
Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure

Revised 2014



THE SCHOOL OF MUSIC
The College of Arts and Sciences
The Ohio State University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
I. Preamble	3
II. School of Music Mission	3
III. Definitions	4
A. Faculty at Large	4
B. Tenure-Track Faculty	4
C. Associated Faculty	4
D. Eligible Faculty	4
E. Voting Faculty	4
F. Regional Campus Faculty	4
G. The Promotion and Tenure	4
H. Quorum	
IV. Appointments	5
A. Criteria	5
<i>A1. Tenure Track Faculty</i>	5
<i>A1a. Instructor</i>	5
<i>A1b. Assistant Professor (without tenure)</i>	5
<i>A1c. Associate Professor (with tenure)</i>	6
<i>A1d. Professor (with tenure)</i>	6
<i>A2. Regional Faculty Appointments</i>	6
<i>A3. Associated Faculty</i>	6
<i>A3a. Visiting Faculty</i>	6
<i>A3b. Courtesy Appointments</i>	6
B. Procedures	7
<i>B1. Tenure-Track Faculty, Columbus Campus</i>	7
<i>B2. Tenure-Track Faculty, Regional Campus</i>	8
<i>B3. Associated Faculty</i>	8
C. Diversity	9
<i>C1. Statement of Diversity</i>	9
<i>C2. Search Initiatives to Enhance Diversity</i>	9
V. Annual Review Procedures	9
VI. Administration, Decision Making, and Advisory Structure	10

A. Administrative Organization	10
A1. <i>Role of the Eligible Faculty</i>	10
A2. <i>Role of the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittees</i>	10
A2a. <i>Performance Faculty Subcommittee</i>	10
A2b. <i>Academic Faculty Subcommittee</i>	10
A3. <i>Duties of the Subcommittees</i>	10
A4. <i>Role of the Area Head</i>	11
A5. <i>Role of the Director</i>	11
B. Probationary reviews	11
B1. <i>First, Second, Third, and Fifth Year Reviews</i>	11
B2. <i>Fourth and Sixth Year Reviews</i>	12
B3. <i>Seventh Year Reviews</i>	12
B4. <i>Preliminary Screening of Candidates for Non-mandatory reviews</i>	13
C. Promotion and Tenure Reviews for Tenured Faculty	13
C1. <i>Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</i>	14
C1a. <i>Music Education Faculty</i>	15
C1b. <i>Musicology and Music Theory Faculty</i>	15
C1c. <i>Composition Faculty</i>	16
C1d. <i>Performance Faculty</i>	16
C2. <i>Promotion to Rank of Professor</i>	18
C3. <i>Regional Campus Faculty</i>	18
D. Procedures	18
D1. <i>Candidate Responsibilities</i>	18
D2. <i>SOM Promotion and Tenure Subcomm. Responsibilities</i>	19
D3. <i>Guidelines for the Subcommittee</i>	20
D3a. <i>Examination of Evidence</i>	20
D3b. <i>Conduct of the Review</i>	20
D4. <i>Responsibilities of Eligible Faculty and Peer Reviews</i>	20
D5. <i>Responsibilities of the Director</i>	21
D5a. <i>Responsibilities of the Area Head</i>	22
D5b. <i>Responsibilities for Reg. Campus Deans/Director</i>	22
D6. <i>External Evaluations</i>	23
E. Documentation	24
E1. <i>Evaluation of Teaching</i>	24
E2. <i>Evaluation of Scholarly and Creative Activity</i>	25
E3. <i>Evaluation of Service</i>	25
VII. Appeals	25

I. Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty <http://www.trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>; 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 and procedures of the college and university to which the School of Music and its faculty are subject.

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

The Office of Academic Affairs must approve this document before it may be implemented. It sets forth the school's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the university, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the Office of Academic Affairs accepts the mission and criteria of the school and delegates to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to college mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01, www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php of the Administrative Code. In particular, all faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, www.trustees.osu.edu/ChapIndex/index.php and other standards specific to this college and its units; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.

II. School of Music Mission

The Ohio State University School of Music educates students for professional careers in composition, performance, scholarship, and teaching. As an integral part of a major public university with a strong commitment to teaching, research, and service, the school recognizes the relationship that binds music to other academic and artistic disciplines. The school aims to provide, at the highest level, instruction in the study and practice of music and, in so doing, to promote an awareness of music as a humanistic study. The school encourages musical research in all its dimensions by providing students and faculty opportunities for performance, creative activity, and scholarly inquiry. The school is dedicated to sustaining and advancing musical culture in the academy and in the society at large, and it endeavors to meet service obligations to various communities within and beyond the university. Recognizing the dynamic and evolving character of music in contemporary life, the school acknowledges an ongoing responsibility to evaluate its programs and procedures, and to investigate fresh approaches to the realization of its mission. In keeping with the university's broader mission, the school is committed to nurturing the best of Ohio's students, while maintaining excellence and diversity by recruiting nationally and internationally.

