

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE DOCUMENT

Criteria and Procedures of the
Department of Near Eastern and South Asian
Languages and Cultures

(Revised May 1, 2019 – OAA Approved 7-2-19)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Preamble	p. 3
II. Department Mission	p. 3
III. Definitions	p. 4
IV. Appointments	p. 5
V. Annual Review Procedures	p. 10
VI. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	p. 15
VII. Appeals	p. 26
VIII. Seventh-Year Reviews	p. 26
IX. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching	p. 26

I. Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty (<https://trustees.osu.edu/bylaws-and-rules/faculty-rules>); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (<https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook>); and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the department and its faculty are subject.

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

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

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 (<https://trustees.osu.edu/bylaws-and-rules/faculty-rules>) 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 (<https://trustees.osu.edu/bylaws-and-rules/faculty-rules>) and other standards specific to this department and college; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.

Decisions considering appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the university’s policy on equal opportunity (<http://hr.osu.edu/policy/policy110.pdf>).

II. Department Mission

Through teaching and research the Department of Near Eastern and South Asian Languages and Cultures (NESA) promotes knowledge and understanding about the peoples of the Near East. The focus is on their languages and their cultures, including such topics as religions and scriptures, literary and scientific works, and law and society. The Near East is construed broadly and inclusively as the domain in which Afroasiatic, Iranian, Turkic, and Indo-Aryan languages have been used generally. In ordinary terms this means northern Africa, the Middle East, and South and Central Asia. The chronological scope of the department’s interests run from prehistory to the present, bridging periods characterized today as ancient, medieval, and modern. The NESA department uses the opportunities presented by the available materials to study changing cultural traditions over long histories.

The methods of our study are diverse, including the broad range of approaches based in the humanities and social sciences, but the department is united by the principle that individuals, societies, and their products are understood best through the media of their own languages and that profound analysis of their cultures requires expertise in the language of the source material in any investigation.

The department offers Bachelors of Arts degrees and degree minors in Arabic, Hebrew, and Islamic Studies, and degree minors in Arabic, Hebrew, Persian, Turkish, and South Asian Studies. The NESAs department maintains a graduate program offering Masters degrees and PhDs in Near Eastern and South Asian Languages and Cultures. Undergraduate and graduate students are encouraged to develop the ability to approach the Near East through multiple methods and disciplines and to attain the highest competency possible in the language or languages pursued in each case.

III. Definitions.

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty. Only tenured and tenure-track faculty are eligible to vote on departmental matters when prompted by the department chair. Eligibility to vote on personnel matters depends on the case, as follows.

A.1. Appointments, promotion, and tenure.

i. Appointment of tenure-track faculty. The faculty eligible to vote on the appointment of new tenure-track faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty whose tenure or prospective tenure resides in the department. For an appointment at senior rank, a second vote of appointment is taken by faculty members eligible to vote on the rank under consideration. The eligible faculty for senior rank new appointments consists of all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in the department.

ii. Reappointment of Probationary Faculty. The faculty eligible to vote on reappointment of probationary faculty consists of all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in the department.

iii. Promotion in Rank. Faculty eligible to vote on promotions in rank are those who hold an equal to the rank under consideration or a higher rank.

iv. Tenure Reviews of Probationary Professors. For tenure reviews of probationary professors, eligible faculty are tenured professors whose tenure resides in the department.

A.2. Exclusions from eligibility to vote can arise from administrative restrictions, conflicts of interest, or pre-arranged and planned absence.

i. Administrative restrictions. Faculty who hold any of the following positions are not eligible to vote: NESAs department chair, dean or assistant dean or associate dean, executive vice president and provost, or president of the university.

ii. Conflict of Interest. Conflicts of interest exclude otherwise eligible faculty from voting on a related matter. A conflict of interest exists when an eligible faculty member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some way on the candidate's services, has a close professional relationship with the candidate (e.g. dissertation advisor), or has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an objective review of the candidate's work is not possible. Generally, faculty members who have collaborated with a candidate on at least 50% of the candidate's published work since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion or reappointment review of that candidate.

iii. Availability of Eligible Faculty. Members of the eligible faculty who are on approved leave of absence such as FPL, external fellowship subsidy at an off-campus site (EFS), or family medical leave, or excused by the department chair for another urgent extraordinary reason by mutual agreement between the chair and the affected voting faculty member, are excluded from a voting committee as unavailable.

B.1. Minimum Composition. A minimum of three faculty members is required to conduct a vote. 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 department within the college.

B.2. Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committees consist of all available eligible faculty. All eligible faculty, as defined above, participate in the evaluation of other faculty. All available tenured faculty constitute the committee for candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor. All tenured professors constitute the committee for candidates for tenure. All professors constitute the committee for candidates for promotion to the rank of professor.

C. Quorum. The quorum required to discuss and vote on all decisions for which a vote is called is two-thirds of the available eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-campus assignment. Faculty members who recuse themselves because of a conflict of interest are not counted when determining quorum.

D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. In all votes taken on personnel matters only “yes” and “no” votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. Eligible faculty members are strongly encouraged to participate fully in the review process by not abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter.

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted.

Votes on Initial Appointment. A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

Votes on Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal. A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

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. In such a case, the search is either cancelled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

B. Ranks and positions. Specific criteria for particular positions as they become available in the department will be determined by a committee duly appointed by the Chair. New positions require the approval of the voting faculty and the Chair of the Department, and are subject to the approval of the Dean of the College.

