

**Faculty Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure:
Criteria and Procedures**

DEPARTMENT

OF

ENGLISH

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

September 2007

Table of Contents

Preamble	3
Mission Statement	3
Appointments	5
Criteria	4
Procedures	6
Annual Reviews	8
Probationary Faculty	8
Fourth- Year Review	9
Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period	10
Tenured Faculty	11
Regional Faculty	11
Merit Salary Increases	12
Promotion and Tenure Reviews	13
General Criteria for Promotion	13
for Promotion to Associate Professor	16
for Promotion to Professor	16
for Regional Campus Faculty	17
Procedures and Documentation	17
Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty	18
for Promotion to Associate Professor	19
for Promotion to Professor	19
Documentation	20
Comments Process	20
Procedures Oversight	20
Conflict of Interest	20
Appeals	21
Seventh Year Reviews	24

FACULTY APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE: CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

PREAMBLE

What follows is a supplement to Chapter 6 of the Rules of the University Faculty (Additional Rules Concerning Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure) <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules6/ru6index.html>; the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook/xi_ptannual.htm; and any additional policies established by the College and the University to which the Department and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the Department will follow those 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 Chair.

This section of the Pattern, in accordance with University Rules, has been approved by the Dean of the College of Humanities and the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University; any significant changes must also receive approval before they can be implemented. This section 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 its criteria and procedures for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document the Dean and Executive Vice President and Provost accept the mission and criteria of the Department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating continuing faculty and candidates for positions in relation to the Department's mission and criteria.

MISSION STATEMENT

The Department of English is dedicated to the development and teaching of knowledge about the study of language, literature, media, and culture in the English speaking world. In addition, the Department is dedicated to serving audiences both inside and outside the University, through participation in activities ranging from supporting faculty governance to participating in community-based Humanities programs. We believe that the analytical study of literature, folklore, language, and writing helps develop a capacity for logical thought, a greater awareness of the complexity of value judgments, and the imaginative possibilities of the mind itself. English studies can expand our emotional, creative, and cognitive capacities, can sharpen our ability to make difficult judgments, and can help us understand societies, times, and subcultures different from our own.

The audiences for our teaching include the large number of undergraduates who take our courses to satisfy General Education requirements; our own English majors; and graduate students in our three different degree programs, the M.A., the M.F.A., and the Ph.D. The audiences for our research include other scholars and writers, who participate in our critical conversations; teachers who are looking for ways to apply

research findings in their classrooms; graduate students who are beginning their professional training; segments of the larger public interested in literature, language, and the humanities. The audiences for our service are also diverse; they include our colleagues at OSU and a broad spectrum of the public: high school teachers, people in various occupations who want to work on special skills, and citizens interested in the Humanities. The Department is dedicated to improving continuously the quality of its contributions to these multiple audiences.

We believe all faculty should make significant contributions in each of the three areas of teaching, research and service. For promotion and tenure, we require evidence of effective teaching at both the graduate and undergraduate levels as measured by student evaluations and reports of peer visitors, who will also evaluate course materials such as syllabi and assignments. Effectiveness on the graduate level is also measured by the quality of one's work as an advisor on student committees. In research, we require evidence of a faculty member's ability to make significant, high-quality contributions to important conversations in his or her field; this evidence typically takes the form of a published book or a sustained, original scholarly project in another form appropriate to the field, as well as essays in major refereed journals or edited volumes, conference papers at national meetings of scholarly organizations, and book reviews and review essays. For promotion to full professor, we require a second body of published scholarship, typically a published book or a sustained, original scholarly project in another form appropriate to the field and additional articles, reviews, presentations, and edited work beyond that required for tenure. In service, we recognize a variety of valuable contributions: service within the Department, within the College, within the University, within the larger profession of English Studies, and within the community--local, state, or national.

The faculty and administration are bound by the principles articulated in **Faculty Rule 3335-6-01: General Considerations**.

APPOINTMENTS

Criteria: Regular Tenure Track Faculty

1. Initial appointment

A. A person appointed as Assistant Professor is normally expected to hold the Ph.D. or equivalent. Appointments to the rank of Instructor will normally be made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor but the appointee has not completed the Ph.D. (or equivalent) at the onset of the appointment. Such appointees must have completed this degree by June 1 of their first academic year of service and have been promoted to the rank of Assistant Professor by June 30 of that same year, or the appointment will not be renewed. On promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor, faculty will be granted prior service credit for the time spent as an Instructor unless they request in writing, at the time of promotion, that prior service credit not be granted.

B. A person appointed as Associate Professor or Full Professor is normally expected to hold the Ph.D. or equivalent, to have successful teaching experience, and

to be capable of distinguished scholarship on the evidence of work already accomplished. A person appointed as Full Professor should have a distinguished record of teaching and scholarship. All appointments to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor require prior approval of the Executive Vice President and Provost.

2. Probationary period

A. Appointments as Associate Professor and as Professor will normally entail tenure. However, a probationary period not to exceed four years may be granted by the Office of Academic Affairs upon petition of the Department and the College of Humanities. For the petition to be approved a compelling rationale must be provided regarding why appointment at a senior rank is appropriate but tenure is not. Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a senior rank and approved for tenure, if appropriate, but the University does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency.

