



Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Document
Department of Speech and Hearing Science
15 April 2014

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. Clinical Faculty	4
3. Research Faculty	5
4. Conflict of Interest	5
5. Minimum Composition	5
B. Quorum	5
C. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty	5
1. Appointment.....	6
2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion and Contract Renewal.....	6
IV. APPOINTMENTS.....	6
A. Criteria	6
1. Tenure-track Faculty	6
2. Clinical Faculty	7
3. Research Faculty	8
4. Associated Faculty	8
5. Courtesy Appointments.....	9
B. Procedures.....	9
1. Tenure-track Faculty	9
2. Clinical Faculty	11
3. Research Faculty	11
4. Transfer from the Tenure-track.....	11
5. Associated Faculty	11
6. Courtesy Appointments.....	11
V. ANNUAL REVIEWS	12
A. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty.....	12
B. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty – Fourth Year Reviews.....	13
C. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty – Extension of Time from Probationary Period	13
D. Tenured Faculty.....	13
E. Clinical Faculty	14
F. Research Faculty	14
G. Associated Faculty	15
VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER AWARDS	15
A. Criteria.....	15
B. Procedures.....	15
C. Documentation	16

1. Teaching.....	16
2. Scholarship.....	16
3. Service.....	16
VII. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION	16
A. Criteria.....	17
1. Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure	17
2. Promotion to Professor.....	17
3. Promotion of Clinical Faculty	18
4. Promotion of Research Faculty	18
B. Procedures.....	18
1. Candidate Responsibilities	19
2. Eligible Faculty Responsibilities.....	19
3. Department Chair Responsibilities.....	20
4. External Evaluations	21
C. Documentation	22
1. General.....	22
2. Teaching.....	22
3. Research and Creative Work.....	23
4. Service.....	23
VIII. APPEALS.....	23
IX. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS.....	24
X. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING	24
A Student Evaluation of Teaching	24

B.

I. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules>); 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/policiesprocedureshandbook.html>); and other policies and procedures of the College of Arts and Sciences and the University to which the Department and its faculty are subject. 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 executive Dean of the College and the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University 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 executive Dean of the College and the Executive Vice President and Provost accept the mission and criteria of the Department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating continuing faculty and candidates for positions in relation to its mission and criteria.

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

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

II. DEPARTMENT MISSION

The Ohio State University aspires to be among the world's truly great universities—advancing the well-being of the people of Ohio and the global community through the creation and dissemination of knowledge. Four core elements are seen as critical components in terms of achieving the university's goal: Becoming a national leader in the quality of our academic programs; becoming universally recognized for the quality of the learning experience we offer our students; creating an environment that truly values and is enriched by diversity; and expanding the land-grant mission to address our society's most compelling needs. The Department of Speech and Hearing Science is part of the Division of Social and Behavioral Sciences which, in turn, is part of the College of Arts and Sciences. The Department's activities are thus guided by its own mission statement as well as those of the Division and the College.

The mission of the College of Arts and Sciences is to achieve excellence in research and other creative endeavors, teaching, and service. Excellence in research and scholarship can be measured by attainment of national and international recognition, as evidenced by publications, citations, external funding, presentations, performances, creation of original art, awards, and honors. Excellence in teaching can be measured by the attainment of local, national, and international recognition, as evidenced by pedagogical publications, awards, honors, and critical student outcomes. Excellence in service involves making available a high level of professional expertise, engagement, and experience to the public, including the university, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, and the nation, as well as to scholarly professional organizations.

The mission of the Division of Social and Behavioral Sciences is to achieve excellence in research, teaching, and service. Excellence in research means attainment of international recognition, as evidenced by comparative

rankings, external funding, awards, and honors in both basic and applied research in the social and behavioral sciences. Excellence in teaching means providing to all students the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning in the social and behavioral sciences and providing to the most capable and motivated students an enhanced learning experience. Excellence in service means making available a high level of professional expertise and experience to the public including the University, Columbus community, State of Ohio, and the nation, as well as to professional organizations.

The mission of the Department of Speech and Hearing Science is to serve and advocate for persons affected by communication disorders through advancing knowledge of normal and disordered communications and promoting excellence by educating leaders in speech and language pathology and audiology. The Department's Vision is to strive to be universally recognized and respected for diversity, innovation and inspiration in our synthesis of science and practice

The programs of the Department encompass the research, education and clinical service activities required in scholarly pursuits in the areas of speech-language pathology, audiology, speech science and hearing science. The Department maintains an undergraduate major and as well as two professional graduate programs (a MA program in speech-language pathology and AuD program in audiology) and a PhD program. The faculty of the Department will consist of individuals whose research interests and expertise maintain an appropriate balance among the areas of the discipline. The Department seeks continuous improvement in all areas of research, instruction, and service to the University and to our discipline.

