

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures for the Department of Linguistics

[Approved by vote of Department faculty 3/10/97]
 [Revised in accordance with OAA suggestions 8/20/97]
 Revised in accordance with OAA suggestions 11/23/98]
 [Revised by vote of Department faculty 11/30/98]
 [Revised by vote of Department faculty 1/11/99]
 [Revised for explicitness and corrected 1/28/99 and 3/11/99]
 [Revised by vote of Department faculty 5/6/02]
 [Revised by vote of Department faculty 5/20/02]
 [Revised by Chair per memo from Dean Michael Hogan 5/7/03]
 [Revised by Chair per memos from Vice Provost Carole Anderson and Dean Michael Hogan 6/17/03]
 [Revised by vote of Department faculty 11/18/05]
 [Revised by Chair per memos from Vice Provost Matt Platz and Dean John Roberts 5/29/07]
 [Revised by vote of Department faculty 1/23/09]
 [Revised by Chair per memos from Vice Provost Susan Williams and Dean Mark Shanda 7/13/2012]
 [Revised by vote of Department faculty 8/27/2012]
 [Revised by vote of Department faculty 3/18/2013]
 [Revised by Chair per memo from Associate Dean Sebastian Knowles 4/5/2013]
 [Revised in accordance with OAA suggestions 11/14/13]
 [Revision adding Section X as appendix to 2007 version accepted by Vice-Provost Wolf OAA 3/9/16]
 [Revised in accordance with OAA suggestions 7/12/16]
 [Revised by vote of Department faculty 8/29/16]

Table of Contents

I. Preamble	3
II. Department Mission	3
III. Definitions	4
A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty	4
1. Tenure-Track Faculty	4
2. Conflict of Interest	4
3. Minimum Composition	4
B. Quorum	4
C. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty	5
1. Appointment	5
2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion	5
IV. Appointments	5
A. Criteria	5
1. Tenure-Track Faculty	5
2. Associated Faculty	6
3. Courtesy Appointments for Tenure-Track Faculty	7
B. Procedures	7
1. Appointment of Tenure-Track Faculty	7
2. Appointment of Associated Faculty	8
3. Appointment of Courtesy Tenure-Track Faculty	8

V. Annual Reviews	9
A. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty	9
1. First, second, third and fifth year reviews	9
2. Fourth year reviews	10
3. Exclusion of time from probationary period	11
B. Tenured Faculty	11
C. Associated Faculty	11
VI. Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards	12
A. Criteria	12
B. Procedures	12
C. Documentation	12
VII. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	13
A. Criteria	13
1. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure	13
2. Promotion to the rank of Professor	15
B. Procedures	15
1. Candidate Responsibilities	15
2. Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities	15
3. Department Chair Responsibilities	16
4. External Evaluations	18
C. Documentation	19
1. Teaching	19
2. Research	20
3. Service	20
VIII. Appeals	21
IX. Seventh Year Reviews	22
X. Procedures for Peer and Student Evaluation of Teaching	22
A. Student Evaluation of Teaching	22
B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching	23

I. Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty (<http://trustees.osu.edu>); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policy and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>); and other policies established by the College and the University. Should those rules and policies change, the department shall 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 appointment or reappointment of the Department Chair.

This document must be approved by the Dean of the College and the Office of Academic Affairs before it can 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 its criteria and procedures 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 continuing faculty and candidates for positions in relation to its mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) of the Administrative Code. In particular, peer review provides the foundation for decisions regarding faculty appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure. Peers are those faculty who can be expected to be most knowledgeable regarding an individual's qualifications and performance - normally tenure initiating unit colleagues. Because of the centrality of peer review to these processes, faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in peer review processes; to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) and other standards specific to the Department of Linguistics and the College; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty. Recommendations by the faculty vested with the responsibility for providing peer review will be accepted unless they are not supported by the evidence presented regarding how the candidate meets the standards established in faculty rule 3335-6-02 and other standards specific to the academic unit and discipline. When, for the reasons just stated, a decision regarding faculty appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure differs from the recommendation of the faculty, the administrator or body making that decision will communicate in writing to the faculty body that made the recommendation the reasons that the recommendation was judged not to be supported by the evidence.

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 statement

The overall mission of the Department of Linguistics is to pursue the scientific investigation of language as a human phenomenon in its historical, psychological, and social dimensions, through effective and innovative undergraduate teaching, a research-oriented graduate program, and high-quality faculty and student research covering the major subareas within the discipline of linguistics.