III. Definitions (Refer to POA, pages 2-3)

- A. The Faculty** includes all persons with tenure-track and non-tenure-track appointments.
- B. Tenure-Track Faculty** includes those holding salaried appointments of greater than 50% FTE in the SOM as professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors.
- C. Associated Faculty** includes those with clinical practice titles, adjunct titles, visiting titles, and lecturer titles; also professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors who serve on appointments totaling less than fifty per cent service to the university. Persons holding associated titles are not eligible for tenure and may not participate in the promotion and tenure reviews of tenure-track faculty.
- D. Eligible faculty**, in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (B)(1), are tenured faculty whose tenure resides in the School of Music, and who are of higher rank than the candidate. The Director of the School is excluded from the eligible faculty.
- E. Voting Faculty** includes members of the tenure-track faculty. Non-tenure-track faculty may participate in School of Music governance when approved by a vote of at least a majority of all of its tenure-track faculty. Each of these members is entitled to one vote, and when a faculty vote is taken, anyone may request a secret ballot. The voting faculty is consulted in appropriate phases of new faculty appointments including initiation of searches, review of candidates, and final selection. Although the voting faculty has the final decision on all committee actions affecting school legislation, this does not abrogate the prerogatives of committees acting on behalf of the faculty, if committees are empowered to do so.
- F. Regional Campus Faculty** members holding tenured or tenure-track appointments are voting members of the school faculty as well as of their home area faculty. Whenever practicable and appropriate, regional campus faculty may serve on both school and area committees.
- G. The Promotion and Tenure Committee** for all SOM personnel decisions is defined as the eligible faculty in attendance. In addition, two Promotion and Tenure Subcommittees, one for cases involving performance faculty and one for cases involving academic faculty, will assist the eligible faculty by following the procedures outlined below.
- H. Quorum** is required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions and, in compliance with the ASC APT, is defined as two thirds of the eligible SOM faculty not on an approved leave of absence. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment or Faculty Professional Leave may be excluded from the quorum count if approved by the director.

IV. Appointments

Types of faculty appointments in the School of Music include those of tenure-track faculty and associated faculty, per their definitions in University Rule 3335-5-19.

A. Criteria

A1. Tenure Track Faculty

The School of Music will support the hiring of only the best available tenure track faculty members consistent with the strategic needs of the school and the college, and with the goal of having as diverse a faculty body as possible. The school recruits and appoints to its faculty only individuals who enhance or have the strong potential to enhance the quality of research, teaching, and service that is characteristic of a world-class school of music. Regardless of the level of appointment, an important consideration is the individual's record to date in research, teaching and service; potential for further growth in these three areas; and, the potential for collaboration and cooperation with other faculty and students across the College of Arts and Sciences as well as outside of the college.

A1a. Instructor

Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but the candidate has not completed requirements for the terminal degree at the time of appointment. The school will make every effort to avoid such appointments and an appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. When an instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment, the third year is the terminal year of employment. Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. The SOM eligible faculty, the director, the executive dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs must approve this request. 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.

A1b. Assistant Professor (without tenure)

It is expected that any individual who is appointed as an assistant professor without tenure will have earned a terminal degree or commensurate experience in an appropriate field of study. S/he will show evidence to develop into an internationally recognized scholar, researcher, or performer, as an effective teacher at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and have a willingness to provide high-quality service to her or his field and institution. At the time of appointment to the rank of assistant professor, the individual must have a strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the ranks in a timely fashion. 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 or not 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. Similarly a probationary

appointment may be terminated at any time subject to the notice provisions of Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 and the provisions of paragraphs (G), (H), and (I) of Faculty Rule 3335-6-03.

A1c. Associate Professor (with tenure)

It is expected that an individual appointed as an associate professor with tenure is a nationally recognized scholar or performer with a high-quality body of research or creative activity, has demonstrated excellence in teaching undergraduate and graduate students, and demonstrated excellence in service/outreach to the profession and field as well as locally to the university. It is expected at the time of appointment to the rank of associate professor that the individual has strong potential to advance to the rank of professor in a timely fashion. On rare occasions, however, individuals may be appointed as associate professor without tenure when joining the faculty.

A1d. Professor (with tenure)

It is expected that an individual appointed to the SOM faculty as a professor with tenure has established a national or international reputation as a leading scholar or performer in his or her field with an outstanding body of scholarship or other creative activity, has demonstrated excellence in teaching at graduate and undergraduate levels and has demonstrated a record of high quality service to his or her field and institution.

A2. Regional Faculty Appointments

As the missions of the regional campuses emphasize undergraduate instruction, regional campus criteria for appointment at the rank of tenure or tenure-track assistant professor, associate professor, or full professor are similar to those of the Columbus campus faculty, but give relatively greater emphasis at each rank to teaching experience and quality.

A3. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty includes persons with adjunct titles, visiting titles, and lecturer or senior-lecturer titles; also professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors who serve on appointments totaling less than fifty per cent service to the university.

A3a. Visiting Faculty at Assistant, Associate, and Professor Ranks

Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank they hold at their home institution. The rank at which other 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.

A3b. Courtesy Appointments

The active academic involvement in the School of Music by a faculty member from another unit at Ohio State sometimes warrants the offer of a courtesy (0% FTE) appointment. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course, or a combination of these. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's

current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized. Courtesy appointments can be for multiple years, typically with a review for continuation after three to five years.

B. Procedures

The School of Music procedures for appointing new faculty are consistent with the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook. (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>)

B1. Tenure-Track Faculty, Columbus Campus

The director appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search as well as other fields within the school. In some cases, where the position is interdisciplinary in nature, it is expected that members of the search committee will be drawn from other departments as well.

The search committee shall:

Appoint a Diversity Representative whose responsibility is to ensure as broad an applicant pool as possible consistent with school needs, standards, and Diversity Policy (see p.10) and to review procedures to ensure that they are fair.

Develop a search announcement for internal posting in the university Personnel Postings through the Office of Human Resources Employment Services (www.hr.osu.edu/) and external advertising, subject to the director's and divisional dean's approvals.

Develop and implement a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must assure that at least one print (as opposed to on-line) advertisement appears in a location likely to be read by qualified potential applicants. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency ("green card"), and strict U.S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their appointment to a tenure track position included an advertisement in a field-specific nationally circulated professional journal.

Screen applications and letters of recommendation and present to the full faculty a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. The search committee may, with the consent of the director, invite top candidates to an on-campus interview. If suitable candidates are not available or the search committee members cannot agree on who should be invited to campus, the director will consult the divisional dean to determine the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, delay or cancel the search).

