty member, pending steady and effective research, teaching, and service. The department chair and senior faculty monitor the tenure-track faculty's progress toward that goal through annual reviews and mentoring.

The participants in the annual departmental review of probationary tenure-track faculty are 1) the faculty member under review, 2) the Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF) for probationary faculty, constituted of the tenured senior faculty, with a chair appointed by the department chair, and 3) the department chair.

The probationary faculty member will assemble his/her dossier in accordance with the appropriate format stipulated by the Office of Academic Affairs. Probationary faculty present their dossiers to the chair and CEF chair by a date specified in the letter of notice. The CEF chair will go over the dossier with the probationary faculty member for the following purposes:

- to determine that sufficient evidence has been assembled and that is in satisfactory form (see [OAA dossier outline](#)); to verify the accuracy of the probationary faculty member's listing of his/her published work and provide a statement that this has been accomplished to the chair of the CEF (who will include it in the report of the CEF to the department chair);
- to advise the probationary faculty member and the chair if corrections and/or further evidence is needed.

When the CEF chair and the probationary faculty member have determined that the dossier is complete, the chair will make the dossier available to the members of the CEF. After sufficient time for the CEF to examine the evidence, the CEF chair will convene a meeting of the committee to discuss the evidence and take a vote. The department chair may participate in the discussions but will not vote. Votes on personnel matters must be by confidential ballot. A two-thirds affirmative vote is necessary to establish a recommendation for renewal. The CEF chair must submit a written report for

each probationary faculty member to the department chair for inclusion in the dossier. This report is to include the committee's actual numerical vote and recommendation, an explanation of the recommendation (including the principal strengths and weaknesses of the case), and, if the vote was divided, a presentation of the differing viewpoints on the case.

The department chair shall write a letter to the probationary faculty member summarizing the assessment of the probationary faculty member's case and a decision about reappointment.

Recommendations by the CEF will ordinarily be accepted unless they are not supported by the evidence presented that the probationary faculty member meets university, college, and department standards (see Faculty Rule [3335-6](#) and Section VI.A, below). Should the Chair make an assessment and/or recommendation differing from that of the CEF, he or she will communicate in writing to the CEF the reason(s) why their assessment and/or recommendation was judged not to be supported by the evidence. In case of such a finding and before forwarding the review materials to the divisional dean, the chair will call a meeting of the CEF to explain further his/her decision and invite discussion.

The CEF chair and the department chair together meet with the faculty member under review to explain the outcome and to share their written evaluations.

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

If the Department chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#)) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

1 Fourth-Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exceptions that external evaluations are optional and the dean (not the department chair) 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.

The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

The eligible faculty 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. At the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per

Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the Department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

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 tenure 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

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the department chair. The department chair conducts an independent assessment; recommends to meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair, who recommends to meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their 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 department, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the 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, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty.

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

D Teaching Faculty

The annual performance and merit review process for teaching probationary and nonprobationary 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.

The department's process for Teaching Faculty reappointment is set forth in the Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment Policy, III, A-G. There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

E Associated Faculty

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and recommends to meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their 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 recommends to meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her/their 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 Salary Recommendations

The department chair makes annual salary recommendations to the dean, who may modify them. The recommendations are based on the current annual performance and merit review as well as on the performance and merit reviews of the preceding 24 months.

In formulating recommendations, the department chair consults with the department Chair Advisory Committee. The department chair should proactively engage in equity audits of faculty salary to ensure faculty salaries are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in the department. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

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.

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

VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

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.

A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

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

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

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

The award of tenure is 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.

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](#).

The following tables specify criteria and types of evidence expected of faculty undergoing review for promotion to associate professor with tenure. "Criteria" refers to qualities which candidates must have. "Types of Evidence" refers to documentation candidates may be asked to submit, demonstrating impact and showing that the corresponding criteria have been met. There are separate tables for teaching, scholarship/creative works/research, and service.

Not all points in Types of Evidence need to be fulfilled for each candidate; these points are listed to provide a span of reasonably expected possible measures of the corresponding criteria for the Committee of the Eligible Faculty to assess. Some Criteria below, and their associated Types of Evidence, are noted as "*less expected for promotion to Associate Professor; more expected for promotion to Professor*". The CEF assesses how much expectation is appropriate for each rank of promotion.

TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Developed new and effective instructional techniques and materials appropriate for the objectives and level of the course	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Changes to or development of syllabi, including to enable some undergraduate courses to fulfill General Education requirements or to enable online delivery mode.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed “Foundations, Impact Teaching” or “Teaching at Ohio State” through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning; or awarded “Endorsement” from Drake Institute of Teaching and Learning; or completed other pedagogical training. • Candidate’s teaching narrative mentions and syllabi show that pedagogical continuing education or student feedback (SEI-SEIs, departmental evaluations, peer teaching evaluations) has led to justified changes in classroom practice, assignments, or grading.
<p>Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching statement and supporting evidence (student comment excerpts, assignment samples, Carmen screen shots) indicate clear, well-thought out, fair, and effective pedagogy in courses. • Peer teaching evaluations documenting class practice, course organization, syllabus content, and course’s Carmen website demonstrate positive performance or trajectory during review period. • SEI-SEIs and departmental evaluations reveal a positive classroom environment conducive to learning and do not identify any persistent or recurring issues that students identify as inhibiting their ability to learn or their well-being in class. • SEI do not demonstrate a negative trajectory during review period, particularly not in the evaluation categories, “instructor was genuinely interested in helping students”, and “instructor created an atmosphere conducive to learning”.

<p>Demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom or online technology, and other teaching strategies to create a positive learning environment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching narrative discusses thoughtful use of a span of teaching approaches to stimulate class participation and learning. • Peer evaluation descriptions are positive on the conception and executing of modes of instruction. • Students document in SEIs and departmental evaluations that the teaching techniques are effective and liked.
<p>Engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, critical thinking, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching narrative discusses how critical thinking, independent thought, and creativity are encouraged and cultivated in the classroom and in assignments. • Peer evaluation descriptions are positive on the conception and executing of these goals. • Students document in SEIs and departmental evaluations that they have increased in these qualities as result of this course. • Evidence in syllabi, teaching evaluations, and teaching narrative that candidate seeks to advance student knowledge of diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice as part of the knowledge creation process, and practices these in the classroom.
<p>Chooses to teach a range of courses that together reveal “teaching impact” and advance the department’s various teaching and program goals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching record shows a spectrum of courses taught (GE, span of GE categories, requirements for majors and minors, graduate core courses, advanced graduate courses, cross-listed with other units). Teaching high-demand GE categories (including 4-credit High Impact Practice, Citizenship Theme, REGD, Honors, and others) will be particularly noted. • Teaching record each term shows an effort to contribute generously to the department’s credit hour production. Attempt to fulfill departmental guidelines (posted on NESA intranet) on number of students taught and shows effort to increase enrollments (such as by rewriting the course for an appropriate GE category and securing approval) if the Undergraduate Studies Committee finds the numbers deficient.
<p>Improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs <i>(less expected for promotion to Associate Professor; more expected for promotion to Professor)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement and specific outcomes in curriculum development. • Leadership or participation in development of the curriculum and courses which goes beyond normal teaching and service expectations, including contributions to other units’ courses and programs (through teaching and course/curricular development for courses listed or cross-listed in other units, guest teaching, team teaching). • These points will be evidenced in the teaching narrative.
<p>Actively engage in various forms of mentoring for graduate students and younger scholars.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement in graduate/professional exam, thesis, and dissertation committees within and outside the department. Number of graduate committees served will be noted, especially roles outside the department. • Mentoring of graduate students through teaching independent studies sources, small-enrollment course

	<p>overloads to standard teaching load (particularly for less commonly taught languages).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Served as advisor to graduate students as appropriate given the department's ability to admit graduate students matching the faculty member's areas of expertise. Number of graduate students advised will be noted. • Promoting student participation in research presentations (e.g., Hayes, arranging and coaching departmental graduate student research presentations, practice conference talks, practice job talks) • Mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers.
Served as research mentor to undergraduate students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentoring of undergraduate research students through teaching independent studies sources, small-enrollment course overloads to standard teaching load. • Promoting student participation in research presentations (e.g., Denman). • Serving as mentor or committee member for undergraduate and honors research theses.