B. When an instructor is promoted to the rank of Assistant Professor, prior service credit will be granted for time spent as an Instructor unless the faculty member indicates in writing at the time of promotion that he or she does not wish such credit. This written request must be forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs through the Dean of the College so that tenure records may be adjusted accordingly.

C. An appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor is always probationary, and may not exceed six years, including prior service credit.

Criteria: Auxiliary Faculty

All auxiliary appointments are made for only one year at a time and are, therefore, subject to annual review.

A. Visiting Assistant Professor. Appointments to this position require the Ph.D. or its equivalent. Such appointments typically may not exceed three continuous years.

B. Adjunct Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor. Appointments to any of these unsalaried positions require the Ph.D. or its equivalent as well as the scholarly profile suitable for each rank. Expected contributions to the Department include work with graduate students, participation in the scholarly life of the Department, and, in some cases, teaching in the Department.

C. Senior Lecturer. Appointments to this position require at least the M.A. or its equivalent, though in most cases the Ph.D. or its equivalent is required. Senior lecturer appointments may be renewed indefinitely according to University rules. The Department, however, may limit terms of some senior lecturers for programmatic reasons.

D. Lecturer. Appointments to this position require the M.A. or its equivalent. Lecturer appointments are typically made on a quarter-by-quarter basis to fill teaching needs, though a few appointments for two or three quarters may also be made.

Criteria: Courtesy Appointments for regular faculty

The Department may extend courtesy appointments to regular Ohio State faculty from other tenure initiating units whose teaching and research have ties to the work of the Department. Expected contributions include advising of graduate students,

participation in the scholarly life of the Department, and, in some cases, occasional teaching in the Department. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

Procedures: Tenure Track Faculty

The Executive Committee of the Department will appoint a Search Committee for each position the Department seeks to fill. Each Search Committee will consist of 3 (or occasionally 4) people, some in the field of the prospective hiring and at least one in a different but related field within the Department or from another department. The Executive Committee will designate one person on each Search Committee to serve as Chair. The Department Chair and/or Vice-Chair will be an ex officio member of each Search Committee. Faculty not on the Search Committee are invited to read letters, CVs, and dossiers and make comments, but the Search Committee will select the list of interviewees. A typical search for a junior faculty member proceeds as follows.

The search committee selects approximately six candidates to interview at MLA. As soon as possible after MLA (typically before or during the first week of Winter Quarter), each Search Committee will determine which two (or sometimes three) candidates to bring to campus—at least one of whom should contribute to the diversity of the Department. If the search committee judges that in the pool of candidates there is no person who can contribute in this way, it will explain to the faculty its efforts to attract a diverse pool of applicants and the reasons why those efforts did not produce diversity among the finalists. Shortly after the finalists are selected, the Search Committee(s) will present these candidates to the Department in the form of a short written narrative about the search to this point and the strengths of the candidates selected for campus visitations. In effect, this narrative functions as the first stage of a "hand-off" of the hiring process from the Search Committee(s) to the eligible faculty, the regular tenure-track faculty of the Department.

During the campus interview, the candidate will typically meet with graduate students and with junior faculty as well as with the Chair, the Dean or Associate Dean, and with members of the senior faculty. In addition, the candidate will be asked to participate in a "jobtalk" session. The session will last for about an hour and will have two parts: (1) the candidate's presentation of research; (2) a question and answer session devoted to the candidate's presentation, to the candidate's research more generally, and to teaching.

After the campus interviews, the Search Committee will solicit advice from all who met the candidate, were at the talk, or otherwise involved in the visit. The Committee will then meet to decide which candidate to recommend to the eligible faculty to receive the first offer, which the second offer, or, indeed, any other way of proceeding. This recommendation constitutes the final stage of the hand-off from the Committee to the larger body. The Chair of the Committee will present not only the recommendation but also a narrative of how the recommendation was arrived at, a narrative that includes a precis of debates within the committee. The eligible faculty will then entertain a motion and debate and vote by secret ballot. If two-thirds of the eligible faculty vote in favor, the Chair will then extend the offer, assuming that it has the approval of the Dean. 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 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.

For appointments to the rank of associate professor, immediately following a positive vote by the eligible faculty, the senior faculty will vote to determine whether the candidate meets the Department's criteria for appointment at that rank with tenure. For appointments to the rank of full professor, immediately following a positive vote by the eligible faculty, the full professors will vote to determine whether the candidate meets the Department's criteria for appointment at that rank with tenure. A two-thirds majority of those voting Yes or No by secret ballot is required (see the section on procedures for promotion to associate and full professor for more details on the voting procedure). Following a positive vote from the eligible faculty and the relevant body of senior faculty, the Chair will then extend the offer, assuming that it has the approval of the Dean. For senior hiring, the Department must follow OAA guidelines, which include the solicitation of external evaluations of the candidate's research by scholars whose names are not given to the Department by the candidate. All offers at the associate professor and professors ranks, with or without tenure, and all offers of prior service credit require the prior approval of OAA. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