1. Core Faculty (i.e. tenured and tenure-track faculty)

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

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the 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. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor. A minimum requirement for appointment at or promotion to the rank of assistant professor or a higher rank is an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in a field of study relevant to department's mission and the language and culture areas represented within the Department. 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. 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.

Senior ranks: Associate Professor and Professor. Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at senior rank normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at senior rank is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

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

2. Associated Faculty (i.e. non-tenure-track faculty)

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a couple of weeks to assist with a temporary project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer appointment is useful for long-term planning and retention. Associated faculty may be reappointed.

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

Lecturer. Lecturers have teaching and the organization of pedagogy in a designated field as the main purpose of their position. 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. Senior lecturers have teaching and the organization of pedagogy in a designated field as the main purpose of their position. Lecturers will be eligible to promotion to Senior Lecturer if they have a PhD or three years of service to the department 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 not compensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (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. They may not be reappointed for more than three years at 100% FTE.

Courtesy Appointments for Faculty. Occasionally the active academic involvement in the instruction of graduate students in the department by a tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty member from another department at Ohio State warrants appointment to the Graduate Faculty of the NESAs graduate programs. Such faculty are appointed by the department's Graduate Studies Committee pending approval of the Chair. Courtesy 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 Courtesy Faculty member to serve as the main dissertation advisor for a NESAs graduate student.

C. Procedures

See the Faculty Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (<https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook>) for information on the following topics:

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

- letters of offer

C.1. Tenure-track Faculty

A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection (http://oaa.osu.edu/sites/default/files/links_files/facultyrecruitment.pdf).

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

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

The department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty members who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the department. The chair may appoint one search committee member from the faculty of another department if that faculty member possesses relevant expertise complementary with that provided by NESAs faculty. The Chair of NESAs may serve as a member of the Search Committee.

Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo inclusive hiring practices training available through the Office of Diversity and Inclusion (<https://odi.osu.edu/>). Implicit bias training, also strongly encouraged, is available through the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity (<http://kirwaninstitute.osu.edu/>).

The search committee:

- appoints a Diversity Advocate who is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants. The search committee chair or diversity advocate should also arrange for the committee to receive training in best practices for conducting an inclusive search, offered by the college and/or the Office of Diversity and Inclusion.
- develops a search announcement for internal posting in the university Personnel Postings through the Office of Human Resources Employment Services (www.hr.osu.edu/) and external advertising, subject to the department chair's approval and in consultation with the departmental faculty. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.
- develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must advertise using at least one 30-day online ad in a national professional journal. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency ("green card"), and strict U. S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their appointment

to a tenure-track position included an advertisement in a field-specific nationally circulated professional journal.

- makes available to the entire tenure-track faculty, in either electronic form or in hard copies, the dossiers of the candidates so that the tenure-track faculty can contribute their views on any or all of the candidates. The search committee should make materials available to the tenure-track faculty prior to the search-committee meeting to discuss candidates and with sufficient time for the tenure-track faculty to have meaningful input in the selection of candidates.
- screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents to the full faculty a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. If the faculty agrees with this judgment, on-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the department office. A faculty member who does not agree must state clear reasons for reconsidering the list, and the department chair, in consultation with the faculty, determines the appropriate next steps (such as soliciting new applications, reviewing other applications already received, or canceling the search for the time being).

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

Following completion of on-campus interviews, the Search Committee shall convene, deliberate, and rank order the candidates. The Chair shall convene a special meeting of the entire tenure-track faculty, at which the recommendations of the Search Committee will be presented and discussed. After due deliberation, those eligible faculty members who have reviewed the candidates' dossiers shall vote on the candidates in a confidential ballot. The candidate receiving two-thirds of the votes shall be recommended to the chair as the Department's choice for the position. If the top candidate receives more than half but less than two-thirds of the votes, the faculty will vote again on the single top candidate. If this candidate still receives less than two-thirds of the positive votes, the chair, in consultation with the 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 or he will write a letter of explanation of the circumstances to the faculty with a copy to be sent to the dean. A two thirds vote is normally expected before the chair can recommend the appointment to the 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.

The Chair of NESAs and the Dean of the College shall be responsible for conducting all negotiations and contractual matters leading to the appointment.

Should the preferred candidate be unavailable to fill the position, the Department's second choice shall be recommended to the Chair, unless circumstances dictate that new procedures be instated.

At all times, the procedures shall be conducted in accordance with the dictates of academic freedom and integrity, and confidentiality in conformity with the provisions of the Ohio Public Records Act, the University rules of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action.

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

C.2. Associated Faculty

The appointment, review, and reappointment of all compensated associated faculty is decided by the department chair in consultation with the departmental Area Officers holding relevant expertise. 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 the department Advisory Committee.

Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three consecutive years.

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

Associated faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for tenure-track faculty (see Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews below), with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is negative, and does not proceed to the university level if the dean's recommendation is negative.

C.3. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty member from another Ohio State department. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the 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 Review Procedures

Every faculty member must have an annual performance review. Reviews cover all activities at OSU for one calendar year (January through December). For untenured faculty eligible for future tenure, these reviews play a critical role in monitoring progress toward tenure, and will be conducted by a properly constituted committee of eligible faculty, which the department internally refers to as the Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF), consisting of all available eligible faculty, or in other words tenured senior faculty not on approved leave. For all faculty the reviews serve as a basis for annual salary recommendations, for

assisting faculty in developing and carrying out professional plans, and for calling attention to performance problems where they exist.

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the Faculty Annual Review Policy (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>).

