



THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

**Appointments, Promotion & Tenure
Criteria and Procedures for
The Ohio State University**

School of Communication

Revision Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs:12/1/2025

Table of Contents

I. Preamble.....	1
II. School Mission.....	2
III. Definitions.....	2
A. <i>Committee of the Eligible Faculty.....</i>	2
B. <i>Promotion and Tenure Committee</i>	5
C. <i>Quorum</i>	5
D. <i>Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty</i>	5
IV. Appointments.....	6
A. <i>Criteria</i>	6
B. <i>Procedures</i>	11
V. Annual Performance and Merit Review.....	15
A. <i>Documentation</i>	16
B. <i>Probationary Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....</i>	17
C. <i>Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....</i>	19
D. <i>C/P Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....</i>	21
E. <i>Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....</i>	22
F. <i>Regional Campus Faculty</i>	22
G. <i>Salary Recommendations.....</i>	23
VI. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	24
A. <i>Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion.....</i>	25
B. <i>Procedures</i>	32
VII. Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals	43
VIII. Seventh Year Reviews.....	43
IX. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	43
A. <i>Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI).....</i>	44
B. <i>Peer Evaluation of Teaching</i>	45
C. <i>Teaching Materials Review.....</i>	45
D. <i>Annual Reviews of Teaching.....</i>	47
APPENDIX A.....	48
A. <i>Scholarship.....</i>	48
B. <i>Teaching.....</i>	56
C. <i>Service</i>	58
APPENDIX B.....	60
A. <i>Research</i>	61
B. <i>Teaching.....</i>	64
C. <i>Service</i>	65
APPENDIX C.....	68
APPENDIX D	70
APPENDIX E	72



School of Communication
Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Document

I. Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty, the Office of Academic Affairs procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, and any additional policies established by the college and the University. Should those rules and policies change, the School will follow those new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document is subject to continuing revision and must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years on appointment or reappointment of the School Director. It is very desirable for the Director and faculty to reach consensus on the document, although formal faculty acceptance of the document is not required. Where divisions in the School make consensus or formal faculty approval impossible the Director may have to implement an Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure document without consensus. Revisions may be made at any time. Changes will be made in consultation with the School faculty until sufficient changes have accumulated to warrant distributing a new document.

All revisions, as well as periodic reaffirmation, are subject to approval by the Dean or designee of the College and the Office of Academic Affairs before it may be implemented. It sets forth the School'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 for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the Dean or designee and the Office of Academic Affairs accept the mission and criteria of the School and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to departmental mission and criteria.

The principles under which decisions on appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure are made are those articulated in Faculty Rule [3335-6-01](#).

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](#) and other standards specific to this School 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 employment opportunity](#).

II. School Mission

The mission of the School of Communication is to achieve national and international distinction in scholarship, teaching and service. To accomplish our mission, the School advances high quality social science scholarship and engages in innovative and excellent undergraduate and graduate education. We serve scholarly, professional and public constituencies by helping improve the understanding of communication processes and by working with professionals in communication, journalism, and other disciplines to improve the practice of communication.

In keeping with the [Ohio State Shared Values](#), the School of Communication at The Ohio State University embraces and maintains an environment that respects a wide variety of lived experiences and access for all. Our commitment moves beyond mere tolerance to recognizing, understanding, and welcoming differing viewpoints and the value group members possess as individuals. In our School, the faculty, students, and staff are dedicated to building a tradition of equal opportunity and a supportive community for all.

III. Definitions

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

The eligible faculty for all appointment (hiring), reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure reviews must have their tenure home or primary appointment in the School.

The Director, Dean, the divisional deans and assistant and associate deans of the College, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President may not participate as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure.

1. Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring) review of an assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the School.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank for appointment at the rank of associate professor or professor must be cast by all tenure-track faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

- For the reappointment and promotion and tenure reviews of assistant professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors.
- For the promotion reviews of associate professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured faculty holding the rank of professor.

2. Clinical and Professional Practice Faculty

The School has Clinical and Professional Practice (collectively referred to as C/P faculty), both of which are non-tenure-track faculty lines.