Procedures: Regional Faculty

For a tenure-track position on a regional campus, the regional campus Dean/Director has primary responsibility for determining the need for a position and the position description but should consult with and seek agreement with the Department Chair. The Chair of the Department and the regional campus Dean/Director will agree on a single search committee for the position consisting of members of both units. Candidates should, at the minimum, be interviewed by the regional campus Dean/Director, the Chair of the Department, the search committee and representatives of both faculties. Candidates will be evaluated on both campuses, with the faculty on the Columbus campus (particularly those in the field) serving in an advisory role to the hiring campus. The final vote for a recommendation of an offer will be made by eligible faculty at the hiring campus, after collecting advice from others on their campus and at Columbus who met with the candidates. A decision to hire requires agreement on the part of the Chair of the Department and of the regional campus Dean/Director. Negotiations with a candidate should not begin without such agreement, and a letter of offer must be signed by the Chair of the Department, the Dean/Director of the regional campus, and the Dean of the College of Humanities.

Procedures: Auxiliary Faculty

Appointments to the positions of Visiting Assistant Professor and Senior Lecturer will be made after a review of candidates by a hiring committee (with the Chair as one member), appropriate interviews, typically including one on campus, and a vote of the hiring committee.

Appointments to the positions of Adjunct Assistant, Associate, or full Professor will be made at the discretion of the Chair, typically after consultation with the Executive Committee.

Procedures: Courtesy Appointments

Courtesy appointments will be made at the discretion of the Chair, typically after consultation with the Executive Committee.

ANNUAL REVIEWS

Procedures: Probationary Faculty

All probationary faculty are reviewed annually, and the entire senior faculty participates in the fourth-year review. During the fourth year, a review at the College level is also required; an appointment cannot be renewed for the fifth year without the approval of the Dean of the College.

Annual reviews of probationary faculty are conducted in Spring Quarter. The candidate submits to the Chair a report of activities in the format of the OAA dossier outline; student evaluations of teaching and syllabi for the past year; a selection of scholarship in progress or completed; and any relevant evidence concerning service. The Chair may also solicit such other information and consult with colleagues as necessary to ensure a fair and thorough review. The Chair appoints a member of the senior faculty to serve with the Chair, Vice-Chair, and the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee on the candidate's annual review team. The four members of the team review the material and meet with the candidate to discuss strengths and weaknesses of the performance, to offer advice about preparing for the fourth-year and sixth-year reviews, and to respond to any concerns the candidate might wish to raise. The Chair gives a summary of the discussion of the meeting to the candidate; copies of the summary also go to each member of the team and to the Dean. The candidate may respond in writing. The Chair's annual review letters (and any responses from the candidate, if the candidate so chooses) become part of the faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure.

If the review suggests that the candidate might be terminated prior to the fourth-year review or as a result of the regular fifth-year review, the Chair will convene the Senior Professoriate to conduct a formal review following the procedures for fourth-year review. If, following this review by the senior professoriate, the Chair recommends nonrenewal of the appointment, the comments process will be invoked and, on completion of that process the case will be forwarded to the Dean for College level review. As in the case of fourth-year reviews, the Dean's decision shall be final.

Fourth-Year Reviews

Procedures for the fourth-year review are the same as those for the sixth-year review except that during the fourth-year, external letters of evaluation are optional. Before or at the start of Spring Quarter of the fourth year of service as a member of the

regular faculty, the candidate submits to the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee all relevant evidence concerning teaching, scholarship, and service. For each candidate the committee assembles and distributes to the Senior Professoriate materials that include: (a) the OAA-designed dossier for reporting teaching, research, and service activities; (b) the instructor's cumulative SEI report and summaries of student evaluations of teaching, made by the committee and approved (or else rebutted in writing) by the candidate; (c) reports of classroom visitation by senior colleagues; (d) evaluations by senior colleagues of the candidate's scholarly writing (if available), and (e) the candidate's annual review letters. The Chair may also solicit such other information and consult with colleagues as necessary to ensure a fair and thorough review.

The Chair, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the candidate should pay careful attention to the guidelines and materials--and the format of their presentation--specified by the College of Humanities and the Office of Academic Affairs. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Procedures Oversight Designee will be responsible for verifying the accuracy of the candidates' citations and other aspects of the candidates' dossiers. The Procedures Oversight Designee will also check the dossiers to ensure the appropriateness of their contents.

At its Spring Quarter meeting, the Senior Professoriate (that is, all associate and full Professors with tenure from all campuses) discusses each candidate separately. After all candidates have been discussed, a straw vote is taken on those candidates by secret ballot; the results are announced to the meeting, and those results determine the order of final discussion. The candidate with the highest total in the straw vote is considered first, and each consideration begins with the introduction of a formal motion that the candidate pass the review. Once the formal motion has been made, discussion of the case is resumed. At the conclusion of this discussion, a final vote by secret ballot will be conducted. A two-thirds majority is required for an affirmative recommendation. Proxy votes are not honored.