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH

Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Demonstrated excellence in thematically focused research and scholarship that contributes to knowledge in area of expertise and relationship to candidate's scholarly agenda, unit mission, and societal needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publication record that includes monographs, edited books as (co-)editor, book chapters, peer-reviewed journal articles, editor-reviewed pieces (including book reviews), encyclopedia articles, critical editions, scholarship-based textbooks, conference paper collections, magazine articles, on-line publications, and digital media resources. This record clearly demonstrates a consistently advancing, independent research program over time, and contributes substantively to knowledge in the areas of focus. What constitutes a sufficient set of scholarly products for promotion is to be determined by the Committee of Eligible Faculty, consulting with external letters and practices of peer units and institutions as reference. • Creative approaches to framing research questions and investigative approaches, as evidenced in publications, research narrative, and oral presentations. • Evidence of work in progress in publications, research narrative, and oral presentations.
Evidence of recognition and impact of scholarship and research outside of OSU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grants and fellowships from, or collaborative contracts with, foundations, scholarly organizations, and other appropriate institutions. • Evidence of international recognition and impact of scholarly work, to be found in inclusion in international: grants, fellowships, residencies, conferences, workshops, guest lecturing, edited volumes, awards, or citation in journals. (<i>less expected for promotion to Associate Professor; more expected for promotion to Professor</i>)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluative statements from peers that the candidate has made substantial contributions to the discipline or profession. Prizes and awards for research, scholarly, outreach, or creative work. Evaluative statements concerning hard work, dependability, integrity, collegiality, or similar qualities will be noted. • Collaborative work and leadership in intellectual and scholarly projects with academic and non-academic colleagues, whether or not the endeavors result in published products. The activity can include engagement and relationship-building with (particularly marginalized or at-risk) communities. Evaluative statements from collaborators attesting to the value of candidate's contribution. (<i>less expected for promotion to Associate Professor; more expected for promotion to Professor</i>) • Evidence in any of the evaluated scholarly activities that the candidate seeks to advance and has demonstrated impact in diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice in the knowledge production of their fields and in the practices of their scholarly communities.
--	---

SERVICE	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Demonstrated excellence in service to the department or college	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work on appointed and elected department and college ad hoc or standing committees. • Work on organizing talks, workshops, events, programs, and otherwise promoting scholarly exchange at OSU or elsewhere. • Work to develop or build inter-unit and interdisciplinary initiatives or clusters within the college. • Recognition (awards and prizes) for service to department or college. • Annual evaluations documenting excellence in service to department or college. Evaluative statements concerning hard work, dependability, integrity, collegiality, or similar qualities will be noted.
Demonstrated excellence in service to the university (<i>less expected for promotion to Associate Professor; more expected for promotion to Professor</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointed and elected university ad hoc or standing committees, councils, task forces, and boards. • Administrative responsibilities including the direction/coordination of programs or offices, participation in special studies on behalf of the university, grants received in support of the institution. • Quality indicators of the outcomes of contributions, including roles in any major reports issued, policy changes recommended and implemented, and administrative units restructured. • Service that advances the University's commitment to diversity and inclusion. • Awards and prizes for service to University.

<p>Demonstrated excellence in service to the students of Ohio State</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advising student clubs, College Honors Committee, or other organizations; serving on advisory and as outside Graduate School Representative on examination committees of graduate students, and serving on university student committees (e.g., Judicial and Academic misconduct), STEP mentor or Drake Institute cohort mentor (if not used under teaching).
<p>Demonstrated significant service to a profession or field (<i>less expected for promotion to Associate Professor; more expected for promotion to Professor</i>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement with, possibly leadership roles in, professional journals (journal editorships, reviewer), professional and scholarly societies (offices or committees), and major funded collaborative projects. Those with international scope and reputation will be particularly noted. • Leadership and substantial service in professional conference organizations. • Consultation activity with industry, professional discipline education development, other universities, or government. • Evidence of professional expertise to public and private entities as a reviewer for funding proposals, study sections, external examiner, member of panels and commissions, professional consultant to industry, government, and education organization. • Awards and prizes for service to profession. • Available evidence (e.g., letters from committee chairs) of the quality of service. • Evaluative statements concerning hard work, dependability, integrity, collegiality, or similar qualities will be noted.
<p>Demonstrated community-engagement (<i>less expected for promotion to Associate Professor; more expected for promotion to Professor</i>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality indicators of activities within community settings beyond the academic campus. • Activities building public understanding of societal and community-relevant issues; creation of knowledge (including digital) resources for public use; thematic public-oriented talks, conferences, exhibitions, and performances. • Unique service to marginalized, disadvantaged, and at-risk communities.

2 Promotion to Professor

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

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

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

Accordingly, the Committee of the Eligible Faculty will use the tables of Criteria and Types of Evidence for Teaching, Scholarship/Creative Works/Research, and Service for

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, adjusting expectations for promotion to professor and putting greater weight particularly for Criteria marked, “*less expected for promotion to Associate Professor; more expected for promotion to Professor*”.