The Department of Linguistics is dedicated equally to teaching and research and expects members of its faculty to excel in both types of activities. In addition, all members of the faculty are expected to serve on appropriate departmental, divisional, college, and university committees. The Department's appointment, review, and tenure and promotion criteria arise out of these expectations and are formulated with the above mission statement in mind.

III.

Definitions

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty (CEF)

1. Tenure-track Faculty

The CEF for new appointments of tenure-track faculty consists of all tenure track faculty whose TIU is the department. The CEF for reappointment, promotion and tenure and promotion consists of all tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose TIU is the department. The Department Chair is a non-voting member of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.

2. Conflict of Interest

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 (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 50% or more of the candidate's published work since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of that candidate; collaboration at this rate is not required for withdrawal on grounds of conflict of interest.

3. Minimum Composition

In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the Department Chair, after consulting with the Dean, will appoint a faculty member from another department within the college.

B. Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded

from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

C. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted on matters pertaining to reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion.

1. Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when a simple majority of the votes, cast by written, confidential ballot, are positive. Eligible faculty not in attendance may participate by conference call.

2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion is secured when two-thirds of the votes of the CEF, cast by written, confidential ballot, are positive. Eligible faculty who are not able to attend the meeting in person must participate by conference call in order to cast a vote.

IV. Appointments

A. Criteria:

1. Tenure-track faculty

Since the departmental mission, in similar fashion to the mission of the College and the University, focuses on the pursuit and attainment of international distinction in our discipline, appointment decisions for tenure-track faculty positions must be based on the assessment that the individual to be appointed exhibits strong potential to attain tenure and to advance through the faculty ranks. A minimum requirement for appointment at or promotion to the rank of assistant professor or a higher rank is an earned doctorate or possession of equivalent experience, and it is expected that an appointee will be in a position to achieve international recognition for her or his work in the field.

a) Instructor. Appointments at the rank of instructor will normally be made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor but the appointee has not yet completed the doctorate at the onset of the appointment. An appointment to the rank of instructor is always probationary and limited to three years. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year.

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 Executive 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 without a formal approved request for an extension of the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

b) Assistant Professor. At a minimum it is expected that individuals who are appointed as an assistant professor will have earned a Ph.D. in an appropriate field of study, shown evidence of the potential to develop into an internationally recognized scholar/researcher, demonstrated potential as an effective instructor at graduate and undergraduate levels, and have a willingness to provide service to the field.

An appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary and may not exceed six years, including prior service credit. An assistant professor is reviewed for promotion and tenure no later than the sixth year of appointment as an assistant professor and informed by the end of the sixth year as to whether promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the seventh year. 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.

c) Associate Professor. At a minimum it is expected that individuals appointed as associate professor will be internationally recognized researchers with a high-quality body of scholarship and demonstrated excellence in teaching and service to the field. Appointment as associate professor will generally entail tenure. However, on rare occasions individuals may be appointed without tenure when joining the faculty, with a probationary period not to exceed four years. In such cases, a compelling rationale must be provided regarding why appointment at a senior rank is appropriate but tenure is not.

d) Professor. At a minimum it is expected that individuals appointed as professor will have an established international reputation as a leading scholar in the field with an outstanding body of scholarship and a demonstrated record of excellence in teaching and service to the field. Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a senior rank and approved for tenure, but the university will not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency.

2. Associated Faculty

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

a) Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who provide academic service to the department for which a faculty title is appropriate, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees. 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.

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

c) Senior Lecturer. Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, earned a doctorate in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, with evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion.

d) Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%. Appointment at tenure-track titles is for individuals at 49% FTE or below, either compensated (1 – 49% FTE) or uncompensated (0% FTE). The rank of associated faculty with tenure-track titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty. Compensated tenure-track titled faculty appointed at 49% and below will have reduced expectations based on the terms of their appointment.

e) Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in the home institution. 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 consecutive years at 100% FTE.

3. Courtesy Appointments for Tenure-Track Faculty

Tenure-track Ohio State faculty from other tenure-initiating units who have substantial involvement in and make significant contributions to the academic work of the department, such as by teaching a course

in our department, advising our students or serving on committees (student or administrative) will be considered for a courtesy appointment in the Department of Linguistics, a no-salary joint appointment between Linguistics and their home department. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current OSU rank, with promotion in rank recognized. Courtesy appointments do not require formal annual renewal but continuation of the appointment is appropriate only when it reflects ongoing contributions.