For fourth-year review, the Department forwards its recommendations to the Dean via two letters--one from the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, summarizing the case and one from the Department Chair expressing his or her view of the case. The Dean, at his or her discretion, will convene the College Promotion and Tenure Committee to review the Department's recommendations as part of the College review of the case. However, before reaching a negative decision or a decision contrary to the Department's recommendation, the Dean must consult with the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, as provided in Faculty Rule 3334-6-03. The Dean's decision in the fourth year is not forwarded to the Executive Vice President and Provost. If the outcome of the review is negative, the fifth year is the terminal appointment.

If all annual review decisions in the first five years are positive, the Department makes a recommendation about promotion and tenure in the autumn of the sixth year, and sends the recommendation forward for action, first, by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean, then by the Executive Vice President and Provost's Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Executive Vice President and Provost, and, finally, for positive decisions, by the Board of Trustees. If the ultimate decision about the case is negative, the seventh year is a terminal appointment. If the ultimate

decision about the case is positive, the promotion and tenure takes effect at the beginning of the seventh year.

At both the fourth and sixth years, candidates will be informed promptly when recommendations have been reached at each level of review. They will be given copies of the letters from the Chair and from the Promotion and Tenure Committee stating the recommendations and the reasons for them. Candidates will be informed that they have ten calendar days to submit comments in writing on these letters. If the candidates do submit comments, the Chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee may, in turn, provide written responses to the candidates' comments. Similarly, candidates will be invited to examine letters from the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and from the Dean and to comment in writing on these letters. The Dean and the College P & T Committee may, in turn, provide written responses to the candidate's' comments.

Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

An exclusionary year for caregiving responsibilities associated with the birth or adoption of a child under age six is automatic unless a nonrenewal notice has been issued. The Department will notify the Office of Academic Affair within one year of the birth of a child or the adoption of a child under age six of a probationary faculty member using the *Notification of a Birth or Adoption Form*. Requests to decline a one-year exclusion under Section (D) (1) of Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 must be submitted on the *Declination of Exclusion of Service Time from Tenure Probationary Period* form.

A probationary faculty member may also apply to exclude time from the probationary period in increments of one year because of personal illness, care of a seriously ill or injured person, an unpaid leave of absence, or factors beyond the faculty member's control that hinder professional performance. Requests for such an exclusion must be made to the Chair, who shall ask the Promotion and Tenure Committee to vote upon these requests. Such requests require approval by the Chair, Dean, and Executive Vice President and Provost. A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any of these reasons must be made prior to the beginning of the year in which the mandatory review for tenure must occur. The extent to which the event leading to the request was beyond the faculty member's control, the extent to which it interfered with the faculty member's ability to be productive, and the faculty member's accomplishments up to the time of the request will be considered in the review of the request.

A request to exclude time from the probationary period will not be granted after a nonrenewal notice has been issued nor will previously approved requests to exclude time from the probationary period in any way limit the University's right not to renew a probationary appointment.

Expectations for productivity during the probationary period cannot be increased as a consequence of exclusions of time granted for any of the above reasons.

Procedures: Tenured Faculty

All tenured faculty receive an annual evaluation of their performances. For the associates, the Chair consults with the full professors, who help with the process.

During Winter Quarter, the Associate Review Coordinator consults with the senior faculty to arrange review partners. The Associate Review Coordinator ensures that the workload is distributed as fairly as possible and that, ideally, the same person is not reviewing the same colleague every year. For full professors, the Chair consults with the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The end result is that all associate and full professors receive an annual review letter based on their Activity Report. The annual review letter is separate from the salary letter. The purpose of the annual review letter is as follows:

- (1) to aid individual faculty in their on-going self-assessments of their teaching, research, and service;
- (2) to foster greater knowledge of each other's work and the opportunity for regular, serious discussion of it.
- (3) to provide, over time, fuller information to the Chair and the salary committees for their deliberations about raises.

For Associate Professors, the letter becomes part of their official Promotion and Tenure file. Unlike probationary faculty, senior faculty are not required to have a face-to-face conference with the Chair, but may request one. Any senior faculty member who wants a more extensive review may request one. Such reviews typically require the assessment of additional materials.

Procedures: Regional Campus Faculty

1. Probationary faculty on regional campuses will also be reviewed annually by the regional campus Dean/Director and by the Chair of the Department on the Columbus campus. The regional campus review, which focuses mainly on teaching and service, should take place first. The Dean/Director's report of that review and a copy of the faculty member's annual report will be forwarded to the Chair of the Department with a copy to the Dean of the College. The Department review will focus on the candidate's scholarly work and on the appropriateness of course content and course standards but will consider all aspects of his/her record. The Department Chair should give a written review to the faculty member and a copy to the Dean/Director. It is important that the Chair of the Department and the regional campus Dean/Director be alert to any developing discrepancy between the quality of the teaching and service on the one hand and the quality and quantity of the scholarly work on the other. When such discrepancies become apparent, the regional campus Dean/Director should seek appropriate means of addressing this problem with the faculty member and the Chair of the Department.

In the event that the regional campus Dean/Director recommends renewal and the Department Chair recommends nonrenewal, the case shall be reviewed by the Dean of the College. The disagreement shall be considered during that review, with the Dean of the College's judgment prevailing. If the Dean/Director recommends nonrenewal, and the Chair recommends renewal, the Chair's judgment shall prevail.