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

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

3 Teaching Faculty

Promotion to Assistant Teaching Professor. For promotion to assistant teaching professor, a faculty member must complete his/her/their doctoral degree and meet the required licensure/certification in his/her/their specialty and be performing satisfactorily in teaching, professional practice, and service related to teaching and curriculum.

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;; and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of this department. The specific criteria in teaching for promotion to associate teaching professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. The criteria for service are limited mostly to service related to the candidate’s existing teaching functions and language coordination functions (if any). Scholarship activity and receiving research grants are not required but count positively if accomplished. More broadly, any service and scholarship/creative works/research done beyond these expected requirements for teaching faculty are commended and counted positively for the promotion case.

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. Any service and scholarship/creative works/research done beyond these expected requirements for teaching faculty are commended and counted positively for the promotion case.

4 Associated Faculty

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.4.

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

B Procedures

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

1 Tenure-Track and Teaching Faculty

a Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier and providing a copy of the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators compiled for their case according to department 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 Committee of Eligible Faculty 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/her/them.

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

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.

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 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.

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.

The NESAs department requires the following forms of documentation for teaching, scholarship, and service from the promotion candidate, which the Committee of Eligible Faculty are responsible to verify and evaluate. These forms of documentation are to be used according to the promotion Criteria listed above in the tables. The candidate is responsible to ensure that the following are in his/her/their promotion dossier.

Teaching Documentation

- 1) Complete sets of SEIs of all taught courses in the review period. Any discursive comments enabled by SEIs must be included.
- 2) Departmental (discursive) evaluations of all taught courses in the review period.
- 3) Peer teaching evaluations written during the review period. These are made by designated faculty members in and outside the department, and result from evaluations of the syllabus, course structure, materials (readings, films, websites), assignments, course website, and classroom observations (or observations of online instructor-student interactions for DL courses). The chair, in consultation with the candidate and CAC selects the evaluators during the review period.
- 4) Syllabi of all taught courses in review period, and any supplemental teaching material that the candidate deems helpful in assessing their pedagogy, such as assignments, exam questions, project instructions.
- 5) Evidence of excellence in graduate teaching, advising, and advocacy as indicated by achievements, awards, and early professional successes of the candidate's students and advisees due to the candidate's direct or indirect guidance, influence, supervision, and support. Such evidence might include graduate fellowships, honors, degrees awarded with distinction, pre-doctoral publications, post-doctoral fellowships, solid professional employment, etc.
- 6) Any other evidence that the candidate and the Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF) believe pertinent to the candidate's teaching work may be considered.

Scholarship Documentation

- 1) Digital or paper copies of publications: includes monographs, edited books as (co-)editor, book chapters, peer-reviewed journal articles, editor-reviewed pieces (including book reviews), encyclopedia articles, critical editions, conference paper collections, magazine articles, on-line publications, and digital media resources. In general, monographs and papers that undergo considerable scrutiny before publication (e.g., by anonymous peer review, journal editorial boards or anthology editors) will be more highly valued than those that do not.
- 2) Digital or paper copies of other publications (not listed in order of importance):
 - a. Textbooks, source books, readers, anthologies, contributions in the area of foreign language teaching and similar publications which are conceived primarily for university instruction shall be judged scholarly works.

- b. Translations and creative work shall be evaluated in the light of originality, depth, and pertinence to the academic mission of the department and the candidate's research narrative.
 - c. Evaluation of reviews of scholarly works written for professional journals shall take into account the scholarship of the reviews and the type of the journal and quality.
- 3) Recognition shall be given for scholarly activity at international, national, and/or regional professional meetings, papers, formal participation in symposia, and official commentaries as discussant of the papers of others shall be appraised whenever possible both directly and by the members of the Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF) and on the basis of opinions, oral and written, of scholars in the field.
 - 4) Importance shall be attached to scholarly recognition in the form of prizes, awards, grants, and fellowships, as well as to the invitations to delivery public lectures or to teach at other universities.
 - 5) Recognition in the form of requests to serve on editorial boards of scholarly journals, to chair sessions at professional meetings and conventions, or to serve on program committees for such meetings may be considered.
 - 6) Any other evidence that the candidate and the Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF) believe pertinent to the candidate's development as a scholar may be considered.