III. DEFINITIONS

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

1. Tenure-track Faculty

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of tenure-track faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty whose tenure resides in the Department. For an appointment at senior rank, a second vote is taken by the faculty members eligible to vote on the rank under consideration.

The eligible faculty for senior rank of new appointments, reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion reviews of tenure-track faculty consists of all tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in the Department excluding the Department Chair, the Dean of the College and assistant and associate deans of the college, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President.

For tenure reviews of probationary professors, eligible faculty are tenured professors whose tenure resides in the Department excluding the Department Chair, the executive Dean of the College and assistant and associate deans of the college, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President.

2. Clinical Faculty

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of clinical faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty whose tenure resides in the Department and all clinical faculty whose primary appointment is in the Department. For an appointment at senior rank, a second vote is taken by the faculty members eligible to vote on the rank under consideration.

The eligible faculty for reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion of clinical faculty consists of all tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in the Department and all non-probationary clinical faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose primary appointment is in the Department excluding the Department Chair, the executive Dean of the College and assistant and associate deans of the college, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President

3. Research Faculty

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of research faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty whose tenure resides in the department, all clinical faculty whose primary appointment is in the department, and all research faculty whose primary appointment is in the department. For an appointment at senior rank, a second vote is taken by the faculty members eligible to vote on the rank under consideration.

The eligible faculty for senior rank of new appointments, reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of research faculty consists of all tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in the department, all non-probationary clinical faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose primary appointment is in the department, and all non-probationary research faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose primary appointment is in the department excluding the department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

4. 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 at least 50% of the candidate's published work since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of that candidate.

5. 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 of the College, 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 of absence. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the Department Chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

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.

1. Appointment

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

2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast are positive.

IV. APPOINTMENTS

A. Criteria

The Department of Speech and Hearing Science is committed to making only those faculty appointments that enhance or have the strong potential to enhance the quality of the Department. Faculty appointments are to be made that are consistent with the stated mission of the Department and must serve to help the University reach its stated mission which is “to serve and advocate for persons affected by communication disorders through advancing knowledge of normal and disordered communications and promoting excellence by educating leaders in speech and language pathology and audiology.”

Important considerations include the individual's record to date in teaching, scholarship and service; the potential for professional growth in each of these areas; and the potential for interacting with colleagues and students in a way that will enhance their academic work and attract other outstanding faculty and students to the Department. No offer will be extended in the event that the search process does not yield one or more candidates who would enhance the quality of the Department. The search is either cancelled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

1. Tenure-track faculty

Appointment decisions for tenure-track faculty will be based on criteria that reflect strong potential to attain tenure and advancement through the faculty ranks.

a. Instructor

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

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the Department's eligible faculty, the Department Chair, the executive Dean of the College, 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 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

An earned terminal degree in speech and hearing science or a related field (recognizing that speech and hearing science is an area of scholarship that is inherently multi- and interdisciplinary in nature) is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the Department and the profession is highly desirable. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor

is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Promotion and Tenure Committee determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted. A probationary appointment may be terminated at any time subject to the notice provisions of rule 3335-6-03 of the Administrative Code and the provisions of paragraphs (G), (H), and (I) of this rule. *Probationary faculty members will be informed no later than the end of the year in which their mandatory review for tenure takes place as to whether tenure will be granted by the beginning of the following year. If tenure is not granted, a one- year terminal year of employment is offered (Rule 3335-6-03 (B)(3)).*

c. Associate Professor and Professor

Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the Department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to these ranks. These criteria include an earned doctorate in speech and hearing science or a related field, a substantial record of scholarly achievement in one or more of the Department's program specialty areas, and evidence of a national reputation as a scholar with clear potential to attain (Associate Professor) or show evidence of (Professor) international visibility. There must be a high likelihood of continued and significant scholarly contributions and a judgment that the addition of the candidate will improve the level of scholarship of the Department. Additionally, there must be evidence that the applicant has been an effective teacher and has provided substantial service to the Department, the University and the profession. Appointment at a senior rank normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at a senior rank is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

2. Clinical Faculty

Appointment of clinical faculty entails a three-, four- or five-year contract. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to clinical faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the Department wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see Faculty Rule 3335-7 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>).