2. The annual reviews of tenured regional campus faculty are conducted by the regional campus Dean/Director according to policies set forth in Section X of the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook. A copy of the Dean/Director's review letter should

be sent to the Department Chair. In addition, the faculty, the Dean/Director, or the Chair may request a meeting to discuss the review or any other concerns.

MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS: CRITERIA, PROCEDURES, AND DOCUMENTATION

Criteria

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

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

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

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

Procedures

The Chair annually presents to the Dean recommendations about merit salary increases. In preparing those recommendations, the Chair seeks the advice of the Senior Professoriate through the establishment of a Committee on Merit Salary Increases. This Committee consists of the Chair, the full professor and associate professor who are in their second year on the Executive Committee, and two full professors elected at large for this purpose. Those elected serve for two years. Members of the Merit Salary Committee may not be elected to another term until two years have passed. These four persons and the Chair are charged to look at merit and equity issues, on an annual and career basis by examining information: (1) in an annually updated c.v.; (2) in the career profile for the previous five years (from data in the c.v.); (3) in the annual report of professional activities; (4) and in any other documentation as deemed appropriate by the Chair and the Committee. The Senior Professoriate are encouraged to submit information concerning their teaching (e.g.,

awards or recognitions), service (e.g., student activities, etc.), and research (e.g., publications or papers read at scholarly meetings) both to the weekly Newsletter and to the Department of English Annual Report of Professional Activities. Anyone is free to confer on an individual basis with the Chair on excellence and equity issues.

Since final favorable action upon the Chair's recommendations for promotion or merit salary increases is determined by a number of factors--the sufficiency of legislative appropriations, the budgets of the College and the Department, the approval of the Dean and the Executive Vice President and Provost--Department members should realize that a recommendation sets in motion administrative procedures over which the Department no longer has direct control.

Documentation

The two documents that all faculty need to submit to the Department are an updated *Curriculum Vitae*, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place, and an Annual Activity Report.

Regional Campus Faculty

Each of the regional campuses has its own amount of raise money for distribution to its faculty. Regional campus Deans/Directors have responsibility for recommending to the Executive Vice President and Provost increases for regional campus faculty. Each Dean/Director will consult with the Department Chair before making these recommendations.

PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEWS

General criteria

Promotion and tenure in the Department of English shall be administered in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (D) and other University and College guidelines. Copies of these documents shall be made available to every new or continuing regular faculty member (of the level of Instructor or above), together with such additions, amendments, and/or revisions as might subsequently be issued. The following guidelines are supplementary to the University and College documents and set forth procedures applicable particularly to the Department of English.

A review for tenure must take place no later than during the final year of a probationary period. A faculty member may ask to be considered for non-mandatory promotion and tenure review or for promotion review at any time; however, the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee may decline to put forth a faculty member for formal non-mandatory promotion and tenure review or promotion review if the candidate's accomplishments are judged not to warrant such review. The Promotion and Tenure committee may not deny a tenured faculty member a formal review for promotion more than three consecutive years.

Only the candidate may stop any review for promotion and tenure once external letters of evaluation have been sought. The candidate may withdraw from review at any stage of the process by so informing the Department Chair in writing. If the review process has moved beyond the Department, the Department Chair shall inform the

Dean or the Executive Vice President and Provost, as relevant, of the candidate's withdrawal. Withdrawal from the mandatory tenure review during the final probationary year means that tenure shall not be granted.

In formulating its judgments on promotion and tenure, the Department takes into account the candidate's accomplishment in (1) teaching; (2) scholarship; and (3) service to the Department, the University, and the profession. As our mission statement indicates, the Department is aware that no one of these criteria can or should be applied mechanically. The Department's everyday life provides a variety of informal means for cultivating teaching, scholarship, and service. People share teaching ideas, exchange syllabi, visit each other's classes, consult with course directors; they try out early versions of scholarly papers at Department colloquia, or invite particular colleagues to criticize early-draft manuscripts; they suggest changes in curriculum or policy that require committee deliberation. The Department's basic vitality will always depend on this informal activity, which can also help candidates for promotion and tenure meet the general criteria described below.

1. Teaching

The Department considers excellence in teaching as important as excellence in scholarship, and it takes into consideration the candidate's effectiveness among the variety of students enrolled in our courses, in exciting interest, cultivating independent thought, and imparting demonstrable knowledge and skill. Candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to advise students regularly and, upon appointment to the graduate faculty, to serve on M.A. or Ph.D. examination committees and to direct M.A. and eventually Ph.D. dissertations.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness should ordinarily consist of: (a) student evaluations from a variety of classes, at different levels of the curriculum where appropriate; (b) written reports of classroom visitation by senior colleagues, including assessments of syllabi and other course materials; and (c) a written self-evaluation describing rationales and procedures, and evaluating both successes and failures in particular courses.