On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee, students, and the director. In addition, all candidates make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their research and provide evidence of their ability to teach. The latter could be an actual class or a mock instructional situation or some other opportunity that allows an assessment of the candidate's teaching abilities. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview

format. While on campus, candidates for tenure-track faculty positions must be interviewed by the executive dean, a divisional dean, or their designee.

After the on-campus interviews, the eligible faculty have an opportunity to express their perceptions and preferences and to vote on each candidate. The search committee reports a recommendation on each candidate to the chair or director. In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the director decides which candidate to approach first. At that time, terms of the hire will be discussed, including salary and other features of the recruitment; the dean must be consulted during this time. All offers at the associate professor and professor ranks and all offers of prior service credit require the prior approval of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs. After the school deliberations have been concluded, the chair or director will then contact the divisional dean to provide a summary of the interviews and recommendation for hiring.

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

B2. Tenure-Track Faculty, Regional Campus

For the hiring of regional campus-based faculty, the dean/director of the regional campus, in consultation with the College of Arts and Sciences executive dean and divisional deans and the SOM director, will authorize a search. The regional campus has primary responsibility for determining the position description for a tenure-track faculty search, but the dean/director or designee consults with the SOM director to reach agreement on the description before the search begins. The regional campus search committee must include at least one representative from the school. Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, the executive dean, divisional dean or their designee, and/or the SOM director, SOM eligible faculty, and regional campus search committee. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. A decision to make an offer requires agreement by the director and regional campus dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin. Letters of offer must be signed by the both director and the regional campus dean.

B3. Associated Faculty

Associated-faculty appointments may be made for a maximum of three consecutive years and, with the exception of visiting titles, may be renewed. In accordance with University Rule 3335-6-08 (D), decisions regarding the renewal of associated faculty must be made in accordance with criteria and procedures of the School of Music and in accordance with University policies concerning associated faculty positions. Appointments of all associated faculty, with the exception of courtesy appointments, must be reviewed and approved by the College of Arts and Sciences.

As stated in Faculty Rule 3335-5-19 (C) (1), adjunct appointments are normally not compensated. Adjunct appointments are made for the period in which the uncompensated service is provided, not to exceed three years.

Renewal is contingent upon continued significant contributions. In rare instances, adjunct faculty who take on exceptional responsibility may be compensated for services provided, subject to OAA guidelines.

Visiting appointments are limited to three consecutive years at 100% FTE.

C. *Diversity*

C1. *Statement of Diversity*

The School of Music is committed to building a diverse faculty and staff for the highest quality workforce and to recruiting a student body that reflects human diversity, with ample opportunities for under-represented minorities and women. The School embraces human diversity and is committed to equal employment opportunity, affirmative action, and eliminating discrimination. This commitment is both a moral imperative consistent with an intellectual community that celebrates individual differences and diversity, as well as a matter of law. Discrimination against any individual based upon protected status, which is defined as age, ancestry, color, disability, gender identity or expression, genetic information, military status, national origin, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, or veteran status, is prohibited.

C2. *Search Initiatives to Enhance Diversity*

At least one of the candidates invited to campus for the interview or audition should contribute to increasing the diversity of the SOM faculty. If the search committee judges that in the pool of candidates there is no qualified person who can contribute to the diversity of the SOM, it will explain its efforts to attract a diverse pool of applicants and will describe the pool of applicants and the pool of finalists before asking the director and dean to invite the finalists to campus for an interview. Vigorous efforts to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates are required. The SOM should encourage collaboration with other hiring agencies, such as Centers and Institutes, and wherever appointments may be interdisciplinary to ensure a diversity action plan is in place to recruit new faculty.

V. *Annual Review Procedures*

<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>

The School of Music follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the Faculty Annual Review Policy. Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 provides the following context for reviews involving promotion and tenure:

In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the university enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established academic patterns. In such cases care must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing

members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the School of Music.

VI. Administration, Decision-Making, and Advisory Structure

A. Administrative Organization

Within the School of Music, three agencies are involved in appointment-renewal and promotion-and-tenure reviews: the eligible faculty (aided by the promotion and tenure subcommittees), the area head, and the director. The judgments and actions open to each agency are set forth below.

A1. Role of the Eligible Faculty

The eligible faculty in attendance at the meetings designated for faculty review serves as the Promotion and Tenure Committee and is, therefore, the voting body for every 4th and 6th year review of probationary faculty and every promotion to associate professor and professor. It is the responsibility of eligible faculty to review the candidate's dossier and supporting documents prior to the promotion and tenure meeting. Eligible faculty should not rely exclusively on comments made at the meeting in forming their opinions. All other reviews (1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 5th years) are for evaluative purposes only and, although a vote is not taken, a report is generated based on the conversation and submitted to the director by the chair of the appropriate subcommittee. Only those in attendance may participate in the discussion or the vote.

A2. Promotion and Tenure Subcommittees

To assist the eligible faculty, the director appoints two promotion and tenure subcommittees of five tenured faculty members each: three full professors and two associate professors. Faculty are appointed to three-year rotating terms on subcommittees as defined below.

A2a. Performance Faculty Subcommittee

3 full professors from 3 performance areas

2 associate professors, one from an academic area

A2b. Academic Faculty Subcommittee

3 full professors from 3 academic areas

2 associate professors, one from a performance area

A3. Duties of the Subcommittees

Solicit faculty and external letters concerning promotion and tenure cases and probationary reviews.

Assist candidates in creation of dossiers for promotion and tenure.

Draft letters that represent SOM faculty comments and recommendations from meetings concerning fourth year and tenure reviews and promotions which document the official vote of the eligible faculty.

Document SOM faculty comments and recommendations and submit to director so letter may be drafted to advise probationary faculty in first, second, third, and fifth year reviews.

Annually initiate process of discussions with associate professors to offer advisement in matters of promotion and to solicit faculty feedback as part of process.