The annual reviews of every faculty member are based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties and responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. The documentation required for the annual performance review of every faculty member is described below.

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

A. Procedures for All Faculty. Annually, in the Spring Semester by a deadline set by the Chair, every faculty member will provide the Chair with (1) an updated CV and (2) a written report of accomplishments in instruction, research or other scholarly activity, and service covering the preceding calendar year (January through December). Guidelines for CV format and appropriate forms for the annual report will be made available through the Chair.

Following the review process, however conducted, every faculty member, untenured and tenured, must receive written feedback regarding performance and future plans, including salary recommendation for the following year and a brief explanation for that recommendation and also be given a scheduled opportunity to discuss that feedback in a face to face meeting with the chair. Further, Faculty Rule 3335-5-04 provides that, "At the time of their initial appointment and when they receive their annual review, faculty members shall be given notice of their right to review their personnel file maintained by the tenure initiating unit (i.e., the Department)."

Faculty members will be provided an opportunity to respond, in writing, to the written assessment of their performance, and such responses will become part of their dossiers. Faculty Rule 3335-5-04 also provides that, "A member of the faculty may place in his or her primary personnel file a response to any evaluation, comment or other material contained in the file."

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 assiduously monitor the tenure-track faculty's progress toward that goal through annual reviews and mentoring. Nonrenewal of an appointment can be appropriate following any annual review, through the fifth-year review, if the inadequacy of the probationary faculty member's record and/or professional development should become apparent. It is misleading to probationary faculty members and a poor use of the time and efforts of all parties to the review process to have a full-fledged review for promotion and tenure when it had become apparent at an earlier time that a positive recommendation for promotion and tenure would be unlikely.

At the time of appointment, probationary faculty members shall be provided with and retain all relevant documents detailing Department, College, and University promotion and tenure policies and criteria. If these documents are revised during the probationary period, probationary faculty members shall be provided with copies of the revised documents.

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. Outside evaluations may be obtained for the fourth-year review if judged appropriate by the CEF or the Chair of the Department. Letters from outside evaluators are to be solicited following the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (<https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook>). Such letters become a part of the dossier under review at every stage.

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 by a date specified in the letter of notice. Sloppily prepared dossiers, dossiers that are either padded or lacking in essential information, and dossiers that contain large amounts of self-evaluation or unnecessary narrative impose added burdens on review committees and reflect badly on both the probationary faculty member and the Department. 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 at <http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/CoreDossier.pdf>); 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 Chair of the Department);
- to advise the probationary faculty member and the Chair if corrections and/or further evidence is needed; and
- to screen the evidence submitted and advise the probationary faculty member and the Chair if some items should not be included.

The Department Chair, in the presence of the CEF Chair, will consult with the probationary faculty member after this review of the dossier has been completed. The faculty member will be shown the dossier, apprised of any additional material added, and invited to submit such additional material as is necessary to assist the CEF in making a well-informed assessment.

When the Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF) and the probationary faculty member have determined that the evidence is complete, the Chair will make the dossier available to the members of the properly constituted CEF (see 4.B(2).c, above).

It is the obligation of each eligible member of the properly constituted CEF to examine responsibly and thoroughly the contents of the dossier. The Chair of the Department shall take such measures as are reasonable, practicable, feasible, and collegial to encourage and monitor fulfillment of this obligation.

After sufficient time has been allowed for the members of the CEF to examine the evidence, the Chair of the CEF will convene a meeting of the committee at which time the evidence will be discussed and a vote taken. The Chair of the Department 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 Chair of the Department 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 Chair of the Department 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 3335-6 (<https://trustees.osu.edu/university-faculty-rules/3335-6>) of the faculty rules 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 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 advice on future plans and goals. The faculty member may then provide written comments on the review within ten days of receiving the department chair's letter. The department chair may respond to such comments in writing. The department chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received, and any written response to the comments) is forwarded to the dean of the college. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with faculty member's comments and chair's responses).

If the chair does not recommend renewal of appointment, the process that is normal during the Fourth-Year Review is invoked (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 [<https://trustees.osu.edu/university-faculty-rules/3335-6>]), whereby the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review. Then the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

If, during any review of a probationary faculty member not involving promotion and tenure, the decision of the Dean is not to recommend that faculty member for reappointment, the probationary faculty member will be notified of this decision of non-renewal and the reasons for it in writing and will be provided with a final date of employment in accordance with the standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 (<https://trustees.osu.edu/university-faculty-rules/3335-6>).

C. Fourth-Year Review of Probationary Faculty. The purpose of the Fourth-Year Review is to offer a critical evaluation of progress towards tenure in which faculty from the College outside of the NESA department participate, just as in the tenure review.

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluations are not required and that the dean (not the provost) 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 fully evaluating the scholarship without the assistance outside advice.

The CEF conducts a review of the candidate as in prior years. On completion of the review, the CEF votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The chair of the CEF forwards

a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department chair. The department chair conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 [<https://trustees.osu.edu/university-faculty-rules/3335-6>]) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

D. Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period. Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) (<https://trustees.osu.edu/university-faculty-rules/3335-6>) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure-track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period. Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (<https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook>).

E. Tenured Faculty. Associate Professors and Professors are reviewed annually by the Chair in close consultation with the Chair's Advisory Committee (CAC), all of whom study the annual reports submitted by each tenured faculty member.

Each Member of the CAC will submit to the Chair an evaluation of the faculty members who have submitted materials for review. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the CAC will rank faculty based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) in each of three categories (research, teaching, service), and also provide an overall evaluation (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory).