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a C/P assistant professor, associate professor, or professor the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all C/P faculty in the School.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank for appointment at the rank of associate professor or professor must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all nonprobationary C/P faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of C/P assistant professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors, and all nonprobationary C/P associate professors and professors.
- For the reappointment reviews of C/P associate professors, the eligible faculty consists of all faculty at associate professor and professor-level (tenure-track and non-probationary C/P). For promotion reviews of C/P associate professors and for reappointment reviews of C/P professors, the eligible faculty consists of all faculty at professor-level (tenure-track and non-probationary C/P).

3. Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- **Appointment Review.** The initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members follows a formal search following the [SHIFT](#) Framework, which includes a job posting in [Workday](#) (see Section IV.B above) and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the School Director based on recommendation from the search committee.
- **Reappointment Review.** The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty is decided by the School Director in consultation with the school's tenure-track faculty of equal or higher rank than the candidate.

Promotion Reviews

- Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have lecturer titles.

- The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the School Director. The Director may choose to consult with other faculty, including the Director of Undergraduate Studies.

4. Conflict of Interest

Search Committee Conflict of Interest

A member of a search committee must disclose to the committee and refrain from participation in any of the interviews, meetings, or votes that comprise the search process if the member:

- decides to apply for the position;
- is related to or has a close interpersonal relationship with a candidate;
- 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 (e.g., dissertation advisor); or
- has collaborated extensively with the candidate or is currently collaborating with the candidate.

Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest

A member of the eligible faculty has a conflict of interest when he/she/they are or have been to the candidate:

- a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor;
- a co-author on more than 50% of the candidate's publications since appointment or last promotion, including pending publications and submissions;
- a collaborator on more than 25% of projects since appointment or last promotion, including current and planned collaborations;
- in a consulting/financial arrangement with the candidate since appointment or last promotion, including receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services) or is dependent in some way on the candidate's services; or
- in a family relationship such as a spouse, child, sibling, or parent, or other relationship, such as a close personal friendship, that might affect one's judgment or be seen as doing so by a reasonable person familiar with the relationship.

Such faculty members will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of that candidate.

5. Minimum Composition

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

B. Promotion and Tenure Committee

The School has a Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee (or Committees; see below) that assists the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in managing personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The committee's chair and membership are appointed by the School Director. Ordinarily, the Chair of the P&T Committee is also the Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. The term of service is two years, with reappointment possible. At least two of the four to five members of the P&T Committee(s) must hold the rank of professor. In consultation with the Chair of the Eligible Faculty, one of the members will be appointed by the Director as the Procedures Oversight Designee (POD), as required by university guidelines.

When considering cases involving C/P faculty, the P&T Committee may be augmented by up to two non-probationary C/P faculty members.

A faculty mentor for the candidate may serve on the Committee; sharing their insights from their mentorship is welcome but mentors are not advocates for the candidate and should strive to be as objective as they can in their evaluation and comment.

The Director, in consultation with the Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty (also known as the "P&T Chair"), may appoint one or more P&T Committees for all assistant professors being reviewed for the fourth-year review or for the promotion and tenure review during a particular year. The Chair and POD are typically the same for all committees (unless there is a conflict of interest or other issue requiring a replacement in these roles); other members may be selected who are best qualified to review the areas of research/teaching expertise of the candidate.

C. Quorum

The presence of 2/3 of the eligible faculty in the meeting constitutes a quorum. The Director as well as individuals who are on FPL, official medical leave, who are on their off-duty semester, or who have more than 50% of their appointment outside of the School are not counted in the number needed to reach a quorum. Faculty on approved leave of absences may participate in personnel decisions including promotion and tenure reviews, but only if they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. A member of the eligible faculty on special assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the School Director has approved an off-campus assignment. Faculty members who recuse themselves or are recused by the Director because of a conflict of interest are not counted when determining quorum.

D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

Only those present at the entire review meeting or participating the entire review meeting remotely are eligible to vote. Those who are not present may not send a vote to be entered on

their behalf, nor may they send a written statement to be read, nor have their opinions presented in the meeting, because such statements cannot be responsive to discussion at the meeting. Faculty members who have been recused cannot be represented in the discussion. Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted but participating fully in discussions and voting via remote two-way electronic connection are allowed.

In all votes taken on personnel matters only “yes” and “no” votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes and are strongly discouraged.

1. Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when 60% or more of the votes cast are positive.