All members of the Department must allow students to evaluate their courses. Furthermore, University rule stipulates that units should have a common evaluation instrument, and, at the present time, that instrument is the SEI. For purposes of promotion and tenure decisions, assistant professors and associate professors are required to submit SEIs. All teachers are also strongly encouraged to collect discursive commentary through the use of evaluation forms that solicit information about both the quality of the course's content and the quality of the instructor's performance. One of the common topics of discussion at annual reviews will be the appropriateness and effectiveness of the candidate's discursive evaluation form. In order for the students to feel free to express their opinions without fear of reprisal at grading time, the following procedures should be followed in distributing, collecting, and reading evaluations. First, the instructor should not be in the room when the evaluations are filled out. Second, the evaluations should be collected by someone other than the instructor (it may be one of the students), who should then place them in a sealed envelope labeled with the course number and the instructor's name and bring them to the English Department office.

Third, the instructor should not pick up and read the evaluations until after the grades are turned in to the Registrar.

By the time of the fourth-year review, the Department requires four peer evaluations of teaching, and by the time of the sixth-year review, the Department requires a total of six such evaluations. The first peer evaluation must be done no later than a candidate's second year. All senior faculty are eligible and expected to do such evaluations, and the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee assists in these arrangements. Candidates should have their teaching at different levels of the curriculum evaluated.

Candidates for promotion to full professor should have a minimum of five peer reviews covering the five years preceding the promotion case. All full professors are eligible and expected to do these evaluations. Candidates for full professor should have their teaching at different levels of the curriculum evaluated, and they should be sure to have at least one graduate course evaluated.

Peer evaluators should visit at least one, and preferably two, sessions of a course, should examine the syllabus for the course, and other relevant materials such as assignments, examinations, study guides and handouts. Peer evaluations should take the form of an evaluative account of what the evaluator observes. Peer evaluators should also discuss their observations with the candidates.

2. Scholarship

Scholarship is indispensable to membership on the University's graduate faculty, and is expected of all persons holding professorial rank. Beyond the quantitative standards for promotion to each rank (see below), the Department values especially the quality of a candidate's scholarship--its originality, lucidity, and intellectual depth. Evidence of scholarship should consist of published scholarship or creative work, singly or collaboratively authored, or, where appropriate, recordings, videotapes, films, and works in electronic or other media, singly or collaboratively produced. Publication and other scholarly and creative activities occur in diverse media (e.g., print and digital format), and the same standard—clear excellence—applies regardless of the medium. Scholarship and creative work should normally be reviewed in the medium in which it was published (e.g., web publications should be read online).

3. Service

Candidates for promotion and tenure are expected to assume committee responsibilities when called upon by the Department, the College, the University, or the profession, and to participate where appropriate in activities that support the academic mission of the University in the community, and in general to participate in and contribute to the collective intellectual life of the Department. Evidence of service should consist of a record of service activities, along with the testimony of those served where appropriate; candidates must also write a statement about their service for their promotion and tenure dossier.

Criteria: Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

For persons initially appointed to the rank of Assistant Professor, this promotion carries tenure. In addition to satisfying the general criteria described above, candidates must have fully demonstrated teaching excellence in a variety of courses and they are expected to be active members of the graduate faculty and to have rendered significant Departmental committee service. Candidates must also demonstrate evidence of having made significant, high-quality contributions to important conversations in their field. This evidence typically takes the form of a published book or a sustained, original scholarly project in another form appropriate to the field as well as essays in major refereed journals or edited volumes, conference papers at national meetings of scholarly organizations, and book reviews and review essays. Where appropriate, evidence of scholarship may take the form of textbooks and journal articles on pedagogy, recordings, videotapes, films, and works in electronic or other media, singly or collaboratively produced. These forms of scholarship will be evaluated by the same process and according to the same criteria as all other forms of scholarship.

Typically, a candidate for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure will be expected to present to reviewers a published book (or at least a finished manuscript under final, board-approved contract and in production) or a sustained, original scholarly project in another form appropriate to the field, published by a scholarly venue with a strong reputation, which, particularly in emerging areas of study, should not be equated with a *longstanding* reputation. Such publication (or imminent publication) is strong evidence that the candidate's research has met the profession's standards of peer review. Such a quantitative record, however, is not itself a guarantee that the research has met the Department's qualitative standards. The senior faculty of the Department will make that judgment on the basis of their reading and discussion of the book or sustained, original scholarly project in another form appropriate to the field and of assessments of it in published reviews (if any) and the letters from external evaluators.

In addition, every candidate must show other evidence of scholarly accomplishment, as described above, and of substantial efforts to gain outside funding for research.

Criteria: Promotion to Professor

In addition to satisfying the criteria for the Associate Professorship, candidates are typically expected to have fulfilled the promise exhibited at the time of their first promotion. They should have done extensive graduate teaching and graduate advising in their fields (or in the case of regional campus candidates to have demonstrated sustained excellence in undergraduate teaching). Promotion to full professor requires a second body of published scholarship beyond that required for tenure. Such scholarship typically takes the form of a second published book or a sustained, original scholarly project in another form appropriate to the field, as well as additional evidence of scholarly productivity. Candidates are also expected to have rendered significant College, University, and national service.