Following above, meet with associate professor and with director to discuss readiness for promotion and to suggest ways that director can help facilitate associate professor's progress in this area.

A4. *Role of the Area Head*

In addition to serving as a mentor throughout the review period, the area head evaluates each candidate annually and, based on the dossier and other supporting materials, writes a performance review; in cases of 4th and 6th year reviews and promotions, the area head's evaluation should be cumulative and address the entire period under review.

A5. *Role of the Director*

The director oversees the review process and ensures that proper procedure is followed, but does not engage in the discussions or in the reviews conducted by the faculty. Once the case has been examined and the vote has been recorded (if applicable), the director provides his or her opinion on the merits of the case by submitting a letter to the candidate and to the appropriate college and university committees and administrators.

B. *Probationary Reviews*

B1. *First, Second, Third, and Fifth Year Reviews*

In preparation for the school's *spring* promotion and tenure meeting, the subcommittee receives the dossier from the candidate and any applicable supporting documents from the director's office. The latter will include such items as annual review letters, peer observation of teaching, external letters, and letters from regional deans, as appropriate. The subcommittee delivers the materials to the area head, and soon thereafter receives an evaluation letter from the area head. Copies of the area head's letter and the dossier are then made available to the eligible faculty.

The eligible faculty studies all documents and the area head prepares summary remarks to be delivered to the eligible faculty at the promotion and tenure meeting. At that meeting, after the candidate's case is presented by the area head, the subcommittee chair leads a discussion, during which the eligible faculty discusses the merits of the case for or against promotion. Subcommittee members take notes of the discussion and provide these to the chair, who writes a letter summarizing the discussion and sends it to the director. A vote is not mandatory at probationary reviews other than fourth and sixth year reviews.

Based on the subcommittee chair's letter and the other materials submitted, the director writes an evaluation to be shared with the candidate; this letter not only serves as a record of the

faculty's review, but also provides recommendations for the candidate, intended to be useful for his/her pursuit of tenure and promotion. The director's evaluation, along with the area head's letter and other materials, is placed in the candidate's SOM file.

B2. Fourth Year and Sixth Year Reviews

In preparation for the school's *autumn* promotion and tenure meeting, the subcommittee receives the dossier from the candidate and any applicable supporting documents from the director's office. The latter will include such items as annual review letters, peer observation of teaching, external letters, and letters from regional deans, as appropriate. The subcommittee immediately provides a copy of all materials to the area head, and soon thereafter receives a letter from the area head. Copies of the area head's letter and the dossier are then made available to the eligible faculty for study.

The subcommittee studies all documents, discusses the merits of the case, and advises the subcommittee chair on summary remarks to be delivered to the eligible faculty at the promotion and tenure meeting. At that meeting, the subcommittee chair provides a summary of the candidate's case and leads a discussion, during which the eligible faculty reviews and discusses the merits of the case for or against promotion. After a time, the subcommittee head calls for a straw vote by secret ballot in order to gauge whether the final vote will reflect the discussion. Discussion may continue after the straw vote. After all discussion has concluded, the faculty formally votes by secret ballot. A positive vote of at least 67% of the eligible faculty in attendance at the meeting constitutes a positive faculty recommendation. Abstentions are removed from the total voting contingent.

The subcommittee then prepares a letter summarizing the discussion at the meeting. It is expected that the letter from the subcommittee will allow readers at higher levels to contextualize the vote of the faculty, and that the letter will reflect the various positions expressed during the discussion. It is not necessary for the letter to summarize the content of the dossier. The subcommittee's letter, the area head's letter, the candidate's dossier, and the vote are then forwarded to the director. These materials are then accompanied by the director's evaluation, recommending for or against promotion, and are submitted to the college and university promotion and tenure committees, deans, and provosts.

B3. Seventh Year Reviews

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a Seventh Year Review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year (mandatory tenure) review.

In rare instances, the director may petition the dean for permission to conduct a seventh-year review for an assistant professor who has been denied promotion and tenure. Points to be emphasized here are (1) that the petition must provide documentation of substantial new information regarding the candidate's performance that is directly related to the reasons for the original negative review, and (2) that the conduct of a seventh-year review does not presume a positive outcome.

B4. Preliminary Screening of Candidates for Non-mandatory reviews

An associate professor seeking a non-mandatory fall-semester formal promotion review will submit by the first Friday in February a complete curriculum vitae, SEIs, or other evidence of teaching evaluation along with a written statement describing her/his rationale for requesting the preliminary screening to the director's office for distribution in timely fashion to the appropriate P&T subcommittee.

An assistant professor wishing to be considered for early promotion and tenure will be bound by the same deadlines and process, but will submit a full core dossier in addition to the written statement describing the rationale for requesting the screening.

The Promotion and Tenure subcommittee may decline a request to proceed with a screening if the candidate's documentation and/or accomplishments are judged not to warrant the process.

Only professors on the committee and subcommittee may consider screening requests concerning promotion to full professor.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee will examine the submitted materials and decide whether it is appropriate for a formal promotion or promotion-and-tenure review to take place in fall semester of the next academic year.

The quorum required to discuss and vote on preliminary-screening cases is two-thirds of the eligible faculty as described in section III. H of this document. A two-thirds majority of those present and eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the case to proceed to the formal promotion- or promotion-and-tenure review.

After examining the case, the P&T committee will communicate its findings in writing by the first Friday in March to the Director, who will share the report with the candidate. In accordance with University Rule 3335-6-04(3), the promotion and tenure committee may not deny a tenured faculty member a formal review for promotion more than one year.

Note that a positive report in a preliminary screening review in no way commits the eligible faculty, the director, or any other party to make a positive recommendation at the formal P&T committee meeting in the following fall semester.