In the case of a joint appointment, the School must seek input from a candidate’s joint-appointment TIU prior to his/her/their appointment.

2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion is secured when 60% or more of the votes cast are positive.

In the case of a joint appointment, the School must seek input from a candidate’s joint-appointment TIU prior to his/her/their reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure.

IV. Appointments

A. Criteria

All appointments, reappointments, and promotion and tenure decisions are made with the intent of fostering the mission of the School and are made in a non-discriminatory manner. The School, in keeping with its stated mission and with the criteria of the University for faculty appointments (as stated in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 \[A\]](#)), is committed to making faculty appointments that have the strong potential to enhance the quality of the School. 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 School. The search is either cancelled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, C/P, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment.

All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university’s system of record for faculty and staff. Formal interviews are required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in [Workday](#) to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

1. Tenure-track Faculty

At the time of appointment, probationary tenure-track 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. (see [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03](#))

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 School will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment to the rank of instructor is always probationary and may not exceed three years. Promotion to assistant professor occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the end of the third year of appointment or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year. When an instructor is promoted to the rank of assistant professor, prior service credit may be granted for time spent as an instructor if the faculty member requests such credit in writing at the time of the promotion. This request must be approved by the School's eligible faculty, the School director, the Dean or designee 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 once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor: The basic criteria for appointment as an assistant professor are ordinarily an earned doctorate, experience and training suggesting a high likelihood of success as a scholar, and evidence indicating the potential to become an excellent teacher. The ability to foster a sense of community, promote access for all, and value/engage with differing viewpoints from individuals with a wide variety of lived experiences in research, teaching, and service is an asset (see Appendix C).

University rules regarding probationary service and duration of appointments for faculty are found in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03](#). Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the seventh year will be the final year of employment. 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 except through an approved request to extend the probationary period.

Associate Professor and Professor: Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor, with or without tenure, or Professor with tenure and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Minimum criteria for tenured associate professors on the Columbus campus are an earned doctorate, a substantial record of scholarly achievement in an area relevant to one of the School's priority areas and/or relevant to the mission of the

College, and an evident national reputation as a scholar with potential to attain, or evidence of, international visibility.

A sufficiently strong research record may justify appointment as professor. Additionally, there must be evidence that the applicant has been an excellent teacher and has provided substantial service to the profession, the state, and/or the university. The ability to foster a sense of community, promote access for all, and value/engage with differing viewpoints from individuals with a wide variety of lived experiences in research, teaching, and service is an asset (see Appendix C).

The assessment of the record is informed by input from the search committee, eligible faculty, Director, and deans.

Appointment at the rank of Associate Professor normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at that 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. Accordingly, 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.

Appointments at the rank of professor without tenure may not occur.

Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

2. C/P Faculty

Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all other C/P faculty members must be for a period of five years. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for C/P assistant and associate professors must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for C/P professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. Tenure is not granted to C/P faculty and there is also no presumption that subsequent appointments will be offered, regardless of performance. The terms of a contract may be re-negotiated at the time of reappointment. If the School wishes to consider reappointment, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period; non-mandatory review can be requested with approval of the Director. For more information see Faculty Rule [3335-7-33](#). Subsequent appointments are not probationary, and the individual may only be terminated for cause (see rule [3335-5-04](#) of the Administrative Code) or financial exigency (see rule [3335-5-02.1](#) of the Administrative Code).

Assistant Professor: The minimum criterion for appointment as Assistant Professor in a C/P faculty position is a master's degree in communication or journalism or a related field and substantial industry/professional experience in the area of appointment. Evidence of teaching ability is highly desirable. The ability to foster a sense of community, promote access for all, and value/engage with differing viewpoints from individuals with a wide variety of lived experiences in research, teaching, and service is an asset (see Appendix C).

Associate Professor and Professor: The minimum criteria for Associate Professor or Professor in a C/P faculty position include a master's degree in communication or journalism or a related field and extensive industry/professional experience in the area of appointment. For example, a C/P faculty member at these ranks might have extended experience working as a journalist or for a PR firm. Faculty at either of these ranks are also expected to have a substantial record of teaching excellence, including a national reputation as an educator, and a strong record of service to the School, University, professional associations that promote undergraduate education, and/or the community. The ability to foster a sense of community, promote access for all, and value/engage with differing viewpoints from individuals with a wide variety of lived experiences in research, teaching, and service is an asset (see Appendix C). Appointment at the rank of C/P professor also requires a record of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice.

3. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty appointments carry no presumption of academic tenure. Unless otherwise indicated below, all appointments are for a one-year term which may or may not be renewed. As described below, these appointments may be uncompensated or compensated.

Lecturer: Appointment to the position of Lecturer is made primarily to assist in meeting the School's instructional obligations. As such, the primary criterion for those appointed to these titles is a demonstrated skill as an instructor, especially in undergraduate courses. Appointment at a lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a Master's degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught. Senior lecturer appointments require a PhD and relevant teaching experience.

Lecturer appointments are normally made on an annual basis and require formal approval each year by the Director if they are to be continued. Senior lecturers may be provided with up to three-year appointments, contingent on available resources and continuing proof of teaching ability.

Visiting Faculty (Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor): Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Typically, uncompensated Visiting Professors engage in collaborative research with other faculty members of the School. Compensated Visiting Professors are commonly involved in teaching courses and may also be involved in research. 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 (that is, 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.

The minimum criteria for visiting faculty are in line with the School's tenure-track faculty. This type of appointment is typically unpaid and designated for individuals seeking to use their sabbatical leave to work on research with School faculty, though it may also be provided to capable doctoral level colleagues who are for other reasons in the Columbus area and qualified to teach courses and conduct research in the discipline. Individuals requesting a visiting faculty

appointment must have a School faculty sponsor who will present their request at a faculty meeting where a vote will be taken whether or not to grant said request.

4. Regional Campus Faculty

As the mission of the regional campuses emphasizes undergraduate instructional regional campus criteria for appointments at the tenure-track ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor are similar to those for Columbus campus appointments. In general, however, relatively lesser weight will be placed on the quantity of a candidate's research compared to Columbus appointments and more emphasis is placed on teaching potential and accomplishments, in recognition of the differing mission of the regional campuses. The quality, though not the quantity, of research of regional campus appointments should be comparable to that of Columbus appointments.

Regional campus criteria for the appointment of C/P and associated faculty are the same as those for Columbus faculty in each of these categories.

5. Emeritus Faculty

Emeritus faculty status is an honor given in recognition of sustained academic contributions to the university as described in Faculty Rule [3335-5-36](#). Full-time tenure track, C/P, or associated faculty may request emeritus status upon retirement or resignation at the age of sixty or older with ten or more years of service or at any age with twenty-five or more years of service.

The title of Emeritus makes the faculty member eligible to certain benefits as provided by Board of Trustees policies, but promises no resources of any kind from the School. Emeritus faculty who wish to pursue further activities with the School, or who wish to request use of School resources, must negotiate these with the Director. Emeritus faculty who wish to use association with the School as a platform for submitting grant proposals must also get approval for the foci, funder, budget, and direction of these proposals from the Director and Office of Research in advance. Emeritus faculty members must use School resources in academic and educational pursuits, not as a basis for consulting or ventures for profit.

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the School director (regional campus dean for associated faculty on regional campuses) outlining academic performance and citizenship. The Committee of Eligible faculty (tenured and nonprobationary C/P associate professors and professors) will review the application and make a recommendation to the School director. The School director will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the Dean or designee. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule [3335-05-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered.

See the OAA [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) Volume 1, Chapter 1, for information about the types of perquisites that may be offered to emeritus faculty, provided resources are available.

Emeritus faculty may not vote at any level of governance and may not participate in promotion and tenure matters.

6. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

No-salary/courtesy appointments are extended to Ohio State faculty from other tenure initiating units on the expectation of the appointee's substantial involvement in the School and its programs. Continuation of such courtesy appointments is contingent upon the continuation of the appointee's contributions to the School. 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

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, C/P, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment. All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university's system of record for faculty and staff. Formal interviews are required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in [Workday](#) to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

See the [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#) and the [Policy on Faculty Appointments](#) for additional information on the following topics:

- recruitment of tenure-track, C/P, and associated 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 on the Columbus Campus

A national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. This includes all external candidates for all faculty positions. The only exception is for dual career partners, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 4, section 5.1 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. All faculty searches must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

All personnel appointments in the School are made upon the recommendation of the Director and the approval of the Dean or designee of the College of Arts and Sciences. The Dean's approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise.