Criteria: Regional Campus Faculty

As members of the Department of English, regional campus faculty are expected to contribute to scholarship in their discipline. Their contributions should be of the same quality and should meet the minimum quantitative standard expected of Columbus campus faculty (for promotion to Associate Professor typically a book or a sustained, original scholarly project in another form appropriate to the field; for promotion to Professor typically a second book or a sustained, original scholarly project in another form appropriate to the field). These contributions will be evaluated by the same means and according to the same criteria as on the Columbus campus. However, in recognition of the different mission of the regional campuses, the Department makes some adjustments in emphasis. Because the primary mission of the regional campuses is to provide high quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities, the Department will give greater weight to the performances in teaching and service of regional campus faculty.

Furthermore, because the responsibility for maintaining strong ties with the local community falls more directly on the regional campus faculty than is the case on the Columbus campus, service for regional campus candidates may be understood to include not only active participation on campus committees and in professional organizations, but participation also in those activities that support the academic mission of the University in the community.

In formulating its judgment on regional campus candidates, the Department pays close attention to the recommendations of the campus's Peer Review Committee, and the campus Dean/Director.

Procedures and Documentation

As noted above, annual reviews of untenured faculty (including those on regional campuses) are the responsibility of the Chair of the Department.

For fourth-year reviews, sixth-year reviews, and reviews regarding promotion from Associate to full Professor, the Promotion and Tenure Committee serves the important function of notifying candidates of deadlines, contacting external reviewers, ensuring the timely distribution of all materials to the senior faculty, and otherwise overseeing the process of the review. The recommendations are reached by the relevant body of senior faculty acting as a committee of the whole. The Senior Professoriate, consisting of all full Professors and tenured Associate Professors, recommends the outcome of fourth-year reviews, promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, and appointments at the rank of Associate Professor. The full professors recommend promotion to full Professor, and appointment from outside at the rank of Full Professor.

For fourth-year reviews, sixth-year reviews, and reviews for promotion to full professor, the voting procedure is as follows: After all candidates have been discussed, a straw vote is taken on those candidates by secret ballot; the results are announced to the meeting, and those results determine the order of final discussion. The candidate with the highest total in the straw vote will be considered first, and each consideration will begin with the introduction of a formal motion that the candidate pass the review. Once the formal motion has been made, discussion of the case is resumed. At the conclusion of this discussion, a final vote by secret ballot will be conducted. A two-

thirds majority is required for an affirmative recommendation. Proxy votes are not honored.

For reviews of candidates for tenured associate or full professor positions: the same procedures apply, except that the straw vote may be omitted if any member of the review body (the senior faculty in the case of candidates for associate professor positions and the full professors in the case of candidates for full professor positions), including the chair, so proposes and no one objects.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee, acting for the committee of the whole, submits a written report on each candidate to the Chair indicating the Senior Professoriate's vote and recommendation, and an explanation of that recommendation, typically rendered as a summary of the discussion among those present at the review meeting. The Chair includes that report in the dossier forwarded to the Dean.

The Chair also writes a separate recommendation and assessment of the case to be included in the dossier sent to the Dean. The purpose of this letter is to present the Chair's view of the case--an assessment from the Chair's perspective of the candidate's work in the areas of teaching, research, and service. While the Chair's letter should not comment on evidence in the case not available to everyone else, the letter may discuss at greater length items that the Chair, by virtue of his/her position, has special knowledge of. The Chair's letter will also comment on the relevant contextual features of the case such as the disciplinary standing of the external evaluators.

If the Chair's individual view of a candidate's merit may lead to a recommendation different from that of the relevant body of senior faculty, the Chair will communicate in writing to that body the reasons for that recommendation.

Procedures: Regional Campus Faculty

Except when the review is a mandatory review for tenure, the Department determines which faculty members will be reviewed for promotion and tenure or for promotion. If a regional campus faculty member is to be reviewed, the Department Chair will so notify the faculty member, with a copy to the Dean/Director of the regional campus.

The Dean/Director will initiate a review by the regional campus faculty according to the procedures established on the campus. This review focuses mainly on teaching and service. The Dean/Director forwards the report of this review, and a recommendation to the Chair of the Department, for inclusion in the candidate's dossier and for the use of the Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee. From this point the review follows the same course as all promotion and tenure reviews.

Procedures: Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure

The procedure is identical to that followed for fourth-year review (see above) with one exception: the Committee on Promotion and Tenure solicits evaluations of the candidate's scholarship from scholars outside the University as well as colleagues within the Department. The Department requires five such letters but solicits six, since experience shows that soliciting six is the best way to ensure getting five.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee should generate a lengthy list of potential evaluators. These people should be scholars or creative artists who are in a

position to comment in an informed way both on the quality of the faculty member's work and on its significance to the broader field in which it resides. They should not be former advisors, collaborators, close personal friends, or otherwise have a relationship with the faculty member that could reduce objectivity. Letters from collaborators may be appropriate as a means of determining a faculty member's contributions to joint work, but such persons should not be asked for a letter of evaluation.

The faculty member under review should be shown the list and be invited to augment it with a few names of individuals who meet the criteria of objective, credible evaluators. Unless the persons so identified do not meet such criteria and the faculty member cannot offer acceptable alternatives, the Department should make every reasonable effort to obtain at least one but not more than two letters from some one suggested by the candidate.