The Department Chair prepares a written evaluation of the faculty member and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the evaluation for inclusion in his or her personnel file.

The Chair will make salary recommendations in accordance with the recommendations of the CAC and the performance evaluation of the faculty member, and submit them to the Divisional Dean of the Arts and Humanities. The Chair will also make available to the Divisional Dean the completed performance evaluation of the faculty member and any response from the faculty member to this evaluation.

Other rewards-such as Faculty Professional Leaves, Special Assignments, adjusted teaching duties for new faculty, provision with graduate research associates, College and University awards requiring departmental rank-ordering, etc., will be determined by the Chair of the Department in consultation with the CAC and with approval of the dean as required by college or university policy.

F. 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 meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. The department chair's recommendation on renewal of the appointment is final. If the recommendation 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. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. The department chair's recommendation on reappointment is final and the faculty member will be notified of the decision in the Autumn semester of the final year of appointment.

VI. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

A. General considerations. The criteria outlined below follow from and supplement those set forth in Chapter 6 of the Faculty Rules (<https://trustees.osu.edu/university-faculty-rules/3335-6>), which obtain in matters of reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion in this Department. These criteria are, by and large, applicable to tenured faculty members as well as probationary faculty members and, with appropriate adjustment of expectations, will obtain in annual reviews of tenured faculty members and reviews for promotion to professor. They are addressed to some of the concerns particularly relevant to the Department of NESAs. In all cases each probationary faculty member under consideration for promotion and tenure and each tenured faculty member under review will be judged with respect to the proposed rank and duties, considering the record of his/her performance in:

- teaching;
- scholarship, pedagogical research, and creative work; and
- service to the Department, the College, the University, and the professional community, as well as public service related to his/her expertise and departmental citizenship. See explanation below B.1 Criteria, c. Service

Outstanding undergraduate and graduate teaching is vital to the Department's successful maintenance of a viable and coherent curriculum. Therefore, due consideration will be given to demonstrated teaching proficiency in all reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion decisions. One of the Department's primary objectives is to establish and sustain reputable graduate programs that will attract qualified students and assure them of a rigorous and exciting educational experience. Therefore, meritorious publication is a necessary condition for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion. In addition, it is to be expected that senior faculty members of the Department achieve national and international recognition as scholars and contributors in their respective fields and that junior faculty members show promise and evidence of achieving such recognition.

Reasonable flexibility shall be exercised in balancing heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another.

The Department seeks to foster an environment in which all faculty members, but especially probationary faculty, achieve an equitable allocation of time and effort among teaching, research, and service. The probationary period passes quickly and the Department urges probationary faculty members to concentrate on those things that matter most for the attainment of promotion and tenure. These include excellence both in teaching in those areas noted to be the most important by the Department and in developing a focused program of research. The Department recognizes that probationary faculty should reasonably limit service. The probationary period is not the time for faculty members to voluntarily take on numerous committees and time-consuming professional roles that can detract from efforts to establish themselves as excellent teachers/scholars. On the other hand, the Department will not sanction avoidance of all service. Probationary faculty members will be expected to demonstrate their willingness and ability to be contributing members of the Department and also to the College, the University, and/or the profession. Tenured faculty members have a professional obligation to share in the administration of the Department, College, and University and to provide other kinds of professional service. In addition to high quality teaching and research, leadership in service roles is expected for promotion to professor. According to Faculty Rule 3335-6-02(C), "promotion 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.”

It must be stressed, above all, “in all instances superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in the Faculty Rules and in this document, 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” (Faculty Rule 3335-6-02{D}).

In promotions to Associate Professor or Professor, the responsibilities of the candidate are as follows:

- To submit a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist.
- To submit a copy of the APT document under which the candidate wishes to be reviewed. Candidates may submit the department’s current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion, whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year. The APT document must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the department.
- To review the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair and the Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF). The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The department chair decides whether removal is justified.

The procedures described below generally follow from and supplement those set forth in Section V Annual Reviews.

B. Promotion to rank of associate professor with tenure

As noted above, every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Excellence in teaching, scholarship and service includes professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University professors’ Statement of Professional Ethics (<https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-professional-ethics>).

B.1 Criteria

a. Teaching

Excellent teaching on all levels and in all appropriate areas is central to the aims of the Department. To assess the quality of teaching, the department depends on University SEIs, the department’s own student qualitative course evaluation forms, and written peer evaluations.

The number of written peer evaluations required in NESAs follows closely the recommendations of the College at this iteration of the APT document. For promotion to associate professor, five or more written

peer evaluations of teaching are required, normally one for each of five years. Written peer evaluations of the teaching of professors are not required but are strongly encouraged once every five years.

The peer reviewer gives the faculty member oral feedback and furnishes the Chair with a written evaluation which becomes part of the faculty member's dossier, as do the SEI forms for each course. SEIs are provided to each class for confidential completion during class time. Copies of complete sets of SEIs are retained in the department office.

Excellence in teaching may be demonstrated through success in developing student interests in the subject area(s), effectiveness in conveying to students the essentials of the subject(s) taught, and a willingness to demand of students' clear evidence of intellectual growth. In all appropriate classes—including language classes, whenever feasible—teachers should emphasize the necessity of clear and expressive writing, provide models for such writing through materials and readings made available to the class, insist uncompromisingly on competent writing from the students, and afford guidance, correction, and encouragement through meticulous, timely critical evaluation of students' written work.