The School Director has primary responsibility for recruiting new faculty in collaboration with the Chair of the Search Committee. All faculty appointments are competitive on the basis of excellence of qualifications. The Director is assisted in faculty recruiting by faculty Search

Committees, the Executive Committee and Associate Director, and the faculty as a whole. All consultation with School personnel on faculty appointments, including discussion and votes taken in faculty meetings, is advisory to the Director.

All faculty vacancies are School vacancies; the entire faculty of the School has a vested interest in recruiting quality faculty, regardless of their particular area of specialization. The decision to focus a search or make a hire in a given program area is the responsibility of the Director, who will be advised in these matters by the Executive Committee and the School faculty.

All faculty members are encouraged to help in publicizing, recruiting, and evaluating applicants for faculty positions. The official mechanism for recruiting new faculty is the Search Committee. Search Committees will normally consist of four to five faculty members, including tenure-track faculty and up to one C/P faculty member, plus the Director as an *ex-officio* member. One member of the committee will be designated as Search Committee Chair.

Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo any [mandatory university](#) trainings. In addition, all employees/faculty involved in the hiring and selection process must review and acknowledge the EEO Recruitment and Selection Guidelines in the BuckeyeLearn system.

The Framework serves as a centrally coordinated guideline and toolkit to support the entire process of faculty recruitment with clear engagement from all participating stakeholders involved in the faculty hiring process. This framework is intended to provide faculty engaged in search committees and staff providing support services with the tools and support needed to attract excellent applicant pools, conduct consistent and equitable evaluations, and successfully hire and properly onboard new faculty members who will continue our tradition of academic excellence. This framework consists of six phases, each targeting a specific stage of the recruitment process:

- “Phase 1 | Search Preparation & Proactive Recruitment” is the earliest stage in the search process. Key steps during this phase include determining faculty needs for the unit, creating a search strategy (including timeline), establishing a budget, and identifying additional partners to include in the process. The steps in this phase provide guidance on forming committees, detail training requirements for search committee members, and innovative approaches to advertising and outreach. This section also includes ideas and resources for developing qualified talent pools to ensure alignment with university and unit EEO goals and advance the eminence of the institution.
- “Phase 2 | Preliminary Review of Applicants” focuses on best practices for the application review and candidate screening processes. The guidelines and resources in this section support consistency and fairness in the review, assessment, and selection of candidates moving forward in the recruitment process. This section also outlines how to select a list of candidates for on-campus interviews.
- “Phase 3 | Finalists Interviews & Evaluations” provides guidance and tools for conducting interviews and campus visits, requesting reference letters (if not requested earlier in the application stage), and collecting feedback from everyone who interacted with the candidates. Adherence to the guidelines outlined in this section has a direct

impact on enhancing the candidate experience and ensuring a consistent evaluation process. This phase concludes with the submission of a letter from the search committee to the TIU chair/director.

- “Phase 4 | Extend Offer” provides guidance and resources related to effectively selecting the most qualified candidate(s) for the position(s) and successfully negotiating to result in an accepted offer.
- “Phase 5 | Preboard and Onboard” offers resources to help prepare and support new faculty as they transition to Ohio State. The suggestions in this phase focus on creating a seamless transition for incoming faculty and their partners/families, if applicable.
- “Phase 6 | Reflect and Assess the Search” is a process supported by OAA to reflect on the hiring cycle each year and evaluate areas that may need improvement and additional support.

If an offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If an offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the School Director. Appointments at the rank of associate professor, with or without tenure, or professor, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

The School will discuss potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status with the Office of International Affairs. An [MOU](#) must be signed by faculty eligible for tenured positions who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees.

All recommendations of the Search Committee and the faculty are advisory to the 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. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the Director. The Director will designate someone to receive the ballots and count them and will announce the vote to the faculty present.