Clinical faculty members are scholars whose primary contributions are to the professional programs of audiology and/or speech-language pathology. Individuals appointed to a clinical faculty position might have any of a variety of educational degrees. Within the field of speech and hearing science, there are a number of possible degrees that might be appropriate for a clinical faculty member. For speech-language pathology, the minimum required degree for clinical practice in the U.S. is a master's degree, and thus it is possible that the degree of a clinical-track faculty member in that area might be MA, MS, MEd, EdD or PhD, depending on the program from which he/she graduated. For audiology, a practicing audiologist might have a degree of MA, MS, MEd, EdD, AuD or PhD, again depending on the program from which he/she graduated. Where appropriate, the individual may also be required to hold clinical certification from a national association and/or licensure at the state level.

3. Research Faculty

Appointment of research faculty entails one- to five-year contracts. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to research faculty. There is also no

presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the Department wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see Faculty Rule 3335-7 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/rules7/>).

Research faculty members are researchers and shall be engaged in research related to the mission and goals of the academic unit. Minimum research criteria for research faculty appointments are similar to those for main campus tenure-track faculty appointments of equivalent ranks. These criteria also will serve as a basis for evaluating a research-track faculty member who desires promotion.

4. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a couple 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.

a. Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor

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

b. Lecturer

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

c. Senior Lecturer

Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a doctorate in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction; or a Master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience with documentation of high quality. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The initial appointment for a senior lecturer should generally not exceed one year.

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.

e. Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor

Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not

eligible for tenure or promotion. They may not be reappointed for more than three consecutive years at 100% FTE.

5. Courtesy Appointment for Faculty

Occasionally the active academic involvement in the Department by a tenure-track, clinical, or research faculty member from another department at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in this Department. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course from time to time, or a combination of these. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

B. Procedures

See the Faculty Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](http://oaa.osu.edu/policiesprocedureshandbook.html) (<http://oaa.osu.edu/policiesprocedureshandbook.html>) for information on the following topics:

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

1. Tenure-track Faculty

- a. A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must be consistent with the university policies set forth in the most recent update of [A Guide to Effective Searches](http://www.hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf) (www.hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf).
- b. The Dean of the College provides approval for the Department to commence a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise.
- c. The recruitment of new tenure-track faculty must be based on a clear and sound plan for the programmatic future of the Department and on a realistic determination of the availability of resources to support a new appointment. The Chair has the primary responsibility for the recruitment of all new academic personnel. He or she is assisted in recruiting activities by faculty search committees and the faculty as a whole. All consultation with and votes by the eligible Faculty are advisory to the Chair. All appointments in the Department are made upon the recommendation of the Chair and the approval of the Executive Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Additionally, appointments at a senior rank, with or without tenure in the case of tenure-track faculty, or with prior service credit, require prior approval by the executive Dean of the College and the Office of Academic Affairs. Potential appointment of a foreign national who lacks permanent residency must be discussed with the Office of International Affairs.
- e. The general disciplinary sub area of the new position will be based on the future programmatic needs of the Department and will be sensitive to the current distribution of expertise within the Department faculty in terms of speech-language pathology, speech-language science, audiology, and hearing science and current student interest and academic goals of Department.
- f. The major faculty mechanism for recruiting is the Search Committee. The Search Committee and the Search Committee Chair shall be named by the Chair, with the exception of the Diversity Advocate. One member of the Search Committee shall be designed (by the chair of the Search Committee) as the Diversity Advocate. The Department Chair shall not serve as a member of the Search Committee.
- g. The first duty of the Search Committee is to create a position description including specific details as to qualifications, deadlines, and materials to be submitted by the applicants. The Search

Committee will also develop a position announcement. Both the internal Position Vacancy Notice and external advertising should provide for the maximum flexibility in hiring, because any offers extended must be consistent with the advertising.