B. Procedures:

Current information concerning policy on faculty recruitment, selection and appointments is available in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>) for information on the following topics:

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

1. Appointment of Tenure-track (or Tenured) Faculty.

In the normal course of departmental planning, after some discussion in a general department meeting with student representation, a decision will be made as to the area of linguistics in which to hire. After approval by the Executive and Divisional Deans, the Chair will appoint a search committee consisting of at least three faculty members (possibly including the Chair) and one appointed student representative, though the faculty composition of the committee may be determined by self-selection (i.e., all faculty who want to may be permitted to serve on the committee). In the case of interdisciplinary positions, members of the search committee may be drawn from other departments with relevant expertise. The committee will draft a position announcement and solicit applications.

The committee shall appoint a Diversity Representative whose responsibility is to ensure as broad an applicant pool as possible, consistent with department needs and standards, and to review procedures to ensure that they are fair. If there are qualified candidates in the pool who would contribute to the diversity of the department (understood in terms of the number of members of officially underrepresented groups on the faculty) then at least one such candidate should be in the group of finalists. If the search committee judges that in the pool of candidates there is no qualified person who can contribute to the diversity of the department, the Diversity Representative will explain to the department the committee's efforts to attract a diverse pool of applicants, describing the pool of applicants and the pool of finalists.

After presentation of those candidates judged worthy of interview to the faculty, the committee will invite one or more of the most promising candidates to campus for interviews with the faculty, students and interested university administrators. After the interviews, the committee will present a recommendation, including designation of a favored candidate should there be one, to the Committee of

the Eligible faculty who will vote to determine which candidate shall be presented by the Chair to the Deans. This vote will be by written, secret ballot, and faculty not in attendance may vote by absentee ballot or conference call. A simple majority of those voting will be necessary for a positive recommendation. In order for the vote to be valid, at least two-thirds of all faculty eligible to vote must vote either yes or no. Abstentions are not votes.

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.

2. Appointment of Associated Faculty

When decisions need to be made concerning the hiring of lecturers, senior lecturers, associated assistant professors, or visiting professors for teaching duties in the department, in the typical case, the Chair will consult with as wide a range of faculty as possible. Since, however, it is often the case that the need to hire lecturers arises only at the last minute, the Chair may, when necessary, act unilaterally to find a suitable candidate to fill the need. No-salary associated appointments will be made with discussion among the faculty as a whole when a proposal for such an appointment has been made by a member of the department. The Chair will consult with the faculty as appropriate when making decisions for the renewal of associated faculty appointments. Associated faculty for whom promotion is possible follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for tenure-track faculty, 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.

3. Appointment of Courtesy Tenure-Track Faculty

No-salary courtesy appointments will be made only after discussion among and approval of the faculty as a whole, once a proposal for such an appointment has been made by a member of the department. When a courtesy appointment is approved, the Chair will ensure that an invitation of appointment is extended to the candidate. Termination of such an appointment will similarly require faculty discussion and approval, and will be appropriate in case the appointee no longer has substantial involvement in nor makes significant contributions to the academic work of the department.

V. Annual Review Procedures

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>).

Annual reviews of 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 annual reviews is described under Merit Salary Increases below.

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

A. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty

All probationary tenure-track faculty are reviewed annually in all areas of faculty responsibility (teaching, advising, research, and service) by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty and the Department Chair. Normally the reviews are conducted in the Spring semester of each academic year. Annual reviews are intended to be constructive and candid, a means of being supportive of and helpful to untenured faculty but also of communicating clearly aspects of performance that need improvement. Faculty have the right to reply to annual reviews and for that reply to be placed in their personnel file.

1. First, second, third and fifth year reviews

The Department Chair will notify untenured faculty members electronically, generally in March or April of each year, that the review will take place and will provide access to the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline to be completed by the faculty member in reporting accomplishments to date. Following the outline, candidates will then provide appropriate professional materials for review, and these will be made available to the Chair and the CEF, who may also seek such additional information as necessary and consult with colleagues as necessary for a fair and thorough review. The purpose of the review is to ascertain and evaluate: (a) the research and publication record of each such faculty member, (b) her/his teaching performance, including advising, and (c) his/her service to the department, college, university, and profession, and in addition to look for evidence of continuing development on the faculty member's part.

Upon reviewing all available evidence, the CEF can choose to recommend to the Chair that the faculty member be continued as a probationary member of the faculty or that her/his employment not be renewed beyond the following year. The Department Chair makes his/her own judgment of the case, with the same outcomes possible.

If the department Chair's recommendation is to reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year of service, that recommendation will be final.