C. Promotion and Tenure Reviews for Tenured Faculty

In promotion and tenure cases, decisions are made by the provost; all reports emanating from the school and the college include recommendations only. In every case, all communication with the candidate about either recommendations or decisions comes only from the director or from higher levels. The director informs the candidate that the School of Music review has been completed and that the letter prepared by the promotion and tenure committee on behalf of the eligible faculty and the director's letter may be reviewed in the director's office. At that time, the candidate may write a commentary that will be included in the dossier sent forward for review at the college level.

Tenure-track faculty appointments are normally filled at the rank of assistant professor or above. Occasionally the successful candidate for an assistant professorship will not have completed

the requirements for the terminal degree prior to beginning the first year of employment; in such cases, the director may choose to appoint at the rank of instructor. An appointment to the rank of instructor is probationary and cannot exceed three years. Details on obtaining prior service credit for time spent as an instructor are given in Faculty Rule **3335-6-03** (B)(1).

Promotion from assistant professor to associate professor automatically conveys tenure, and usually comes with the successful sixth year review, but may occur earlier. If granted in the sixth year, promotion and tenure take effect at the beginning of the seventh year. Tenure is not granted below the rank of associate professor.

C1. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure

The essential basis for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure is convincing evidence that the candidate has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a performing artist, composer, and/or scholar, and as a provider of effective academic and professional service. Decisions will consider the entire body of career work that evidences the standards of excellence enumerated in the area criteria. Moreover, this evidence should justify the expectation that the candidate will continue to make valuable contributions relevant to the mission of the school in all of these categories.

The school's policy on the weighing of teaching, scholarship, and service is that of University Rule 3335-6-02(D):

In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the university enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established academic patterns. In such cases care must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

The School considers music performance, music composition and their allied fields of study and activity as research and scholarship, equivalent in stature to research- and scholarly activities in the academic areas of the school.

Superior attainment in scholarship is evidenced by national or international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of production of research and/or other creative/artistic endeavors. A successful candidate will have an emerging national or international reputation in his/her field. Work that is peer reviewed is given the greatest significance.

Superior attainment of teaching entails successfully conveying knowledge and skills to students. It can be measured by student evaluation of teaching (SEI), peer-review, recognitions and awards, and successes of former students.

Superior attainment in service entails participation and leadership in national and international professional organizations, in university faculty governance and committees, and in other

service activities at the national, state, and local level. The service contribution during the probationary period of assistant professors is limited by design. The candidate's dossier should contain indicators of commitment to future service.

Teaching, research, and service in all areas of study should be conducted according to high standards of professional ethical conduct, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics.

(<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/statementonprofessionalethics.htm>).

Criteria for promotion to the rank of associate professor specific to each area list as follows:

C1a. Music Education Faculty

Creative and scholarly contributions in music education take various forms. Accomplishment may be evidenced through published books, articles in journals, scholarly presentations, musical performances, and published compositions and arrangements. Products which receive dissemination nationally or internationally are expected, and products that are peer reviewed are given the most credit. Quality is valued more than quantity, though a record of steady productivity is important. Consideration is given to work in progress.

A significant record of service, including outreach, to the profession at the local, state, and national level is important, as is service to the music education area, school, college, and university. Leadership at the national level is preferred. Conducting professional development workshops and clinics, consulting, and adjudicating events are considered service activities.

C1b. Musicology and Music Theory Faculty

Research is an essential purpose of these disciplines. Research leads to better teaching, to innovation in curricula, and to professional growth of the faculty, in addition to the development and application of scholarly knowledge. In the evaluation of research, special emphasis is placed on quality and originality. Consideration is given to work in progress. Evidence must indicate that the research accomplishments of the candidate are significant contributions to scholarship, recognized nationally or internationally.

Such evidence may include:

Publications: The kind, scope, and quality of publications are considered. Publications based on original research have primary importance as evidence of scholarly achievement. These typically consist of books, monographs, critical editions, articles, distributed digital resources and in some cases, reviews. Articles and reviews appearing in refereed publications receive greater weight than those appearing elsewhere. Textbooks and other instructional tools are judged as scholarly works to the extent that they present new ideas or incorporate the results of scholarly research.

Presentations and performance activities: presentations of papers and participation in sections, panels, and symposia at professional meetings are considered in the evaluation of the candidate's scholarly achievement, as are musical performance activities informed by the

candidate's scholarly research. Invited presentations to academic or professional organizations receive special consideration.

Group research projects: Consideration is given to the candidate's role in group-research projects at the local, national, and international level.

C1c. Composition Faculty

Candidates' work in composition is evaluated with respect to its originality, quality, and quantity. Quality indicators include commissions and performances from noted artists and ensembles; public performances in important venues; radio and television broadcasts; performances at juried conferences and festivals; artist residencies; election to national office in important professional organizations; grants from state, national and international arts organizations; and publication of books and articles about the candidate's works.

C1d. Performance Faculty

Music performance and its allied fields of study and activity are considered as research and scholarship by the School of Music, equivalent in stature to research and scholarly activities in the academic areas of the school.

Members of the performance faculty are expected to maintain an active creative/scholarly profile. Most of this activity will take the form of public performance, both at OSU and in other significant venues. Faculty members are expected to present a range of repertoire that highlights their personal musical strengths while enhancing exposure to diverse musical works.

Examples of creative activity and scholarship in the Performance Area might involve various combinations of the following, listed without hierarchy:

- Performances in solo recital and/or chamber music
- Professional engagements with orchestras, wind bands, opera companies, choral and/or vocal ensembles, or jazz ensembles
- Professional engagements as an ensemble performer with orchestras, wind bands, opera companies, choral and/or vocal ensembles, or jazz ensembles
- Solo performances that are recorded, reviewed, and/or broadcast
- Scholarly writing that leads to publication of books and/or articles related to pedagogy, literature, history, theory, performance practice, acoustics, anatomy and physiology, performer's wellness, etc.
- Lecture/demonstrations, adjudications, master classes
- Engagements as conductor, opera director, or other musical preparation staff

The quality of work accomplished, the stature of venues, and the significance of collaborating artists and professional music organizations are essential factors in evaluating a candidate's creative activity and scholarship.