In classes devoted more specifically to language teaching and learning or those devoted to critical and intensive study of original-language literary (and other) texts, teachers should be equally challenging in insisting on their students' improvement of the important skills involved and their growth in knowledge of the language(s) in general. Language teachers at every level should also be concerned with developing effective means and instruments (tests, exercises, recitations, reading and/or, writing assignments, etc.) for determining, measuring; and evaluating students' actual proficiency and progress in the language(s), as well as their mastery of the specific subject matter.

For faculty members whose responsibilities to a great extent involve program direction or multiple class course coordination, that aspect of their appointment must be weighted and evaluated with particular attention. Demonstration of excellence will be sought in such areas as the training and supervision of GTAs, the adaptation or development of materials used in the program or course in question, and/or success in gaining recognition for the program or course through national rankings, student recruitment and retention, or the attraction of outside funding.

Since evidence of successful graduate teaching and advising is important for promotion and tenure, and of particular importance for promotion to professor, excellence of faculty members in this area will be a matter of major concern. Wherever appropriate, attention should be given not only to a faculty member's involvement in graduate students' MA or PhD examinations or preparation of theses or dissertations, but also to his/her availability and effectiveness as a formal or informal graduate advisor. To the extent possible and feasible, the Department should also attach importance to the determinable progress and success of students under a faculty member's guidance and direction—both during and following their graduate careers, to evaluate the faculty member's contribution (as mentor, advisor, recommender, advocate, etc.) to that progress and success.

b. Scholarship

No area of academic endeavor contributes as much as research does to the standing of the Department in the eyes of the College and its other units, of the University, and of the national and international academic community. Review committees for probationary faculty and tenured members, then, will place great emphasis on scholarly achievement and productivity. All candidates for tenure and promotion must demonstrate clear excellence in this area. Typically, a candidate for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure will be expected to present a book published (or in production) by a scholarly press with a strong reputation as well as a number of refereed articles that demonstrate original and important

scholarship in the field, preferably published in refereed journals. Recognition may also be given to works of translation. For candidates conducting studies in pedagogy, evidence of an active research program may also include textbooks and refereed articles that incorporate or present theoretical ideas or advances in pedagogy; it may also include innovative instructional software and other digital and technology-based instructional materials and systems. In certain subdisciplines in the Department, such as linguistics, the publication of several substantial articles may represent effort and achievement comparable to the publication of a book in other disciplines. All candidates must also show other evidence of scholarly production in the form of published articles in major refereed journals, presentations at scholarly meetings, and the gaining of or efforts to gain funding for research.

c. Service

The CEF shall consider service to the Department, College, and University that the faculty member has been asked to perform, as well as that which he/she may have initiated. The criteria for evaluating such service, together with those for evaluating service to the community, are broadly defined in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02(A), <https://trustees.osu.edu/university-faculty-rules/3335-6>. It should be added with emphasis that those who perform service in which the commitment of time is considerable, such as chairing a departmental, college, or university committee, serving as an undergraduate or graduate advisor, or service as director or coordinator of an instructional unit of a language program with little or no reduction in teaching load can reasonably expect that such service will receive due consideration. Any service obligations undertaken especially by probationary faculty members and submitted by them for evaluation under this rubric must be considered and discussed in their annual review. (See also Section 3.c below, for standards of documentation of service activities.)

Probationary and tenured faculty members should also be held to a high standard of departmental citizenship. Departmental citizenship includes effective service on departmental committees, including meeting deadlines for completion of work charged to such committees; service on college and university committees appropriate to one's skills and within or beyond the department, etc. Poor departmental citizenship at best imposes additional service burdens on other faculty members and at worst may obstruct the Department's ability to function and may damage its reputation. Poor departmental citizenship is recognized in this Department as an appropriate factor in the evaluation process.

B.2. Review Procedures

According to the Faculty Rule 3335-6-02(B), "Tenure will not be awarded below the rank of associate professor."

The procedures to be followed in reviews for promotion and tenure of probationary faculty members are essentially the same as those describing annual reviews above, with the following additions or modifications:

- a. The review for tenure during the final year of a faculty member's probationary period is mandatory and must take place. At the departmental level, it culminates in a vote of all tenured faculty by secret ballot. Faculty must be in attendance at the meeting either in person or through video/audio link in order to vote. A two-thirds affirmative vote of those present is necessary for a recommendation for tenure. The chair of the CEF will designate a Procedures Oversight Designee for the probationary faculty member's case
- b. In contrast with annual reviews not involving questions of promotion and tenure, which are normally conducted in the Spring Semester, mandatory promotion and tenure reviews will normally be conducted during the Autumn Semester of the probationary faculty member's sixth year of probationary service.

c. All candidates for promotion and tenure are reviewed not only by CEF and the Chair of the Department, but also at the College and University levels, as directed in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04(C), <https://trustees.osu.edu/university-faculty-rules/3335-6>.

d. Only the candidate may stop any review for promotion and tenure once external letters of evaluation have been sought (see g. of this Section, below). If the review process has moved beyond the Department, the Chair of the Department shall inform the Dean or the Vice Provost for Academic Policy and Faculty Resources as relevant, of the candidate's withdrawal. Withdrawal from the mandatory tenure review during the final probationary year means that tenure will not be granted. The probationary faculty member who withdraws from such a review in progress must provide a written letter of resignation to the Chair of the Department in order to prevent or terminate the review. The letter must contain a statement by the faculty member acknowledging that the decision not to complete the review may not be revoked.

e. Any tenured faculty member of the Department who is off-duty during a Semester when the final review of a probationary faculty member or the review for promotion of a tenured faculty member is to take place is to be asked, explicitly in writing and in a timely fashion, by the Chair whether he/she would be able and willing to participate in the review process on the same condition stipulated above. That tenured faculty member is to respond to the Chair's invitation, in writing and in a timely fashion.

f. Voting in absentia is disallowed.

g. In all reviews for tenure and promotion and for promotion, the procedures with regard to outside evaluations of a probationary and tenured faculty member's research accomplishments must be implemented in accordance with the guidelines set forth in the OAA *Handbook* and in the College's procedures as contained in

https://ascintranet.osu.edu/sites/default/files/external_evaluator_college_approval_process_7-30-18.pdf.