- h. The Search Committee will also be responsible for identifying the appropriate venues in which the position should be advertised (for example, ASHA magazine, appropriate web sites and e-mail server groups, personal networking, and *The Chronicle of Higher Education*). Special effort will be made to advertise in a range of venues that may attract applications from a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates. Searches for tenure-track faculty will be posted in the Office of Human Resources “green sheet.” The Search Committee will make use of the University’s *Guide to Effective Searches*.
- i. The Diversity Advocate will have the special responsibility for assuring that the search is conducted according to relevant University, College and Department rules, that all procedures are carried out in a professional manner, and that all proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions about members of underrepresented groups that could bias the evaluation of a candidate. The Search Committee shall make every effort to solicit applications from diverse candidates for all positions.
- j. The committee will review and evaluate all candidates and recommend to the Chair those most notable in accomplishment and consistent with the published description. The Chair will take the recommendations before the faculty to assist in final decision about who to invite for interview and ultimately to rank order applicants for a position offer. Before this faculty meeting, the Search Committee will make available at least one week ahead of time the entire set of applications so that any member of the faculty may review them beforehand.
- k. The Search Committee will, if desired by the Department Chair, assume responsibility for scheduling the interviews and making local arrangements. The top candidates identified will be invited into the Department for an interview. Every faculty member and appropriate members of the clinical staff shall participate in these interviews. The candidate will also be required to give a presentation on some aspect of his/her research.
- l. After all candidates have completed formal visits, the eligible faculty will meet to discuss each candidate. The Chair of the Department can call for a special meeting to discuss one or more candidates following any visit. Through the process of voting by secret ballot, the eligible faculty will make recommendations to the Chair following the completion of the search process. It is the responsibility of the faculty to attend, participate, and vote on every appointment.
- m. On receipt of the recommendation, the Chair may recommend to the executive Dean of the College regarding making an offer to a particular candidate, resuming the search or canceling the search. If the Chair’s recommendation is contrary to the recommendation of the faculty, the Chair will consult with that body before making a final decision. In hiring faculty into probationary tenure-track positions, the Department should be convinced that the candidate—given his or her training and record to date—will successfully meet the Department’s, the College’s, and the University’s standards for tenure by the end of the probationary period.
- n. Negotiation with a particular candidate will not commence without the approval of the executive Dean of the College. Letters of offer require the prior approval of the and the executive Dean of the College and/or their designees and offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs. These negotiations and all letters of offer must follow the guidelines set by the College, the Office of Academic Affairs, and—in the case of appointment of foreign nationals—the Office of International Affairs.
- o. Candidates for prior service credit must have accomplishments that inspire confidence that the candidate’s record will warrant a positive review for promotion and tenure at the end of the shortened probationary period. Prior service credit will not be given unless the candidate demands it and even in those circumstances, the Department will discourage the candidate’s request.

2. Clinical Faculty

In general, the process for hiring clinical faculty is the same as that outlined for tenure-track faculty except that teaching experience with regard to clinical skills and clinical education, clinical service, and grantsmanship/development with regard to the professional audiology or speech-language

pathology program is paramount in terms of hiring criteria. Exceptions to a national search only require approval by the executive dean.

3. Research Faculty

In general, the process for hiring research faculty is the same as that outlined for tenure-track faculty. Exceptions to a national search only require approval by the executive dean.

4. Transfer from the Tenure-track

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a clinical or research appointment if appropriate circumstances exist. Tenure is lost upon transfer, and transfers must be approved by the department chair, the college dean, and the executive vice president and provost.

The request for transfer must be initiated by the faculty member in writing and must state clearly how the individual's career goals and activities have changed.

Transfers from a clinical appointment and from a research appointment to the tenure-track are not permitted. Clinical faculty members and research faculty members may apply for tenure-track positions and compete in regular national searches for such positions.

5. Associated Faculty

Appointment of associated faculty members will be initiated when the Chair determines that the potential contribution of the appointee to the academic work of the Department as well as the needs of the Department justifies such an appointment. The Chair will review the curriculum vitae and associated documents of the potential appointee and will consult with the faculty (and, when appropriate, the clinical staff) before initiating the appointment. Faculty members or clinical staff members may request that such an appointment be initiated but must provide a written rationale for the appointment. Adjunct appointments require the prior approval of the College before a formal offer can be extended.

Associated faculty appointments may be up to three years at a time. Renewals will be based on an evaluation of the appointee's contribution to the Department during the past year by the Chair. If the Chair determines that the appointee is not making significant and substantive contributions to the Department, following consultation with the faculty (and, when appropriate, the clinical staff) the Chair may decide to not renew the appointment.

6. Courtesy Appointments

Occasionally the active academic involvement in this Department by a tenure-track, research or clinical faculty member from another department at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in this Department. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course from time to time, 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 will be initiated when the Chair determines that the potential contribution of the appointee to the academic work of the Department as well as the needs of the Department justifies such an appointment. The Chair will review the curriculum vitae and associated documents of the potential appointee and will consult with the faculty (and, when appropriate, the clinical staff) before making the initial appointment. Faculty members or clinical staff members may request that such an appointment be initiated but must provide a written rationale supporting the appointment.

Although courtesy appointments do not require annual renewal, the Chair will monitor the performance of and contributions by each appointee on a continuing basis. If the Chair determines that

an appointee is not making a significant contribution to the Department, the Chair will consult the faculty (and, when appropriate, the clinical staff) and may decide to terminate the courtesy appointment.