The Director, in consultation with the divisional dean, will determine whether a formal offer will be extended to the top candidate, whether one of the lesser ranked candidates should be offered the position, or whether a new search should be conducted. The Director will keep the faculty apprised of negotiations and will inform the faculty of the success or failure of an offer. If an offer is refused or rescinded, the Director will decide whether to make an offer to the second ranked candidate if previously deemed acceptable, and then if need be, the third candidate if three have been deemed acceptable, and so on if there are more acceptable candidates. Likewise, more than one acceptable candidate may be made offers if positions are available and approved by the executive dean or designee. If the Director does not follow the faculty recommendation, an explanation of this decision will be provided to the faculty.

2. C/P Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Searches for C/P faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the interview is on teaching and professional practice rather than scholarship.

3. Transfer from the Tenure-track

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a C/P faculty appointment if appropriate circumstances exist. Tenure is lost upon transfer, and transfers must be approved by the School Director, the college Dean or designee, 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 C/P faculty appointment to the tenure-track are not permitted. C/P faculty members may apply for tenure-track positions and compete in regular national searches for such positions.

4. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

The appointment of all compensated associated faculty follows a formal search following the [SHIFT](#) Framework, which includes a job posting in [Workday](#) (see Section IV.B above) and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the School Director based on recommendation from the search committee. The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty is decided by the School Director in consultation with the school's eligible faculty.

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the School and are decided by the School Director in consultation with the School's eligible faculty.

Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances up to a maximum of three years. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three consecutive years.

Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are usually made on an annual basis. After the initial appointment, and if the School's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment up to three years may be offered.

5. Regional Campus Faculty

The appointment of all compensated regional campus faculty follows a formal search following the [SHIFT](#) Framework, which includes a job posting in [Workday](#) and candidate interviews.

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 School 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, School Director, and either the regional campus search committee or broader representation of the regional and Columbus faculties. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. A hiring decision requires agreement by the School Director and regional campus dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the School Director and the regional campus dean.

Searches for regional campus C/P faculty are the same as those described above for tenure-track faculty.

Associated faculty are appointed by the regional campus associate dean, in consultation with the dean, School Director, program coordinators, and other relevant faculty members.

6. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Any School faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track or C/P faculty member from another Ohio State department. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this School justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the eligible faculty, the School Director extends an offer of appointment. The School Director reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

Nominations for courtesy appointments in the School for individuals holding faculty rank in other tenure initiating units of Ohio State are initiated by faculty of the School. Nominations are made to the faculty of the School and should include advance distribution of the nominee's vita. At the faculty meeting at which the nomination is considered, the nominator should review the highlights of the nominee's vita and discuss the contributions the nominee would make to the programs of the School.

Following discussion, a vote by secret ballot will be taken. The Director will make the final decision and will notify the nominee and the Chairperson of the nominee's unit of the courtesy appointment. Termination of an existing courtesy appointment may be initiated by any faculty member. The primary reason for failing to renew an appointment is the lack of a substantive contribution to the School.

V. Annual Performance and Merit Review

Formal annual performance and merit review of the faculty will be conducted by the Director and may be based on input from and consultation with the Committee of Eligible Faculty as defined for the next scheduled Reappointment or Promotion Reviews (see Section III.A).

The School follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the [Policy on Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment](#), which stipulates that such reviews must include a scheduled

opportunity for a face-to-face meeting as well as a written assessment. According to the policy, the purposes of the review are to:

- Assist faculty in improving professional productivity through candid and constructive feedback and through the establishment of professional development plans;
- Establish the goals against which a faculty member's performance will be assessed in the foreseeable future; and
- Document faculty performance in the achievement of stated goals in order to determine salary increases and other resource allocations, progress toward promotion, and, in the event of poor performance, the need for remedial steps.

Depending on a faculty member's appointment type, the annual review is based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the School's guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.

The review of faculty with budgeted joint appointments must include input from the joint appointment TIU head for every annual evaluation cycle. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on goals specific to the individual in the joint unit.

Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.

The School Director 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.

A. Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit documentation to the School Director by the deadline set during fall semester of the year under review. The deadline is typically about a week before the start of classes in spring of the following year. Required documentation includes:

- Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), Volume 3 (required for probationary faculty and C/P faculty, and recommended for associate professors on the tenure track) **or** updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (non-probationary faculty) organized per the School's documentation request;
- Updated CV, which will be made publicly available (*all faculty*)

Other documentation for the annual performance and merit review will be the same as that for consideration for promotion and/or tenure. That documentation is described in Section VI of this document.