The results of the review are conveyed in writing and in person to the faculty member by the Chair, who may consult with the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee for review of the wording of the letter, and an indication is given of the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member, areas in which the faculty member can improve her/his performance, and substantive suggestions for achieving improvement. The letter will also remind the faculty member of the right to inspect his or her personnel file, indicated in Faculty Rule 3335-5-04. Should the CEF and the Chair disagree on the outcome of the

review, the committee will write a letter to the Chair indicating the basis for its recommendation and the Chair will write a reply that addresses the basis for the Chair's recommendation.

If the Chair recommends non-renewal at the conclusion of the first, second, third, or fifth annual review of a probationary faculty member, the faculty member will be allowed to respond in writing to the Chair's comments. The Chair's letter, the CEF's letter, and the faculty member's letter will be forwarded to the Executive Dean, who will conduct a college-level review that follows fourth year review procedures as described below. The Dean will make the final decision in such a case. Faculty members who believe a non-renewal decision was made improperly may appeal that decision, if they wish, under the procedures outlined in section VII, below.

2. Fourth year reviews

The fourth year review follows the procedures established for promotion and tenure, except that external letters are not required. External evaluations will be solicited when the Department Chair or the CEF determines that they are necessary to conduct the fourth-year review, such as in cases when the candidate's scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or there is a need for outside expertise in order to evaluate the scholarship. In this case, in the faculty member's fourth year, the CEF will solicit external letters of evaluation from senior scholars at peer institutions who are acknowledged experts in the candidate's area(s) of scholarship, with this group not normally including the candidate's former dissertation advisor. The committee will work from a list that it develops, checked against a list submitted by the faculty member. The faculty member under review may suggest persons from whom external letters are to be solicited, and may provide a list of persons from whom letters are not to be solicited for reasons of bias or conflict of interest. No more than half of the external evaluation letters in the dossier to be evaluated by the department's eligible faculty may be from individuals suggested as reviewers by the candidate. If necessary, additional letters will be solicited by the committee in order to ensure that this requirement is satisfied.

The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review from the CEF to the Department Chair, who conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on renewal of the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04, <http://trustees.osu.edu>) is followed and the case is forwarded to the College for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal. The final decision on reappointment resulting from the fourth year review is made by the Executive Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences after submission to the college of the dossier and reports from the CEF (including a record of the vote) and the Department Chair and review by the divisional promotion and tenure panel. The Department Chair is a non-voting member of the CEF. A two-thirds affirmative vote by the CEF is required for a positive recommendation; less than a two-thirds affirmative vote will be recorded as a negative recommendation. In order for the vote to be valid, at least two-thirds of all faculty eligible to vote must vote either yes or no. Abstentions are not votes. Voting will be by written, confidential ballot. Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted. Faculty members who are not able to attend the meeting in person must participate by conference call in order to cast a vote.

3. Exclusion of time from probationary period

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03(D) (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) 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 (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>).

Faculty rule 3335-6-03(D) provides for time to be excluded from the probationary period in increments of one year to reflect the caregiving responsibilities associated with the birth of a child or adoption of a child under age six, with such exclusion guaranteed so long as notice requirements are met, and for personal illness, care of a seriously ill or injured person or other factors beyond a faculty member's control that significantly interfere with productivity. While individuals may apply for consideration of an exclusion at any time within the limits of the rule, the CEF may wish to consider during the annual review process whether to recommend application for an exclusion. The CEF may not, however, require a faculty member to apply for excluded time.

B. Tenured faculty.

For tenured faculty at the rank of associate and full professor, there will be an annual performance review by the Department Chair, covering all areas of faculty responsibility (teaching, advising, research, and service). Associate professors will be reviewed annually by the full professors in the department, who will provide the chair with comments on the faculty member's progress toward promotion. These annual reviews are intended to be constructive and candid, a means of helping tenured faculty to arrive at appropriate goals for the coming year.

The review will normally take place by the end of the Spring semester of each academic year. The Department Chair will notify faculty members electronically, generally in March or April of each year, that the review will take place, and will invite them to submit a record of accomplishments in teaching, advising, research and other scholarly activity, and service for the preceding calendar year, along with an indication of future goals and plans; an updated curriculum vitae with new items indicated; and all other relevant materials for proper documentation.

The Chair will conduct an independent assessment, issue a written report upon completion of the review and meet with the faculty member to discuss his/her performance, future plans, and goals. The Chair may also consult with members of the faculty, as appropriate, to ensure a fair and thorough review. Full professors may communicate in writing to waive the right to a face-to-face meeting with the chair. Faculty have the right to reply to annual reviews and for that reply to be placed in their personnel file.