Faculty members in conducting are expected to engage in sustained creative activity and/or scholarship that may include, but is not limited to, various combinations of the following (listed without hierarchy):

- Invited performance by an OSU ensemble at a regional, national, or international venue
- Performance or recording with a regional, national or international organization
- Conducting, guest-conducting, or performance in collaboration with a national large ensemble or chamber group
- Presentation or performance at a significant national or international conference
- Conducting an ensemble or collaborative performance for a recording on a label with high visibility and reviews
- Administration and/or artistic direction of a symposium, music festival, or other significant event
- Invited clinics, master classes, adjudications, or workshops at a significant regional, national or international venue
- Publication of a book
- Publication of an article in a journal
- A college or university or professional award for scholarship, creative research, or performance excellence
- A regional, national, or international competition prize or award
- Receipt of a School of Music or University award
- Well documented evidence of the continuing impact of creative and scholarly works, e.g., reviews, citations, reports etc.

Criteria for the evaluation of teaching in the Performance Area may include: student performance in juries, solo, and ensemble performances; notable achievements of former students in performance and employment; the candidate's accomplishments in recruiting, retention, and career development of outstanding students; peer reviews, and student evaluation of teaching (SEI).

The School recognizes that the evaluation of teaching should take into account both the variability of teaching loads in the studio and classroom, as well as the distribution of graduate-to-undergraduate students in the candidate's teaching load.

C2. Promotion to Rank of Professor

Promotion to the rank of professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in teaching; has produced a significant body of artistic achievement in performance, composition, and/or scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated high quality service such as holding elected or appointed office in national professional organizations.

Specific criteria in teaching, artistic achievement and/or scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with added emphasis on sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, before and after tenure, and evidence of an established national and/or international reputation as a leader in the field.

External hires at the associate or full professor level with tenure will demonstrate the same accomplishments in scholarship, teaching and service as persons promoted within the university.

C3. Regional Campus Faculty

The criteria for promotion and tenure of regional campus faculty adhere as closely as is feasible to the spirit of the mission statements of both the regional campus and of the School of Music. The essential basis for promotion and tenure for regional campus faculty is convincing evidence that the candidate has achieved excellence as a teacher, as an artist and/or scholar, and as a provider of effective academic and professional service. Moreover, this evidence should make it reasonable to anticipate that valuable contributions will continue to be made in all these areas relevant to the missions of the school and the university. This expectation is balanced by the understanding that the relative weight of teaching and service is ordinarily greater on regional campuses because the mission of the regional campuses is to provide quality instruction and serve the academic needs of their communities. For that reason, the school recognizes that the greater teaching and service commitments of regional campus faculty require different expectations. Nevertheless, the School of Music expects regional campus faculty members to establish a program of quality scholarship and creative activity. The judgment of whether a particular level of productivity meets the school's standards for tenure and/or promotion will take into consideration the regional campuses' different mission, higher teaching and service expectations, and lesser access to research resources.

D. Procedures

D1. Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates for promotion and tenure or for promotion within the School of Music must adhere to the deadlines for the submission of all materials and are responsible for providing a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier. If external evaluations are required, candidates must submit the appropriate review materials, not the core

dossier, to the director's office in the spring semester prior to the autumn promotion and tenure meeting of the eligible faculty. Candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the director and the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee. 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 director decides whether removal is justified. (See **D6. External Evaluations**)

D2. SOM Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee Responsibilities

In the spring semester, the appropriate promotion and tenure subcommittee receives the names of all faculty members to undergo mandatory review in the next academic year. Shortly thereafter, the chair of the promotion and tenure subcommittee sends a letter copied to the director, notifying the candidate of the purpose of the review, the time schedule, and the date on which the review is to begin, and invites the candidate to submit materials to be evaluated. Faculty seeking non-mandatory reviews follow the procedures described in section VI. B4. of this document.

By the end of spring semester, or soon thereafter, the subcommittee and the candidate select materials and send them to external reviewers. (The subcommittee will wait until the autumn semester to solicit a letter from the area head.) Evaluators outside the university from whom letters are requested must include some persons selected from a list submitted by the candidate and some persons recommended by the director, area head, or the promotion and tenure subcommittee; no more than half of the letters contained in the final dossier should be from persons suggested by the candidate. To achieve this distribution, the promotion and tenure committee solicits a greater number of letters from reviewers selected by its members, the area head, or the director than by reviewers selected by the candidate. All external solicited letters that are received must be included in the dossier.

At the beginning of the autumn semester, the subcommittee will solicit from the eligible faculty letters describing the performance of the candidate. All internal solicited letters will be included in the dossier until it leaves the School of Music.

The subcommittee receives the dossier from the candidate in time for review early in the autumn semester. The subcommittee chair studies all documents, reviews the merits of the candidate, and prepares a summary of this review which, together with the candidate's dossier, including the area head's evaluation, is presented to the eligible faculty for their consideration at a meeting specially convened for this purpose. The subcommittee does not offer a specific recommendation to the faculty for action. Prior to the meeting date, copies of the dossier are made available to the eligible faculty for study. During the meeting, the eligible faculty reviews and discusses and votes on the case. A positive vote of at least 67% of the eligible faculty in attendance at the meeting constitutes a positive faculty recommendation. Only those in attendance may participate in the discussion or the vote; abstentions are removed from the total voting contingent.

It is recognized that the meeting of eligible faculty is a critical component of the review process. Attendance at this meeting is, therefore, considered a major responsibility of the eligible faculty and proxy votes are not admissible. Eligible faculty members who cannot attend the meeting are expected to notify the director as soon as possible after receiving announcement of the meeting date. In cases where a significant number of faculty members cannot attend, the director will, if practicable, reschedule the meeting to a more favorable time.