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>).

The annual reviews of every faculty member are based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and service as set forth in the Department's policy on faculty duties and responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.

The documentation required for the annual performance review of every faculty member is described under Merit Salary Increases below. This material must be submitted to the Department Chair no later than the final day of autumn semester classes.

The Department Chair is required (per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35) to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

The general policy of the Department in evaluating faculty performance is as follows: In judging research and publications, quality shall be the primary concern. Quantity of scholarly production is important but secondary to quality. In the area of teaching, it is recognized that popularity is a potentially misleading criterion. In view of the fact that what is taught (and the amount of information that students retain) is as important as how it is taught, the evaluating committees and the Chair shall place emphasis on scholarship in their appraisal of teaching performance.

A. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

1. At the time of appointment, probationary faculty members shall be provided with all pertinent documents detailing tenure initiating unit, college, and university promotion and tenure policies and criteria. If these documents are revised during the probationary period, probationary faculty members shall be provided with copies of the revised documents.
2. An annual review of probationary tenure-track faculty will be done by the Department's Committee of the Eligible Faculty and by the Department Chair. This annual review will be completed during the Spring semester or as specified by the College or the Office of Academic Affairs. The Chair will provide the appropriate timetable for submission of all materials.
3. The Chair will attend the meeting to preside over the meeting, to provide any additional information requested and to participate in discussions. However, the Chair will not participate in any vote taken during the meeting. Votes taken during the meeting will be done by secret ballot. Members of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty who are absent from the meeting may provide short comments regarding his or her evaluation of the untenured faculty members in the areas of research, teaching, and service to the Department Chair who will read them during the meeting. Proxy votes from absent committee members will not be solicited nor accepted.
4. Prior to the meeting, the Department Chair will appoint a senior faculty member to be the reporter for the meeting. Following this meeting, the reporter will provide to the Department Chair a written report of the results of the review for each untenured faculty member. This reporter will solicit comments and/or suggestions from other members of the committee in preparing an accurate and balanced report. This report will provide an evaluation (including both strengths and weaknesses) of the untenured faculty member in terms of research, teaching, and service and any recommendations in terms of future performance.
5. After receiving this review, the Department Chair will provide his or her own written evaluation for each untenured faculty member. If there are differences between the assessment of the Department Chair and the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the Department Chair will explain to the members of the Committee the reasons for his or her departure from their evaluation

- .6. Copies of these evaluations shall be provided to both the untenured faculty member and to the College Office. The written evaluations provided to the probationary faculty member should be constructive and candid. This review process is a means to be supportive and helpful to untenured faculty but, at the same time, provide a candid and clearly communicated evaluation of that faculty member's performance—especially in terms of those aspects that need improvement if the probationary faculty member is to make acceptable progress toward tenure. The Department Chair and probationary faculty will meet to discuss this annual review.
7. The Department shall not renew a probationary appointment following any annual review in which it is apparent that the probationary faculty member's likelihood of meeting expectations of promotion and tenure is poor. The Department Chair can make a recommendation of non-renewal in any year prior to the beginning of the 6th year. An annual review in the first, second, third, or fifth year that results in a nonrenewal recommendation must have followed fourth year review procedures (described below).

B. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty- Fourth Year Reviews

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluations are optional and the executive Dean of the College (not the Department Chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

External evaluations are only solicited when either the Department Chair or the eligible faculty determine that they are necessary to conduct the Fourth-Year Review. This may occur when the candidate's scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input.

The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

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

C. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty—Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/rules6/ru6-03.html>) 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/policiesprocedureshandbook.html) (<http://oaa.osu.edu/policiesprocedureshandbook.html>).

D. Tenured Faculty

1. During the Spring Semester, the Chair will review each tenured faculty member. This review will be based, in part, on the performance of the faculty member during the past calendar year, the faculty member's performance during the current year, his or her performance during the past several years, and the faculty member's overall contribution to the Department. This review will include an examination of research performance, teaching performance, and service to the Department, the College, the University, and to the discipline of speech and hearing science. All tenured members of the faculty shall be reviewed on an annual basis by the Chair. This review shall serve as a basis for annual salary recommendations, for assisting faculty in developing and carrying out professional plans, and for calling attention to performance problems where they exist. It is expected that all tenured faculty will exhibit substantial strength and continued progress in research, teaching, and service, consistent with the mission of the Department.