C. Associated faculty.

Compensated associated faculty members will be reviewed annually. The Department Chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss 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.

For compensated associate faculty members on multiple year appointments, the chair will decide whether or not to reappoint no later than October 15 of the final year of the appointment. The department chair's recommendation on reappointment is final.

VI. Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards

A. Criteria:

The criteria for merit salary increases are essentially the same as those for tenure and promotion. Faculty who are on leave, working on grants, or serving as visiting professors elsewhere will not be penalized in regard to merit salary increases for such activities.

B. Procedures:

Each Spring, tenured and untenured faculty members will be asked by the Department Chair to submit an annual report listing their teaching, advising, research, and service accomplishments during the previous calendar year, unless otherwise specified. The report submitted for the annual reviews will suffice (see section V above), though faculty may amplify on that report if they so desire. The Chair may also consult with colleagues, as necessary, in order to assess the quality of the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service during the previous calendar year. The total time period normally used for the evaluation is the previous three years with documentation for previous years available from past reviews. The Department Chair, with the approval of the Divisional Dean of Arts and Humanities, will determine merit salary increases based on this information.

C. Documentation:

- In preparing their annual report, faculty members must provide to the department chair an updated CV, an updated Office of Academic Affairs promotion and tenure dossier outline, Volume 3 (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>), and a cover letter highlighting the most important achievements of the year. Moreover, the department requires detailed documentation of performance in teaching, scholarship, and service.

1. Teaching

To evaluate teaching the following evidence is typically considered:

- a) Cumulative Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for all courses taught, Instructor-created and/or departmental course-specific evaluations are welcome, but not required.
- b) Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in section X of this document).

c) Full citations of pedagogical papers, books or other materials presented, published, or accepted for publication. Material not readily available as an online publication should be made accessible for review in paper or electronic form. Scholarly work accepted but not yet available should be accompanied by a copy of the acceptance letter.

d) Evidence for national reputation for teaching, such as awards, conference invitations and teaching-related presentations

e) Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.

2. Scholarship

To evaluate scholarship the following evidence is typically considered:

a) Full citations of all scholarly works presented, published or accepted for publication. Published material not readily available as an online publication should be made accessible for review in paper or electronic form. Scholarly work accepted but not yet available should be accompanied by a copy of the acceptance letter.

b) Documentation of grants, awards, fellowships and contracts received.

c) Other relevant documentation of scholarship as appropriate (e.g. published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, funding proposals that have been submitted).

3. Service

Any available documentation of the quality of service activities that enhances the list of these activities in the dossier may be considered.

In order to have a full assessment of meritorious achievement, the Chair may also invite faculty to provide copies of publications, readers' reports and published reviews of the faculty member's work, any work-in-progress for which the faculty member seeks credit, and any other information the Chair deems useful.

VII. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

General: Criteria for promotion in all instances depend on excellence. The standards for excellence in research are international in scope, in that the candidate must be judged in relation to the very best practitioners in the field of linguistics at large, not just to linguists in Ohio or the Midwest, or even the United States; the standards for excellence in teaching, however, are local in nature, in that the candidate must meet or exceed university-wide standards for effective teaching. Similarly, the standards for excellence in service are local in nature. The differences in the scope of the standards reflect differences in expectations between a major American research-oriented institution such as The Ohio State University on the one hand and foreign institutions and small liberal arts schools on the other.

For promotion and tenure and promotion reviews, a two-thirds affirmative vote by the CEF is required for a positive recommendation; less than a two-thirds affirmative vote will be recorded as a negative recommendation. In order for the vote to be valid, at least two-thirds of all faculty eligible to vote must vote either yes or no. Abstentions are not votes. Voting will be by written, confidential ballot. Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted. Faculty members who are not able to attend the meeting in person must participate by conference call in order to cast a vote.

A. Criteria:

1. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure

According to Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C) (<http://trustees.osu.edu>): *The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a scholar, and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the university.*

It is expected that the candidate will exhibit substantial strength in research, teaching and service. The record in all three areas also must be such that it inspires strong confidence of continued professional growth and productivity. The criteria in each area are as follows:

a) Teaching ability; excellence as a teacher

Excellence in teaching means providing to all students the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning in linguistics and providing to the most capable and motivated students an enhanced learning experience. An effective teacher of linguistics is one who meets the formal obligations of course instruction in the Department of Linguistics, demonstrates an interest in students, stimulates students' interest in their subject, and succeeds in conveying knowledge of linguistics to students. Excellence in teaching is documented through student evaluations, peer reviews of teaching (these may include reviews of, e.g., syllabi, materials and assignments, feedback to students on assignments and exams as well as direct observation of lectures and other aspects of course conduct) and the importance of the courses taught to the department's graduate and undergraduate programs. Attention is also paid to supervision of high quality dissertations, masters and honors theses, and scholarly papers and presentations by students.

b) Research ability; excellence as a scholar.