After the meeting, the chair of the promotion and tenure subcommittee sends the director the dossier, the subcommittee's letter summarizing the discussion and the vote of the eligible faculty. A faculty member with duties in more than one area must be reviewed by an appropriately constituted subcommittee selected by the director.

D3. Guidelines for the Subcommittee

D3a. Examination of Evidence

The committee should recognize that one of the strengths of the school is the diversity of interests and accomplishments of its faculty. This recognition includes the awareness that, among other things, 1) some areas of creative and scholarly research enjoy more support from extramural funding agencies than do others, 2) collaborative work, including that which crosses disciplinary boundaries, is acceptable and, in some research areas, to be recommended, and 3) there may be different expectations of the relative proportions of teaching, research, and service from one candidate to another.

D3b. Conduct of the Review

Although the essential role of the subcommittee lies in synthesis and evaluation, the tenor of the relationship of subcommittee to candidate should nevertheless be collegial rather than adversarial. The subcommittee should take an active role in the preparation of the candidate's dossier, guiding the candidate in the compilation, organization, and presentation of materials. The ultimate responsibility for the dossier nonetheless remains with the candidate.

It is incumbent upon the subcommittee to solicit and consider evaluations from the candidate's peers in the field from outside the university. A "peer" is understood to be someone in the area of specialty and in a position to judge the candidate's work. It is appropriate for evaluators to consider the standing of the candidate relative to others in the field.

Meaningful evaluation requires a balanced review. The provost expects that both strengths and weaknesses of a candidate be presented in external letters of evaluation and in letters prepared by administrators and promotion and tenure committees. It should be understood that any mention of weaknesses will not inevitably lead to a negative recommendation. Rather, lack of comment on weaknesses that are nonetheless evident in the core dossier may raise questions regarding the credibility of evaluators.

It is the subcommittee's obligation to convey to the college and university levels the value of the candidate's teaching and scholarship, especially when, as so often happens in music, the most significant activities are foreign to the experience of reviewers outside the field.

D4. Responsibilities of the SOM Eligible Faculty and Peer Reviews

Faculty colleagues have the basic responsibility for evaluation of academic accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research, and service for candidates for promotion or promotion and tenure. This evaluation is to be based on the core of the dossier and supporting material, as well as on direct knowledge of the candidate's teaching, service, and research or performance. Eligible faculty meet to review each candidate's case in open discussion and, by vote, render a favorable or unfavorable recommendation.

To facilitate the peer-review process, two-member teams conduct formal reviews of teaching by evaluating a broad range of evidence associated with the teaching assignment of the candidate. This evidence must include direct observation, and may involve juries, student recitals, studio or classroom visits, and the evaluation of syllabi and other teaching materials. These visits may be pre-arranged or spontaneous. The resulting written evaluation of teaching is addressed to the area head, copied to the candidate, and placed in the candidate's file in the director's office for use by the area head, promotion and tenure committee, and director in drafting review letters. The two-member teams are chosen jointly by the candidate and the area head and may include the area head, and if need be, one member from another area. If an area head is a candidate, the director participates in the choice. The candidate may review his/her personnel file and may place in that file a response to the peer evaluation.

For probationary faculty, formal peer-review of teaching is required at least once a year, and more often if deemed necessary by the area head and director. For tenured faculty seeking promotion, at least two formal peer-evaluations of teaching are required before making application. These formal evaluations are to date from separate academic years, not including the year of the review for promotion. Tenured faculty requesting peer-evaluation of teaching must notify the director, in writing, by the announced deadline early in autumn semester.

D5 Responsibilities of the Director

At the time of appointment, the director furnishes probationary faculty with a copy of the POA and APT. If these documents are revised during the probationary period, probationary faculty will be furnished with copies of the revisions.

Early in the spring semester prior to the year of review, the director compiles the list of individuals to be reviewed for tenure or promotion. This list includes three subsets, 1) tenured faculty members seeking promotion, 2) probationary faculty under mandatory review (4th and 6th year tenure reviews) and probationary faculty seeking early promotion, and 3) probationary faculty under 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 5th year reviews. Groups 1 and 2 will be reviewed in the autumn semester, and Group 3 will be reviewed in the spring semester. Upon the director's invitation to those seeking promotion or early promotion, individuals must indicate their intention in writing.

After appointing the promotion and tenure subcommittees, the director arranges a first meeting of all those who will serve and conveys to them the names of candidates to be reviewed.

For Groups 1 and 2, the director receives the subcommittee's report and the vote of the eligible faculty, together with each candidate's dossier. The director then prepares a report on each candidate to be forwarded to the dean of the college, along with the portion of the dossier required by the provost and the report and vote of the faculty. The director's report conveys his/her recommendation and the considerations leading thereto. When not in agreement with the judgment of the eligible faculty, the director meets with the five-member subcommittee to explain the basis of the disagreement before forwarding the reports. The director also sends a letter to the dean, explaining the reasons for the divergent recommendation, and copies the letter to the area head and to the committee.

For Group 3, the director's letter is used in-house only and is provided as an evaluation of the probationary candidate as informed by the review of the subcommittee and the eligible faculty.

This letter is shared with the candidate after a brief interval following the promotion and tenure meeting in the spring and is placed in the personnel file of the probationary faculty member.

The director's participation in the promotion and tenure review process should be limited to answering questions raised by the committee and to suggesting additional issues or questions for consideration as needed.