3. A review of tenured associate professors will be conducted by the professors every two years. The Committee will provide a report to the Chair (a copy of which goes to the faculty member) providing an evaluation of the faculty member's progress toward promotion to full professor.
3. The Chair will provide a written report of this annual review, summarizing and evaluating performance in terms of research, teaching, and service and providing recommendations for future performance, to each faculty member. A copy of this report will also go into their permanent file. A copy of this annual review will also be sent to the Dean of the College. The Department Chair will meet with each faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals.
4. Upon receiving his or her annual review, a faculty member may respond, in writing, to feedback regarding their performance. A copy of this response will be forwarded to the Dean of the College and a copy will be placed in that faculty member's permanent file. Faculty Rule 3335-3-35-08 states that at the time of their initial appointment and when they receive their annual review, faculty members shall be given notice of their right to review their personnel file maintained by their tenure initiating unit. A member of the faculty may place in his or her primary personnel file a response to any evaluation, comment, or other material contained in the file.

E. Clinical Faculty

The annual review process for clinical probationary and non-probationary faculty is identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty respectively.

In the penultimate contract year of a clinical faculty member's appointment, the Department Chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 must be observed.

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

F. Research Faculty

The annual review process for research probationary and non-probationary faculty is identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty.

In the penultimate contract year of a research faculty member's appointment, the Department Chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If it will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 must be observed.

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty. External letters of evaluation are solicited if the candidate is also being considered for promotion. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

G. Associated Faculty

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. The department chair's recommendation on renewal of the appointment is final. If the recommendation is to renew, the department chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment are reviewed annually by the department chair, or designee. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. No later than October 15 of the final year of the appointment, the chair will decide whether or not to reappoint. The department chair's recommendation on reappointment is final.

VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER AWARDS

A. Criteria

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

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

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

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

B. Procedures

The Department Chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the executive Dean of the College, who may modify these recommendations. Salary increases are formulated in dollar amounts rather than percentage increases, with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the Department Chair divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) and considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate. After merit salary increases have been finalized at the College and University level, the Chair shall inform each faculty member of his or her proposed salary increase.

Faculty members who wish to discuss dissatisfaction with their salary increase with the Department Chair should be prepared to explain how their salary (rather than the increase) is inappropriately low, since increases are solely a means to the end of an optimal distribution of salaries.

C. Documentation

The annual performance review of every faculty member requires that all documentation described below, including the two summary documents, be submitted to the Department Chair no later than the final day of autumn semester classes.

- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place
- updated Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, Volume 3 (<http://oaa.osu.edu/policiesprocedureshandbook.html>)

Any published materials presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or other final form that documents actual publication. An author's manuscript does not document publication.

Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the annual review, as such solicitation places its recipient in an awkward position and produces a result that is unlikely to be candid.

The time period covered by the documentation described below is the previous 36 months (organized by individual years).

1. Teaching

Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught.

Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the Department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in previous section of this document).

Copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed. An accepted but unpublished work submitted for consideration in a given annual review may not be resubmitted after publication for consideration in a future annual review.

Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.

2. Scholarship

Copies of all scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.

Documentation of grants and contracts received.

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

3. Service

Any available documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier.

VII. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION

A. Criteria

The review of candidates for promotion and tenure, the Department shall follow Faculty 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.

1. Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure

- a. According to *Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C)*: *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..*
- b. The Department will establish and exercise high standards for the awarding of tenure since a positive tenure decision has a powerful impact on the quality and future of the Department. Every candidate should be held to a standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. The pattern of performance over the probationary period should yield a high degree of confidence that the candidate will continue to develop professionally in ways relevant to the future of the Department.
- c. This excellence typically will be demonstrated through publications in peer-reviewed journals and books, and research grants. Faculty research will be evaluated annually by the Department's Committee of the Eligible Faculty and the Chair, and will be evaluated in the fourth and sixth years by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.
- d. Excellence in teaching means providing to all students the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning in speech and hearing science. Excellence in teaching is demonstrated through student evaluations, peer reviews of instructional substance (e.g., syllabi, materials and assignments, feedback on assignments and exams) and process (e.g., clarity of speech and visual materials, engagement of students), importance of the courses taught to the Department's graduate and undergraduate programs, and so forth. Attention also is paid to supervision of high quality dissertations, masters and honors theses, and scholarly papers and presentations by students
- e. Excellence in service means making available a high level of professional expertise and experience to the Department, the university, the state of Ohio, and the profession. 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. The most important judgment in the area of service is whether the candidate will achieve excellence in service in the future.
- f. The Department must be able to support that claim that the promotion and tenure of the candidate will improve the overall scholarly quality and standing of the Department. Internal cases for promotion to a higher rank and external hires at that rank should be equally strong and meet the same standards. Internal cases should also be comparable to the quality of external candidates who could be hired, controlling for rank and stage of career.
- g. Excellence in teaching, scholarship, 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 Professor

