

Faculty Annual Reviews

2025-2026

This document highlights key aspects of the new annual review process for TIU Heads in ASC and provides additional guidance. It does not replace the information provided in the OAA resources listed in the Resources section below. It is important to first review the OAA resources below.

OAA RESOURCES

- [OAA Faculty Affairs Annual Review Resource Page](#)
- [Required Annual Review Template \(download\)](#)
- [Faculty Annual Review, Post-Tenure Review, and Reappointment Policy](#)

KEY POINTS

- Annual reviews are required for all compensated faculty—tenure track, C/T/P, research, and associated faculty (including part-time lecturers).
- The TIU-level annual review process includes a written review, required meetings with the TIU head (probationary faculty), optional meetings (all other faculty), and opportunities for faculty to comment on the review and/or appeal the TIU head ratings. This TIU process must be completed by May 15, 2026. TIU heads must complete meeting with faculty and upload reviews to each Interfolio case no later than **May 1, 2026**.
- All reviews must use the OAA required [Annual Review Template](#).
- ASC Faculty Affairs will create a case for each faculty member in Interfolio's RPT module. Faculty will upload the unit's required review materials into their case by the unit-designated due date. The core dossier is required for all probationary tenure-track and C/T/P faculty. Units may continue to use their own annual activity reporting template.
- The TIU heads upload the annual review (using the required template) into each faculty member's case. Faculty may comment on their review from within Interfolio no later than **May 15, 2025**.

TO-DO LIST AND RECOMMENDED TIMELINE FOR TIU HEADS

Required due dates are indicated below. All others are recommended.

- **Early December 2025** - Inform faculty of materials they will be required to submit and the due date. We recommend asking faculty to include a list of goals for the year ahead in their annual activity reports, as this is a required component in the template for the TIU head's annual review.
- **Early January 2026** - Define rating categories and standardized metrics/criteria. (See below for examples)
- **Early Spring 2026** - TIU heads must describe every faculty member's 2025 workload allocation in annual reviews. We recommend having conversations with your faculty to determine this workload well in advance of the annual review due dates. Additional guidance on workload assignment will be provided in AU25.
- **Throughout April 2026** - Conduct eligible faculty meetings to review probationary faculty (recommended). Hold required (with probationary faculty) and optional (with nonprobationary faculty) annual review meetings.
- **May 1, 2026 (required)**- Complete annual review meetings and upload annual reviews to each Interfolio case.
- **May 15, 2026 (required)**– Complete TIU comments process in Interfolio.
- **December 15, 2026 (required)** – Align governance documents with annual review policy (details to come).

RATING CATEGORIES AND METRICS

- **Rating Categories:** All units must use “exceeds expectations,” “meets expectations,” and “does not meet expectations,” but may add up to two additional rating categories.
- **Areas of Evaluation:** A rating must be given for any of the following areas in which a faculty member was engaged at least 5% of the time: (1) teaching and mentoring, (2), research, scholarship, or creative work, (3) service, (4) clinical care (if separate from teaching and mentoring), (5) administration, (6) any additional TIU-determined areas.
- **Metrics/Criteria:** Ratings in each area should be based on standardized, objective, and measurable metrics/criteria. We strongly recommend that units align these metrics with the promotion criteria listed in the APT, recognizing that demonstrating progress toward all promotion criteria in a single annual review period may not be necessary or reasonable.
- **Lookback Period:** Units are permitted to use a 12-, 24-, or 36-month lookback period for evaluating scholarship as described in the APT. For example, in determining whether faculty have met criteria in scholarship for the 2025 calendar year, units with a 36-month lookback period would evaluate scholarship in the 2023, 2024, and 2025 calendar years.

SAMPLE RATING CATEGORIES and METRICS

This is a sample that is intended to be used as a starting point. It is not required that you use these exact definitions, metrics, or criteria. In the example, below, adjust the numerical metrics based on the total number of criteria used in each area of evaluation (research, teaching, service, etc.)

Category	Definition	Metrics (based on Criteria Listed Below)
Exceeds Expectations	Demonstrates a significant level of accomplishment beyond the expected standards of performance	Meets at least <four> of the <five> evaluation criteria* OR meets <three> of the <five> evaluation criteria with exceptional performance in at least <one> of the <three> criteria that are met
Meets Expectations	Fully meets the expected standards of performance.	Meets <three> of the <five> evaluation criteria without exceptional performance in any.
Does Not Meet Expectations	Failure to meet expected standards of performance	Meets fewer than <three> of the <five> evaluation criteria

ASC SAMPLE CRITERIA

Tenure-Track Assistant Professors:

For each area of evaluation (teaching, scholarship, service), list criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure in the APT and indicate whether the assistant professor has demonstrated progress toward meeting the criteria during the review period.

Example: Demonstrates progress toward <Criterion 1 for promotion to associate professor with tenure>.

Tenure-Track Associate Professors

For each area of evaluation (teaching, scholarship, service), list criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure and indicate whether the associate professor has demonstrated continued growth in each during the review period.

AND/OR

For each area of evaluation (teaching, scholarship, service), list criteria for promotion to professor and indicate whether the associate professor has demonstrated progress toward meeting the criteria during the review period.

Example: Demonstrates continued growth in <Criterion 1 for promotion to associate professor with tenure>. AND/OR Demonstrates progress toward <Criterion 1 for promotion to professor>.

Tenure-Track Professors

For each area of evaluation (teaching, scholarship, service), list criteria for promotion to professor and indicate whether the professor has demonstrated continued growth in each criterion during the review period.

Example: Demonstrates continued growth in <Criterion 1 for promotion to professor>.

APPLYING CRITERIA TO C/T/P, RESEARCH, ASSOCIATED, AND REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY

- In many APT documents, teaching criteria are similar for teaching faculty, associated faculty, and tenure-track faculty; scholarship criteria are often similar for research faculty and tenure-track faculty. In such cases, the model above may also be used for these faculty appointments, with evaluations conducted only in the areas in which a faculty member has at least 5% responsibility. Attention should be given to the percentage workload assigned to each area of responsibility in determining whether each criterion has been met. For example, expectations for meeting criteria in service will be lower for a faculty member who has a 5% service workload than one who has a 10% service workload.
- Columbus campus faculty and regional campus faculty are often evaluated on the same scholarship and teaching criteria, with the recognition that the scholarship workload is typically lower for regional campus faculty and the teaching workload greater. Therefore, the same template above could be used for regional campus faculty but in assigning the rating, the expectations for meeting each criterion in scholarship will be correspondingly lower for regional campus faculty members and expectations for meeting criteria in teaching will be correspondingly greater compared to their Columbus campus peers.