Excellence in research means attainment of measurable national or international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of high-quality scholarly research. This excellence typically will be demonstrated through significant contributions to the field. Significant contributions are those which offer new knowledge; information that aids colleagues in the field in carrying forward their own research; which tests new or traditional hypotheses in such a manner as to help evaluate their validity; which suggests applications of linguistics to other disciplines; which apply concepts from

other disciplines to linguistics in ways which generally advance knowledge. In assessing various types of research activity, the committee will evaluate both the quality and quantity of contributions. The typical quantity of published work is approximately one major piece per year or the equivalent, but this should not be taken as either necessary or sufficient for promotion. Here and elsewhere, a major piece consists of a monograph or an article in a peer-refereed journal or proceeding, or a chapter in an editor-refereed volume. The committee will consider, in addition to published work, presentation of scholarly papers at professional meetings, research grants, and recognition among other scholars in the field (as evidenced in citations and external evaluations). The committee will evaluate the candidate's achievements and the likelihood of further long term accomplishments on the basis of the widest possible range of evidence, including both evidence offered by the candidate and that solicited by the committee.

c) Service

A member of the Department of Linguistics at Ohio State University has an obligation to use his/her talents for the betterment of the Department, the College, the University, and the profession. Excellence in service consists of recognizing one's responsibilities to the organization and carrying out these responsibilities effectively and in a timely manner. Leadership consists of identifying the needs and problems of the organization and taking the initiative in addressing them. The amount of the service contribution during the probationary period of assistant professors is limited by design, but the quality of the service contribution must be evident.

Excellence in teaching, research and service are moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics
(<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/statementonprofessionalethics.htm>)

2. Promotion to the rank of Professor

According to Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C) (<http://trustees.osu.edu>): *Promotion to the rank of professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in teaching; has produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated leadership in service.*

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

B. Procedures:

1. Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) and the Office Academic Affairs' annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>). Candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the Department Chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. 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. (Also see External Evaluations below.) If a candidate wishes to be reviewed under the criteria and procedures of the department APT Document that was in effect at the time of hire or when the candidate was last promoted, whichever is more recent, the candidate is responsible to submit a copy of that document.

2. Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

The Promotion and Tenure Committee is composed of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. It is chaired by the Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair, who is appointed annually by the Department Chair. The Department Chair is a non-voting member of the CEF. Committee responsibilities are as follows:

- a) To review this document annually and suggest any needed changes.
 - b) To consider annually, normally early in the Spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed. Only “yes” and “no” votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to consider whether they are participating fully in the review process when abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter.
- The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review, including student and peer evaluations of teaching.
 - A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) for one year.
 - 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 not considered for promotion.

- 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) Annually, in late Spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.

Late Spring Semester:

- A Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) is selected for each candidate, serving in this role for the following year. The POD cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. Information about the Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities is available in the Office of Academic Affairs' annually updated *Policies and Procedures Handbook* (<https://oaa.osu.edu>)
- The CEF suggests names of external evaluators to the Department Chair.

Early Autumn Semester:

- The POD reviews their candidate's dossier for completeness, accuracy and consistency with process requirements, and works with the candidate to assure that needed revisions are made before the formal review process begins, meeting with the candidate for clarification as necessary and providing the candidate an opportunity to comment on the dossier.
- After the dossier is made available to the CEF for review, the members of the CEF review thoroughly every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed. Members of the CEF attend all meetings of the CEF except when circumstances beyond their control prevent attendance; they participate in discussion of every case, and vote.
- The CEF meets to review and discuss the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service. They seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.
- Following the faculty meeting, the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee drafts a report to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting, consulting with the faculty as necessary. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure committee forwards the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair.
- After the comment period, the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee provides a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.

3. Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Department Chair are as follows:

- a) To verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty members who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure will not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established.
- b) Annually, in late Spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.

Late Spring Semester:

- To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the chair and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To make available in an accessible place adequate copies of each candidate's dossier for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be reviewed, discussed and voted on.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting.