- a. According to *Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C)*(see: <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/rules6/ru6-02.html>): *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.*
- b. The Department expects an individual ready for promotion to professor to be a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. While the individual seeking promotion should be assessed in relation to assigned responsibilities, exceptional performance in these responsibilities should be required. Internal cases for promotion and external hires at that rank should be equally strong and meet the same standards. Internal cases also should be comparable to the quality of external candidates who could be hired.

- c. A successful candidate for promotion to professor will have achieved national distinction as a scholar based on high-quality productivity and will have an emerging international reputation. The candidate will have demonstrated excellence in teaching as defined as providing to all students the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning in speech and hearing science and providing to the most capable and motivated students an enhanced learning experience. The candidate will also have demonstrated excellence in service having made available a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more publics including the University, the Columbus Community, the State of Ohio, the nation and professional organizations. Internal cases for promotion to a higher rank and external hires at that rank should be equally strong and meet the same standards. Internal cases should also be comparable to the quality of external candidates who could be hired, controlling for rank and stage of career.
3. Promotion of Clinical Faculty
 - a. Promotion to associate clinical professor in the Department requires excellence in teaching and service to the professional programs in either audiology or speech-language pathology. The claim that promotion of the candidate will improve the overall scholarly quality and standing of the Department and program area needs to be supported. Internal cases for promotion and external hires at this rank should be equally strong. Additionally, the teaching and service records of clinical and tenure-track faculty at this rank should be comparable.
 - b. The Department expects an individual ready for promotion to clinical professor to be a role model for less senior clinical-track faculty, for students, and for the profession. Exceptional performance in teaching and mentoring responsibilities is required. Internal cases for promotion and external hires at this rank should be equally strong and meet the same standards. Additionally, the teaching and service records of clinical and tenure-track faculty at this rank should be exceptional and comparable.
 4. Promotion of Research Faculty
 - a. Promotion to associate research professor in the Department requires excellence in scholarship. The claim that promotion of the candidate will improve the overall scholarly quality and standing of the Department and program area needs to be supported. Internal cases for promotion and external hires at this rank should be equally strong. Additionally, the research records of research and tenure-track faculty at this rank should be comparable.
 - b. The Department expects an individual ready for promotion to research professor to be a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. Exceptional performance in research responsibilities is required. Internal cases for promotion and external hires at this rank should be equally strong and meet the same standards. Additionally, the research records of research and tenure-track faculty at this rank should be exceptional and comparable.

B. Procedures

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) 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>). The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty tracks in the department.

1. Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist.

If external evaluations are required 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.)

2. Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the members of the eligible faculty are as follows:

- To review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty
- To consider annually, in 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.
 - 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 (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
 - A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) for one year. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
 - Consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policy, only faculty members who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non-mandatory tenure review. The committee must confirm with the department chair that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident (has a "green card"). Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.
 - 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.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
 - **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.
 - **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair.
 - **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
 - Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
 - Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.
 - Revise the draft analysis of each case following the faculty meeting, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.

- Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure-initiating unit is another department. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.
- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.

3. Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- Where relevant, 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. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.
- **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 adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- 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 eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the eligible faculty 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 eligible faculty and department chair
 - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair
 - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the Department Chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline, except in the case of associated faculty for whom the department chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the Department Chair 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 forward this material, along with the department 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 or promotion reviews, all research appointment contract renewals and promotion reviews, and all adjunct faculty promotion reviews. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for clinical faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations for a clinical faculty member will be made by the Department Chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

A minimum of five credible and useful evaluations must be obtained. A credible and useful evaluation:

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

Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, 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, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, 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/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 this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

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

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

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

C. Documentation

1. General

The promotion and tenure review focuses on the “core dossier” as defined by the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA). This dossier is prepared by the candidate in the format specified by OAA. Candidates will be provided by the Chair and well in advance of the semester during which the formal review will be conducted an outline of all materials required for compliance with OAA guidelines and a list of dates by which all materials and responses are due to the Committee of the Eligible Faculty and/or Chair.