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 can give an "arms' length" evaluation of the research record and is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will only solicit evaluations from professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters are sought 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

(<https://trustees.osu.edu/university-faculty-rules/3335-6>) 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, provided at <http://oaa.osu.edu/sampledocuments.html>, for letters requesting external evaluations.

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

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

B.3. Communication and forwarding of Results and Comments Process. The communication, forwarding, and comments procedures are essentially the same as those set forth above, with the following additions or modifications:

- a. After the departmental review process has been completed, the probationary faculty member has had the opportunity to view and comment on CEF's and the Chair's reports and recommendations, and the CEF and/or the Chair have written responses to the probationary faculty member's comments (if any), the Chair shall then forward to the Dean of the College the faculty member's dossier with all internal and external evaluations, comments, and responses.
- b. At this point, the review procedures at the College and University level, as set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04(C), become effective.
- c. The Chair of the Department is responsible for informing the candidate in writing of the Executive Vice President and Provost's final decision (if negative) or the recommendation to the Board of Trustees (if positive). If the final decision is for non-renewal, the probationary faculty member will be notified of this decision and the reasons for it in writing (see Faculty Rules, <https://trustees.osu.edu/university-faculty-rules/3335-6>) and in a meeting with the Chair and at least one other tenured faculty member of the Department.
- d. Probationary faculty members will be informed no later than the end of the year in which their mandatory final review for promotion and tenure takes place as to whether promotion and tenure will be granted by the beginning of the following year. If promotion and tenure are not granted, a one-year terminal year of employment is offered.

B.4. Early (i.e., non-mandatory) Consideration for Promotion and Tenure

- a. Promotion and tenure may be granted at any time during the probationary period when the faculty member's record of achievement merits tenure and promotion. A probationary faculty member may, therefore, ask the Chair to be considered for early (i.e., non-mandatory) promotion and tenure review at

any time prior to the final mandatory review. However, a non-mandatory tenure and promotion review itself must be conducted only during the Autumn Semester in the College's normal cycle for mandatory tenure and promotion reviews. Hence, in order to ensure that the probationary faculty member and the Department have adequate time to prepare the case fully, the faculty member should address to the Chair his/her request for early consideration early in the academic year preceding the Autumn of the desire review and certainly no later than the end of the preceding Winter Semester.

b. The Chair will convene the CEF in regular or special session to consider the probationary faculty member's request for early consideration. The Committee may decline to put forth a probationary faculty member for formal non-mandatory promotion and tenure review if the faculty member's accomplishments are judged not to warrant such review (See Faculty Rules 3335-6-03 {B.2 } & 3335-6-04 {A.3}, <https://trustees.osu.edu/university-faculty-rules/3335-6.>)

c. If the CEF deems the probationary faculty member's request for early promotion and tenure review worthy of consideration, the Chair of the CEF will set in motion the procedures for review, communication and forwarding of results, and comments discussed above in previous sections of this document.

d. The probationary faculty member may withdraw from a non-mandatory tenure and promotion review process at any time.

e. The Chair of the Department is responsible for informing the candidate in writing of the Executive Vice President and Provost's final decision (if negative) or the recommendation to the Board of Trustees (is positive). If the final decision is negative, the probationary faculty member will be notified of this decision and of the reasons for it in writing, and the Chair and at least one other tenured faculty member of the Department will meet with his/her to discuss the areas in which improvement is needed.

f. A negative decision in a non-mandatory promotion and tenure review process generally does not entail nonrenewal of an appointment. It may reasonably be assumed that evidence judged by the CEF and the Chair of the Department sufficient to put forth a probationary faculty member for a formal non-mandatory early promotion and tenure review, unless discredited by evidence produced during the review process itself, should be sufficient to secure the faculty member's reappointment. Nor should a negative decision, of itself, normally prejudice or adversely affect the outcome of the mandatory final promotion and tenure review.

g. Consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policy, only faculty members who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non-mandatory tenure review. The committee must confirm with the department chair that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident (has a "green card"). Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.

C. Promotion to rank of Professor

C.1. Criteria

a. Teaching

Excellent teaching on all levels and in all appropriate areas is central to the aims of the Department. To assess the quality of teaching, the department depends on University SEIs, the department's own student qualitative course evaluation forms, and written peer evaluations. Copies of complete sets of SEIs are

retained in the department office. For promotion to professor, at least three written peer evaluations are required from the last five years, with one normally being written every other year.