Mid-Autumn Semester:

- To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the CEF's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the CEF to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process of the recommendations by the CEF and Department Chair, the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair and the opportunity to submit, within ten days of receipt of the Chair's letter, written comments on the review material for inclusion in the dossier.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To ensure that the completed dossier is forwarded to the college office by that office's deadline, except in the case when the Department Chair recommends against promotion for associated faculty. The chair's negative recommendation is final in such cases.

- To receive the Promotion and Tenure Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to ensure this material is forwarded, along with the Chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the Department Chair of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

4. External Evaluations

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure and promotion reviews, and for fourth-year reviews of probationary tenure-track faculty in circumstances described in Section V, A2.

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 who 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. 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, at least seven letters are sought, and they are normally solicited no later than the end of the Spring semester prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be solicited should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

As described above in section VII, B1, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the CEF, 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 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) 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, there is no requirement for the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

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.

C. Documentation:

The documentation prescribed by the Office of Academic Affairs for the "core" of the promotion dossier is required by the Department of Linguistics in its tenure and promotion process. All material the candidate deems relevant will be brought before the CEF and Department Chair. While the Promotion and Tenure Committee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by the candidate.

1. Teaching

Evaluation of a candidate's performance as a teacher will be based on the widest possible range of evidence. It may include evidence offered by the candidate and evidence solicited by the relevant Promotion or Tenure and Promotion Committee, and must include materials generated by regular departmental evaluation of teaching on an annual basis. In addition, under teaching, the Committee will consider the candidate's work with students as their academic advisor or in helping individual students and groups of students in areas that are related to the work of the department. The relevant evidence may include but is not limited to:

- a) Evidence from work of students indicating teaching effectiveness
- b) Evidence drawn from evaluation forms standardly used by the department (eSEIs as described in Section X below) as well as any other methods that the candidate may deem appropriate.
- c) Evidence of especially successful or innovative teaching technique.
- d) Special teaching accomplishments, awards, etc.
- e) Solicited testimony from colleagues. Former or current students may not provide testimony in promotion and tenure cases.
- f) Results of visitations by members of the committee and other faculty.

- All faculty eligible for promotion to associate professor and full professor are visited in their classes according to the schedule outlined in Section X below by tenured members of the departmental Peer Review of Teaching Committee.

g) Copies of syllabi, examinations and other class materials.

h) Other information that the candidate, the committee and the Chair believe to be pertinent

2. Scholarship

a) Publications.

The committee will carefully consider the nature of each publication. It will evaluate the quality of the publication and the nature of the publication medium. In general, monographic and comprehensive works (books, articles, etc.) based on original research will be attributed the highest value when published in high-quality venues, especially when peer-reviewed. Papers which undergo critical scrutiny before publication (e.g., by journal or anthology editors) will be more highly valued than those that do not. In evaluating candidates for promotion and tenure, the committee will not only make its own assessment, but it may solicit--and the candidate may present--published reviews and private evaluations from scholars in the field. The candidate will be encouraged to present any other information which might aid the committee in its evaluation (such as citation of his/her publications in works by other scholars and successful grant proposals). In all cases, the committee shall carefully consider the source of outside evaluations and the weight which they should be accorded.

- Candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure will be evaluated on both the quality and quantity of scholarly output, but special emphasis will be placed on quality. In all cases, candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to have a research record that demonstrates clear distinction in linguistics, as is appropriate for faculty at a major research institution. The typical quantity of published work for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure is six high quality articles in reputable refereed journals, or the equivalent, including research monographs published by major presses in the field, rigorously refereed conference proceedings, and refereed chapters in edited books. The published work should provide evidence of an established and coherent research program.
- Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor will be evaluated according to the same criteria as those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with the criteria strengthened in the following ways:
 - The teaching, service and scholarly work upon which the evaluation is based must be subsequent to that upon which promotion to associate professor was based.
 - The typical quantity of published work for promotion to the rank of Professor is an additional six high quality articles in reputable journals, or the equivalent as just

described. In this case, the published work should provide evidence of a deep and sustained research program, and the candidate is expected to have established a national and international reputation.

b) Scholarly activity at professional meetings.

The committee will seek to evaluate the quality and quantity of contributions. Papers, formal commentaries on the papers of others, participation in colloquia, will be evaluated. Again, the committee may seek and the candidate may present evaluations from scholars in the field.

c) Reviews of scholarly works for journals.

The committee will appraise the scholarship of the reviews and the nature of the journals in which they appear.

d) Scholarly recognition.