The Department must seek approval of the tentative list of prospective evaluators from the Dean and then solicit evaluators by phone or e-mail.

At least two months before the evaluations are due, the materials should be sent to the evaluators, along with a letter that sets forth expectations, due dates, and the realities of the Public Records Act.

For any one appointed as Associate Professor without tenure: The chair of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure assembles and distributes to the full Professors a complete dossier on each candidate, as described above. A two-thirds majority in a vote conducted by secret ballot is required for an affirmative recommendation. Proxy votes are not honored.

Procedures: Promotion to full Professor

The full Professors meet during Winter Quarter to decide whether to consider any Associate Professors for promotion in the following academic year. That decision will be based on information contained in an up-to-date c.v., the career profile for the previous five years (from data in the c.v.); a brief description of the book project, its publication schedule (if not already published) and its relation to past work (how much of it has never been published before); the instructor's cumulative SEI report; and if not included on the CV, an updated list of graduate student and honors student committees and a list of service commitments since last promotion or previous five years. A two-thirds majority is required for a promotion review to be conducted, and the vote on this is to be by secret ballot.

If the decision is to consider, the Department Chair and the chair of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure begin the same process as that followed for a sixth year review: they assemble and distribute complete dossiers on each candidate, including documentation about teaching, published reviews of scholarship, and at least five, though preferably six, written evaluations by scholars at other universities. At a meeting during Autumn Quarter, the full Professors decide whether to recommend promotion. A two-thirds majority of those voting by secret ballot is required for an affirmative recommendation. Proxy votes are not honored.

If the recommendation of the full Professors at the Winter Quarter meeting is negative, the matter is considered closed for that year.

After a third consecutive request by any Associate Professor, the full professors will automatically proceed with a full review.

Documentation

In all cases, the candidates are responsible for preparing the core dossier according to the specifications established by the Office of Academic Affairs and the College of Humanities. In addition, candidates are responsible for furnishing the Department with: (a) copies of their research; and (b) copies of all their student evaluations of teaching and syllabi. The Department is responsible for summarizing the discursive evaluations, providing the peer evaluations of teaching, and acquiring the external assessments of the research.

Comments Process

As soon as the report of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Chair's letter to the Dean have been completed, the candidate is given copies. The candidate may provide the Chair with written comments on these letters for inclusion in the dossier within ten calendar days. The Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Chair may, in turn, provide written responses to the candidate's comments for inclusion in the dossier. Only one iteration of comments on the Departmental review is permitted.

Procedures Oversight

When the Promotion and Tenure Committee is appointed, one member must be selected as the Procedures Oversight Designee. This member will work to ensure that the review body at each level follows written procedures governing the reviews, that the proceedings are carried out in a highly professional manner, and, in particular, that the proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions about members of underrepresented groups that could bias the review. Any procedural difficulties or other concerns about the review should first be brought to the attention of the relevant review body. If they cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of the Designee, then they should be brought to the attention of the relevant administrator (Chair, Dean, or Executive Vice President and Provost, depending on the level of the review). That individual must look into the matter and provide a response to the Designee regarding either actions taken, or why action is judged not to be warranted.

Conflict of Interest

No faculty member may participate in the review of a particular candidate for promotion or tenure when he or she has a conflict of interest. At a minimum, faculty members with a familial or comparable relationship with a candidate should not participate in the review of that candidate. In addition, a close professional relationship may give rise to a conflict of interest. For example, if a senior faculty member is a co-author of the candidate's book, then a conflict of interest exists.

Appeals

Faculty members may appeal a negative decision if they believe they have been evaluated improperly. Improper evaluation includes violations of written procedures that

could reasonably have affected the outcome of a review and failure to consider evidence material to a fair determination. In considering the evidence material to making a fair determination, members of review bodies and administrators are required to exercise professional judgment and there will be, on occasion, disagreements in professional judgment. Differences in or disagreements with professional judgments do not provide a valid basis for appeals.

Favorable annual reviews during the probationary period serve as a basis for a positive annual reappointment decision. They do not create a commitment to grant tenure and are not a basis for appeal of a decision to deny tenure and promotion. The review for tenure entails a much weightier decision than the annual review and entails assessment of both cumulative performance and promise for the future. Performance that is adequate for annual reappointment may not be adequate for the granting of tenure.

Information regarding the procedures for appealing a negative promotion and tenure decision is set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05. An appeal can be filed only after a negative decision has been made by the Executive Vice President and Provost.

Seventh-Year Reviews

In rare instances, when new evidence emerges, the Department may petition the Dean to conduct a seventh-year review for a candidate who has been denied promotion and tenure. As noted above, the Department understands new evidence to relate to the materials used in the promotion and tenure review not new writing or materials collected or produced since the decision was made. A seventh-year review must be approved before the end of the sixth year; both the Chair and the senior faculty must approve proceeding with the petition to the Dean. A seventh year review follows the same procedures as a sixth-year review; it does not presume a positive outcome. Should the new review result in a negative decision, the faculty member's last day of employment is that stated in the letter of nonrenewal issued following the original negative decision.

A faculty member may not appeal the denial of a seventh year-review petition initiated by his or 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.