Excellence in teaching may be demonstrated through success in developing student interests in the subject area(s), effectiveness in conveying to students the essentials of the subject(s) taught, and a willingness to demand of students' clear evidence of intellectual growth. Since evidence of successful graduate teaching and advising is of particular importance for promotion to professor, excellence of faculty members in this area will be a matter of major concern. Wherever appropriate, attention should be given not only to a faculty member's involvement in graduate students' M.A. or Ph.D. examinations or preparation of theses or dissertations, but also to his/her availability and effectiveness as a formal or informal graduate advisor. To the extent possible and feasible, the Department should also attach importance to the determinable progress and success of students under a faculty member's guidance and direction—both during and following their graduate careers—to evaluate the faculty member's contribution (as mentor, advisor, recommender, advocate, etc.) to that progress and success.

b. **Scholarship.** A candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor is expected to present substantial publication beyond that which earned promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Typically, this will consist of one or more additional books published or in production and regular publication in refereed journals. The candidate will also be expected to demonstrate a substantial record of participation at conferences, including international conferences, where he or she will have presented papers. For candidates in pedagogy, evidence of an active research program may also include instructional software as well as textbooks and refereed articles beyond that which earned promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. For candidates in sub-disciplines in the Department, such as linguistics, more weight may be attributed to a second series of substantive articles. Candidates must continue to show other evidence of additional scholarly productivity in the form of articles in major refereed journals, presentations at scholarly meetings, and the gaining of or efforts to gain outside funding for research. Finally, recognition may also be given to works of translation.

c. **Service.** The CEF shall consider service to the Department, College, and University that the faculty member has been asked to perform, as well as that which he/she may have initiated. The criteria for evaluating such service, together with those for evaluating service to the community, are broadly defined in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02(A), <https://trustees.osu.edu/university-faculty-rules/3335-6>. Departmental citizenship includes effective service on departmental committees, service on college and university committees, and service beyond the department appropriate to the rank of professor at a major research institution.

C.2. Review Procedures

a. When a tenured faculty member (an associate professor) is considered ready for review for promotion to professor (see Faculty Rules <https://trustees.osu.edu/university-faculty-rules/3335-6>) or when the faculty member requests from the Chair of the Department such a review, he/she shall first meet with the Chair for thorough discussion and consultation.

A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<https://trustees.osu.edu/university-faculty-rules/3335-6>) for one year. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.

b. If the Chair and the tenured faculty member agree to go ahead, the Chair, in consultation with the Dean, will convene a Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF) to consider the tenured faculty member's request for consideration for promotion. The Committee may decline to put forth a tenured faculty member for a formal non-mandatory promotion review if the faculty member's accomplishments are judged not to warrant such review. 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.

c. The members of the CEF must be professors (with the exception noted below) and must include:

- the Chair of the CEF, designated by the Chair of the Department in consultation with the Dean of the College
- the Chair of the Department, who shall not vote but who may participate in the deliberations as a regular member of the Committee, as they are governed by the rulings of the Chair of the CEF (NOTE: If the department chair is not a professor, the divisional dean will appoint another chair in the division who is a professor to serve as chair pro tem for the review);
- a Procedures Oversight Designee, selected by the Chair of the CEF and
- all professors tenured in the Department.

However, whenever the Department has fewer than three eligible professors (excluding the Chair of the Department), it will be necessary to select professors from other departments within the Division of Arts and Humanities to serve as regular members of the ad hoc CEF. These non-Departmental Committee members (whose number may vary from case to case), will, as far as possible, be appointed in careful consideration of the area(s) of specialization of the tenured faculty member under review. The Chair of the CEF and the Chair of the Department, in consultation with the Dean of the College, shall be solely responsible for selecting these outside members.

d. Procedures for review, communication and forwarding of results, and comments will correspond, with modifications suitable to consideration of tenured faculty, to those set forth above.

D. Documentation

a. Teaching.

In some ways, teaching is more difficult to evaluate than research and service, and it is at times subject to a wider range of judgments than the other two categories. It is important that a varied body of informative and credible evaluative information be amassed that provides a basis for making informed judgments about teaching quality as well as for monitoring and improving the quality of instruction in the Department. A candidate's teaching should be evaluated, over a period of several Semesters. The candidate should also be advised to consult the annually disseminated OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook (<https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook>), for a general idea of kinds of evidence admissible in dossier preparation. Evidence of excellence in teaching may be attested in the following areas:

i. Student opinions and judgments appropriately documented (e.g., SEI forms and discursive evaluations) and accompanied by interpretive information. This data, confidentially obtained, should be presented for every class taught. Discursive evaluations are provided to each class for confidential completion during class time, with one student designated to collect and return the forms directly to the department office.

Copies of complete sets of SEIs are retained in each faculty member's dossier. Faculty may also solicit student reviews in other formats and arrange for their confidential completion and inclusion in the dossier.

ii. Written peer evaluations made by one designated faculty member who has visited one or both of the candidate's classes in each of two Semesters. This need not be the same reviewed for each class reviewed. In the case of peer reviews of tenured faculty members, the Department may rely on some teaching evaluations from professors outside the Department. As with extra-Departmental members of a properly constituted CEF these extra-departmental teaching evaluators will, as far as possible and usually on an ad hoc basis be appointed in consideration of the area(s) of concentration and subject matter of the course under evaluation. The Chair of the Department in consultation with the CAC will be responsible for selecting these outside evaluators. Peer reviewers will be given access to SEIs for previous offerings of the course (if available) as well as the current syllabus, test forms, etc., and will conduct at least one direct classroom observation. The peer reviewer gives the faculty member oral feedback and furnishes the Chair with a written evaluation which become part of the faculty member's dossier, as do the SEI forms for each course.

iii. Explanations by the candidate of special accomplishments in teaching or in the development of special materials. (Copies of syllabi or examinations may be included.) Whenever possible, these explanations should be supplemented by peer review (internal and external) of the materials in question, solicited by the Department.

iv. Evidence to support distinction in teaching emphasizing the criteria outlined above.

v. 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.)

vi. Documentation for candidates responsible for program direction or multiple classes course coordination, especially such as is relevant to GTA supervision and maintenance of departmental and College standards. (The format and procedure for providing such documentation will be stipulated in detail in an appropriate departmental policy statement.)

vii. Any other information that the candidate may wish to submit to the Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF) and/or any information which the committee deems pertinent.

b. Scholarship

In evaluating scholarly achievement, both quality and quantity should be considered, but special emphasis must be placed on quality.