Scholarly 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; recognition in the form of prizes, awards, grants, or fellowships based on scholarly esteem and reputation.

e) Letters of evaluation.

Letters of evaluation by scholars outside the university are required. The candidate may suggest names of those who know his/her work. Negative as well as positive letters will be included in the review.

f) Any other evidence which the candidate, the Committee and the Chair believe pertinent to his/her development as a scholar.

3. Service

In itself, service is not sufficient to earn promotion. Nonetheless, it remains important and should be carried out with energy and commitment to the mission of the Department, the Division, the College the University and the broader field of Linguistics. With regard to excellence in service, evidence may include:

a) Service on departmental, divisional, college, and university committees.

b) Assignments outside formal committee work that are nevertheless essential to the work of the department and must be assigned to individual faculty members: for instance, visiting the classes of untenured colleagues, associated faculty and teaching associates, revising curricula, creating databases or other departmental tools, or supervising library acquisitions.

- c) Presentations made in the classes of others, editing of or contributions to departmental publications, lectures to the departmental faculty, and similar activities.
- d) Service to the academic world: for instance, service in state, regional, national, or international professional organizations in linguistics (as office-holder, as member of a committee, or in ad hoc assignments on behalf of the organization), work as a consultant in academic contexts, work on editorial boards as a referee for scholarly journals, work on federal or foundation panels as a grant reviewer, acting as a referee for faculty members under review at other universities.
- e) Any other information that the candidate and the committee may consider pertinent to the committee's evaluation. Each faculty member should keep a record of his/her service and make it available to the Chair and to the CEF for review.

VIII. Appeals

It is the policy of The Ohio State University to make decisions regarding annual review, the renewal of probationary appointments, and promotion and tenure in accordance with the criteria, policies, and procedures stated in the faculty rules, supplemented by such additional written criteria, policies and procedures as may be established by departments and colleges. If a faculty member of the Department of Linguistics believes that an annual review, or a nonrenewal decision, or a negative promotion and tenure decision has been made in violation of this policy, and therefore alleges that it was made improperly the faculty member may appeal that decision or review. General criteria for appeal of negative promotion and tenure decisions are set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 of the Administrative Code (<http://trustees.osu.edu>). Procedures for appealing a decision or review on an allegation of improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05 of the Administrative Code (<http://trustees.osu.edu>).

IX. Seventh year reviews

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) sets for the conditions of and procedures for a seventh year review for a faculty member denied tenure as the result of a sixth year review.

X. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (eSEI) is required in every regular classroom course offered in the department. Faculty members may provide in-class time for students to complete the evaluation using a mobile application. Additional evaluative instruments optionally may be used, including the open-ended course evaluation available from the department, or others as determined by the instructor. Instructors should leave the room during the distribution, completion and collection of evaluations, and completed evaluations should be held in the department until the instructor has turned in grades. Discursive comments from SEIs will be summarized by someone other than the faculty member for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews. SEIs and discursive comment summaries will become part of

the faculty member's record for inclusion in annual reviews and promotion dossiers, and may be considered as well in the determination of merit salary increases.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The department chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process.

Annually the department chair appoints a faculty member to chair the Peer Review of Teaching Committee. The committee chair recruits a number of committee members sufficient to meet the volume and necessary timing of peer review activity expected that year, without overburdening any of the members. The term of service is one year, with reappointment possible. To the extent possible, peer reviewers will be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed.

The responsibilities of the Peer Review of Teaching Committee are as follows:

- to review the teaching of probationary tenure-track professors at least once per year during the first three years of service, and at least twice more before the commencement of the mandatory tenure review, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned
- to review the teaching of tenured associate professors at least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned, having at least two peer reviews of teaching during the six-year period preceding a promotion review
- to review the teaching of tenured full professors at least once every four years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned
- to review the teaching of a faculty member outside the regular schedule for review, upon that individual's request, or upon the request of the department chair, to the extent that time and staffing permit.

Reviews conducted upon the request of the department chair or the faculty member will focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the chair or faculty member and may take a form appropriate to the request.

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations (the first three situations listed above) are comprehensive and should include class visitation and review of course syllabi and related instructional materials. Reviewers may comment on issues such as the appropriateness and effectiveness of course design, level of instruction, and assessment. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, peer reviewers will be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed. Peer evaluators will discuss the review with the candidate, and provide a written report to the department chair, copied to candidate. The candidate may comment in writing on the report, and the reviewer may respond as desired. The report will become part of the faculty member's record for inclusion in annual

reviews and promotion dossiers, and may be considered as well in the determination of merit salary increases.