Service Documentation

- 1) Candidate's dossier should list committee assignments, service activities, positions or roles during period of review at the level of department, college, university, professional or other organizations. List public lectures, teaching, consultations in non-scholarly forums and institutions. Include roles on editorial or professional organization boards or committees, serving as reviewer for academic employment, tenure, promotion in other institutions.
- 2) Evidence of these service roles, when outside the university, are optional but welcome. These can take the form of PDFs or screen shots of websites, email messages, event brochures, or announcement posters.

- **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 their 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** reappointment (for 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, providing the reasons for the request. The department chair decides whether removal is justified.

b Committee of the Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Eligible Faculty (the Promotion and Tenure Committee) 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 on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
 - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record 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 [3335-6-04A\(3\)](#) only once. Faculty Rule [3335-7-08](#) makes the same provision for non-probationary 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 committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
 - **Late Spring:** The Procedures Oversight Designee, elected according to the [NESA POA](#) (see Section VII.B.1) in August of every year, and whose responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs [annual procedural guidelines](#), will be notified that they will serve as POD for this P&T case.
 - **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 each candidate for clarification as necessary and provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his/her/their 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 full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.
 - Revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of the full eligible faculty, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
 - Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
 - Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.
- 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.

c 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 must be asked of all candidates in a non-discriminatory manner. For tenure-track assistant professors, the department 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 Eligible Faculty Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments. The TIU head from the joint appointment unit must provide a letter of evaluation to the primary TIU head. 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.

- 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 Committee 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, a department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
 - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair;
 - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair; and
 - 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/she/they will 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 chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the head of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

2 External Evaluations

This department will seek external evaluations predominately from evaluators at an appropriate peer or aspirational institution and who meet the following criteria.

- (1) 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.
- (2) Evaluators from other institutions, including from universities outside of North America and from liberal arts colleges, may be suggested in cases where the external reviewer:
 - a. is a distinguished expert in the field of the candidate's disciplinary training or research, as indicated by publications; national and international awards; prominence in professional organizations; and presence on editorial boards of major journals;
 - b. is nationally or internationally known in a field outside of the candidate's disciplinary training or research, but related to their interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary projects;
 - c. and/or meets the standards for a peer reviewer in a TIU in which the candidate is joint-appointed.

Justification will be provided in each case when a suggested evaluator is from a program not meeting the above criteria.

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

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 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 at institutions comparable to Ohio State. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.

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

Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters are sought 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 the Committee of Eligible Faculty, the department chair, and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format for letters requesting external evaluations. 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

Only the candidate may appeal a negative tenure, promotion, or reappointment decision.

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 teaching faculty, for securing a reappointment.

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

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

VIII Seventh-Year Reviews

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

IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A Student Evaluation of Teaching

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

B Departmental Narrative Evaluations

NESA administers narrative evaluations in parallel to and in the same timeframe as the SEI process above. Questions are set by the Director of Undergraduate Studies and the chair, and administered via online survey instruments, created for each course each term by the Academic Program Coordinator, who sends the appropriate survey link to each instructor for distribution to the students, around the time that the SEI email messages are sent by the university. It is suggested that each instructor allocate time at the beginning or end of one class period for students to do their SEI and departmental narrative evaluations on their devices; the instructor must leave the room while students are completing these evaluations.

C Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The department chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process. The evaluators may be recruited for this task from other departments in the college. 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. Peer evaluations entail examination of the syllabus, course website, and a classroom visit (or suitable observation of student-instructor interaction if course is DL). The peer reviewer should focus on such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the class visits, the reviewer submits a written report to the department chair, copied to the candidate. 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.

Probationary tenure-track, teaching, and associated faculty should be reviewed at least once per year, except for teaching and associated faculty who have already taught in the department for at least two years in another appointment type.

Tenured associate professors and nonprobationary assistant and associate teaching professors should be reviewed with the frequency such that they have sufficient reviews for an anticipated promotion.

Professors do not require written peer evaluations but it is in each faculty member's interest to have peers visit class sessions and provide constructive formative advice on teaching and to maintain a

steady and consistent record of teaching quality in the form of written evaluations. These may be requested in assessment for various awards, grants, etc., and the Chair and the Chair's Advisory Committee may take them into consideration in the annual evaluation. Ideally, every Professor should undergo a formal Peer Evaluation of Teaching at least every five years, although this is not required.

The Chair of the department may call for the evaluation of the teaching of any faculty member at any time. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.

Individual faculty members may request that peer evaluations be arranged. 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 department chair or faculty member and may or may not include class visitations.