The director informs the candidate, in writing, when the report of the promotion and tenure committee and the director's letter have been completed, and of the availability of these documents for consultation. The candidate may request a copy of these documents, and will be given ten days after receiving notification of the review's completion in which to provide such written responses as he/she may wish included in the dossier. The promotion and tenure subcommittee and director may provide written responses to the candidate's comments, and these responses will also be included in the dossier. Only one set of written comments on the SOM level is permitted. The director informs the candidate of subsequent steps to be taken in the review process. When a final decision has been reached, the director informs the candidate of that decision. If the decision is negative, the director provides information on appeal procedures. If the negative decision also involves non-renewal of appointment, then the director specifies the appropriate termination date of appointment.

D5a. Responsibilities of the Area Head

For probationary faculty under 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 5th year reviews, the area head shall review the candidate's dossier, including faculty activity reports, statements of goals, updated curriculum vitae, peer reviews, and previous letters of evaluation, provide a letter of evaluation, and present a summary of the candidate's case to the eligible faculty at the spring promotion and tenure meeting.

After reviewing the complete dossier for all other probationary faculty under 4th and 6th year reviews, and for all being considered for promotion, the area head forwards to the promotion and tenure subcommittee a letter of evaluation. These duties are performed even if the area head does not hold a rank higher than that of the candidate being reviewed.

The area head should be consulted in the preparation of candidate dossiers, by the candidate, the promotion and tenure subcommittee, and by the eligible faculty. In most cases, the area head will prove to be an accurate source of information and can provide correction or clarification where warranted.

D5b. Responsibilities for Regional Campus Deans/Directors

The dean/director initiates a review by the regional campus faculty. The dean/director then forwards the report of this review, and a recommendation to the Director of the School of Music, for inclusion in the candidate's dossier and for the use of the school's promotion and tenure committee. From this point, the review follows the same course as all promotion and tenure reviews, with two exceptions: 1) the SOM director sends to the dean/director copies of the peer evaluations, of the promotion and tenure committee's report (containing the eligible faculty's vote and assessment of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses), and of the director's recommendations; and 2) if the recommendations of the regional campus dean/director and the SOM director differ, the dean consults with both before making a recommendation.

D6. External Evaluations

External evaluations of scholarship and creative activity are obtained for all promotion reviews in which research and/or teaching must be assessed. These include all tenure track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews; external evaluations of research and scholarly activity are not obtained for associated faculty.

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 research, or other creative work, 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. The SOM will only solicit evaluations from tenured professors at institutions comparable to The Ohio State University. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.

A credible and useful evaluation 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. Since the SOM cannot control who agrees to write or the usefulness of the letters received, at least twice as many letters are sought as are required, and they are solicited no later than the end of the spring semester prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

As described above, the promotion and tenure subcommittee, the director, and the candidate assemble a list of potential evaluators. 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/rules/university-rules.html>) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor the SOM requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format, provided at <http://oaa.osu.edu/sampledocuments.html>, for letters requesting external evaluations.

Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit external evaluations or initiate contact in any way with external evaluators for any purpose related to the promotion review. If an external evaluator should initiate contact with the candidate regarding the review, the candidate must inform the evaluator that such communication is inappropriate and report the occurrence to the director, 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 director's written evaluations or brought to the attention of the Office of Academic Affairs for advice.

E. Documentation (see Section C1.)

Faculty members under review must follow the promotion and tenure dossier outline prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs to record their performance for annual reviews and for salary determination. It is the candidate's responsibility to submit all requested materials.

E1. Evaluation of Teaching

Annual evaluation of teaching for all faculty members in the School of Music is an important element of formal evaluative processes, including promotion and tenure and merit pay determinations. To this end, all areas of the School employ the university's online Student Evaluation of Teaching (SEI) instrument; however use of this standardized tool is not exclusive and the SOM does not rely solely on SEI responses to courses and instruction in their assessment of the quality of a faculty member's teaching. [See: *Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook* Volume 1, 1.4.6.2 Student evaluation.] Formal student feedback represents only one among several categories of teaching evaluation in the School. Other evaluative tools and categories include:

Syllabi, web pages, and other course materials.

Self-assessment and statement of plans and goals.

Peer evaluation of classroom and studio teaching.

Faculty mentor reports.

Customized evaluation instruments such as *Feedback on Your Instruction*, offered by The Center for the Advancement of Teaching.

The success of current and former graduate students and post-docs.

Pedagogical materials adopted by other faculty.

Demonstration of teaching expertise at other venues.

Teaching awards or other recognitions.

The institution of new courses.

Advising and mentoring undergraduate and graduate students.

Recruitment and retention of outstanding students.

The School recognizes that all of these tools and modes of assessment may not apply to every faculty member in any given year. Inclusion of several evaluative criteria does indicate, however, that no single form of evaluation will take precedence over another.

E2. Evaluation of Scholarly and Creative Activity

The spectrum of creative activity in the school reflects the breadth and richness of the discipline of music, and definitions of scholarship across the performance, composition, musicology, and music education areas are correspondingly diverse. The definition and standards for superior attainment in scholarship and/or creative/artistic endeavor notwithstanding, the faculty member must demonstrate a record of sustained growth in her/his area of specialization.

E3. Evaluation of Service

Excellence in faculty service involves contributions directed to both the institution and the profession. Such contributions are exemplified by, but not limited to

Membership on school, college, and university committees.

Membership and offices held in professional organizations.

Service on editorial boards, committees of professional organizations, and as evaluator of performances, composition, and scholarship.

Service to university, student, and community organizations through musicianship or musical scholarship.

Service to university, student, and community organizations in extra-musical ways.

Service as an administrator at area, school, college, or university levels. While the particular variety of service contributions will differ from one faculty member to the next, the effective governance of the school requires that all faculty members accept responsibility for an equitable share of the service load.

VII. Appeals

The procedures for appeals are outlined in Faculty Rules 3335-5-05 and 3335-6-05. Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>). Disagreement with a negative decision is not grounds for appeal. In pursuing an appeal, the faculty member is required to document the failure of one or more parties to the review process to follow written policies and procedures.