2. Teaching

Documentation for an evaluation of a candidate’s teaching performance includes student ratings and written comments, peer review, indicators of the magnitude of service to the Department’s undergraduate and graduate teaching missions

- a. Student evaluations of an instructor will be obtained using the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) instrument. Evaluations must be conducted for every lecture course and seminar course taught in the Department. Tables of the SEI to be maintained must include full course-by-course SEI summaries (and should include instructor means, college means and university means). Faculty members may use other evaluation instruments in addition to the SEI for their own purposes if they wish, but they cannot serve as a substitute for the SEI. Individual SEI student evaluations will be compared to the college and University mean evaluations. Overall mean scores as well as the response patterns to individual SEI items will be examined during Departmental reviews.
- b. Teaching will also be evaluated on a periodic basis through peer visits to the classes with reports to the Chair concerning the peer-evaluation of teaching conducted.

3. Research and Creative Work

Research will be evaluated in terms of contribution to the relevant fields of science. Scientific merit will be considered the most important factor. Scholarly/scientific publications and grant acquisition are the usual objective criteria used for evaluation. Scientific recognition or leadership in scientific contribution in other forms as deemed appropriate for the faculty position may also be considered. The quality of clinical activities, in addition to clinical research, may be evaluated by assessing the person’s contribution to the professional fields and by assessing the impact it will make on clinical research and applications in the future. Documentation for an evaluation of a candidate’s research performance includes information on the quantity and quality (e.g., journal impact ratings, published reviews of books) of publications, magnitude of candidate’s contributions to all publications, citations, research funding, department, college, university, and national research awards. In addition to this information, internal and external letters of evaluation (as noted above), and the candidate’s publications are examined.

4. Service

Service includes service to the Department, the College, University, Community, State, nation and profession. Service outside the university includes the professional expertise of the faculty member. Internal to the University it includes service to students and student-faculty committees as defined in the Faculty Handbook. Documentation for an evaluation of a candidate’s service activities includes information on service provided to the community, Department, College, University, as well as professional service activities (e.g., editorial and reviewing activities, leadership roles for professional organizations). Additionally, attention is given to any service awards or honors won.

VIII. APPEALS

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.

IX. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (B) (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/>) *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 review.*

X. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) is required in every course offered in this department. The faculty member should encourage a high completion rate by explaining to the class the significance of the evaluation. When a small proportion of the class completes the evaluation, the resulting information has little value either for improving instruction or for performance evaluation.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The Department Chair oversees the Department's peer evaluation of teaching process. It is the Chair's responsibility to ensure that the quality of instruction is monitored at all levels. This section sets forth the college's expectations in order to bring commonality in its P&T process across the departments. Of course, a department may establish additional steps, consistent with the disciplinary needs and departmental POA. Annually the Department Chair appoints individual tenured faculty members to serve as peer reviewers for specific courses and instructors for that year. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the tenured faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage the entire faculty's attention to the quality of teaching in the Department. Although there is no requirement that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible.

The responsibilities of the Department Chair are as follows:

- To ensure the review of the teaching by probationary tenure track and clinical track faculty at least four times during the first three years of service, and at least once during the remainder of the probationary period, with the goal of adequately assessing teaching at all levels of instruction (e.g., graduate and undergraduate) to which the faculty member is assigned.
- To ensure the review of the teaching by tenured associate professors and non-probationary clinical associate professors at least once every two years, with the goal of assessing teaching at all levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.
- When the need for a review is triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching, the Department Chair will schedule a peer review for a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, including full professors.
- To ensure a review of the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The Department Chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review.

Reviews conducted upon the request of the Department Chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the Chair or faculty member.

Regularly scheduled teaching evaluations by the peers (the first three situations listed above) are comprehensive and include, in addition to classroom visitation, review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and exams. Departments should make sure that evaluations of a faculty member's teaching over time are conducted by more than one peer. At the beginning of the semester, the committee will request from the faculty member a list of dates on which visitation would be inappropriate because a quiz or exam is being given, a guest speaker is scheduled, etc.

Peer review focuses particularly on aspects of teaching that most students are not qualified to evaluate, such as: appropriateness of curricular choices given the goals of the course (survey as opposed to required major course), implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and appropriateness of approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. As part of its evaluation the committee examines copies of the faculty member's student end-of-course review summaries from recent years.

At the conclusion of the review, the committee submits a written report to the Department Chair, copied to the faculty member. The faculty member may provide written comments on this report and the committee may respond in writing to those comments if it wishes. All such comments are appended to the report for inclusion in the faculty member's promotion and tenure dossier, unless the faculty member requests that the comments be excluded.

Regularly scheduled reviews are both summative and formative (they provide both an assessment of the faculty member's teaching for use in annual and promotion reviews and advice to improve the faculty member's teaching).