When scholarly work still in manuscript form is likely to make a difference in the outcome of the case, the Chair will solicit evaluations from outside scholars with respect to the work. Just as there are varying forms of scholarly activity and varying results of research efforts, there must be varying criteria and patterns for the evaluation of such efforts. In all cases, the Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF) shall consider both the evidence offered by the candidate and that solicited by its own members. The Committee shall look for evidence that the scholarly accomplishments of the candidate make a significant contribution to the field or that they indicate the candidate's research promise. Such evidence may comprise the following categories:

i. Publications. The type and scope of each publication shall be considered. The Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF) shall consider discussions and reviews of the work(s) being evaluated that have been

published in scholarly journals and other serious organs and solicit critical appraisals from distinguished scholars working in the field at other universities.

Books, monographs, critical editions, articles, etc., based on original research shall be accorded special importance as evidence of scholarly achievement and development. In general, monographs and papers that undergo considerable scrutiny before publication (e.g., by editorial boards of journals or anthology editors) will be more highly valued than those that do not.

ii. 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 NESAs.

(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

iii. 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/or on the basis of opinions, oral and written, of scholars in the field.

iv. Importance shall be attached to scholarly recognition in the form of prizes, awards, grants, and fellowships, as well as to the invitations to deliver public lectures or to teach at other universities.

v. 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.

vi. 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.

c. Service

The faculty member's dossier for review should include complete written listings of department, college and university committee assignments held during the period of review, as well as listings of any positions held or other service activities or roles in professional organizations, with a timetable of meetings attended, and titles of any documents or other products prepared or under production in connection with those service roles. The faculty member should also list any public lectures given to organizations or in forums other than scholarly organizations or university bodies. Roles on editorial boards or as reviewers of candidates for academic employment, tenure, etc. may also be listed, as well as any consultancies or other advisory positions held in organizations which can reasonably be construed as relevant to the faculty member's professional identity or the university's mission as a public institution.

All extra-university service activities listed should identify clearly the organization served, in such a way that the accuracy of the listing can be independently checked by the appropriate review committee(s) at their discretion.

VII. Appeals

It is the policy of The Ohio State University to make decisions regarding the renewal of probationary appointments and promotion and tenure in accordance with the standards, criteria, policies, and procedures states in these rules, supplemented by additional written standards, criteria, policies, and procedures established by tenure initiating units and colleges.

If a candidate believes that a non-renewal decision or negative promotion and tenure decision has been made in violation of this policy and therefore alleges that it was made improperly, the candidate may appeal that decision. Procedures for appealing a decision based on an allegation of improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05 (<https://trustees.osu.edu/university-faculty-rules/3335-5>).

VIII. Seventh-Year Reviews

In rare instances, a tenure-initiating unit may petition the Dean to conduct a seventh-year review for an assistant professor who has been denied promotion and tenure. Both the eligible faculty of the unit and the Chair must approve proceeding with a petition for a seventh-year review. The petition must provide documentation of substantial new information regarding the candidate's performance that is germane to the reasons for the original negative decision. Petitions for seventh year reviews must be initiated before the beginning of the last year of employment because the seventh year review, if approved, would take place during the regular university review cycle of the assistant professor's seventh and last year of employment.

If the Dean concurs with the tenure initiating unit's petition, the Dean shall in turn petition the Executive Vice President and Provost for permission to conduct a seventh-year review. If the provost approves the request, a new review, will be conducted equivalent to the one that resulted in the non-renewal of the appointment. The conduct of a seventh year review does not presume a positive outcome. In addition, should the new review result in a negative decision, the faculty member's last day of employment is that stated in the letter of non-renewal issued following the original negative decision.

A faculty member may not request a seventh-year review, appeal the denial of a seventh-year review petition initiated by his/her tenure initiating unit, or appeal a negative decision following a seventh year review, since the faculty member has already been notified that tenure has been denied at the conclusion of the sixth year review. (Faculty Rule 3335-6-05, <https://trustees.osu.edu/university-faculty-rules/3335-6>).

IX. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (eSEI) is required in every course offered in this TIU. Faculty members should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if s/he is going to provide in-class time for students 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.

Peer Evaluations of Teaching. The Chair or the Chair's designee will ensure the regular evaluation of all tenured and tenure-track faculty by Associate Professors or Professors, in order to meet the goals outlined below. The evaluators may be recruited for this task from other departments in the College. Peer evaluations entail examination of the syllabus and a classroom visit and will result in a substantial letter or memo to the Chair of NESAs. The Chair will deposit a copy of this letter of evaluation in the faculty member's file.

Assistant Professors should have a minimum of five peer evaluations at the time of tenure review, typically one evaluation per year of teaching prior to tenure review.

Associate Professors should have a minimum of three peer evaluations from the five years preceding the onset of review for promotion to the rank of professor.

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. Individual faculty members may request that peer evaluations be arranged.