C/P faculty do not need to report citations, and they need only report scholarship related to pedagogy or practice.

All faculty are encouraged to explicitly describe efforts to foster community, promote access for all, and value/engage with differing viewpoints from individuals with a wide variety of lived experiences (see Appendix C) in their documentation. This information does not belong in a separate section; instead, it should be placed in the most relevant section(s) of the documentation.

Faculty are required to provide all requested documentation each year. Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation 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. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Performance and merit reviews of probationary faculty take place annually. For untenured faculty, this review is a critical component of monitoring progress toward tenure and promotion. The annual review also serves 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 may exist. It is expected that probationary faculty will exhibit substantial strength and continued progress in research, teaching and service within the context of the mission of the School, University rules pertaining to promotion and tenure, and years in service as an assistant professor. Performance in all three areas should show a trajectory toward demonstrating excellence, though strong confidence about excellence in research and teaching accomplishments are crucial as these are the chief dimensions of performance appraisal at the time of consideration for promotion and tenure.

The individual's record of fostering a sense of community, promoting access for all, and valuing/engaging with differing viewpoints from individuals with a wide variety of lived experiences in research, teaching, and service should be considered as a part of this review process (see Appendix C). Although all are encouraged to engage in such activities, it is not just something to be checked off a list. Each faculty member is unique, and this has implications for their work. For example, although everyone can likely benefit from learning more about promoting supportive communities and access for all, such topics need not be central to everyone's research programs. Faculty are explicitly cautioned against token engagement. Meaningful engagement with these issues is what we aim to reward. The review process should also take into account that there may be unique obstacles to conducting these types of work. Faculty are encouraged to describe the relevant obstacles to doing such work if this helps contextualize the record.

Mentors: The School has adopted a formal mentoring system. Detailed information on mentors and mentoring is in Appendix D.

Faculty Review: Each year, the Director, in consultation with the Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty, will convene the Committee of Eligible Faculty for the purpose of reviewing all probationary faculty members. The comments and recommendations provided in this meeting will be used when writing annual review letters for assistant professors. Reviewed faculty

members may respond in writing to the annual review letter and such response will be included in their personnel file along with the Director's letter.

Votes on renewal are not taken during annual review years (except the 4th year) unless there is a motion for nonrenewal from the faculty, or a request from the Director.

Feedback: Probationary faculty will receive an annual review letter from the Director that is informed by comments made in the meeting of the Committee of Eligible Faculty. The (co-)Chair(s) of the Promotion and Tenure Committee typically assists the Director in the drafting of these letters, though the Director may request help from other tenured faculty. The letter provided to the faculty member is considered a draft in that any factual errors can be corrected by the faculty member (with appropriate documentation) before the letter becomes part of the personnel file.

This feedback is to include any evaluative assessments provided in the meeting of the tenured faculty during the deliberations of the eligible faculty, and any other pertinent assessment of the faculty member's progress toward tenure, including discussion of dimensions on which the assessment by the eligible faculty and/or the Director differ.

Annual performance and merit reviews should be constructive and candid. Tenured faculty in the School and the Director should use the review process as a means to be supportive and helpful to untenured faculty as well as to candidly and clearly communicate aspects of performance that need improvement if the candidate is to make acceptable progress toward tenure. Any and all written comments submitted by the faculty member will be placed in his/her annual review materials.

If the School Director recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The School Director's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The School Director's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the dean of the college. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments, if provided).

If the School Director recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#)) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

As set forth in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03\(F\)](#), *Probationary appointments may be terminated during any probationary year because of inadequate performance or inadequate professional development. At any time other than the fourth year review or mandatory review for tenure, a nonrenewal decision must be based on the results of a formal performance review conducted in accord with fourth year review procedures as set forth in paragraph (C)(3) of this rule. Notification of nonrenewal must be consistent with the standards of notice set forth in [Rule 3335-6-08](#) of the Administrative Code.*

1. The Fourth-Year Review

The fourth-year review of probationary faculty is conducted in the same time-frame as the annual reviews of other probationary faculty but requires a more elaborate report of activities from the faculty member. The fourth-year review of probationary faculty shall follow the same process as the review for tenure and promotion at the School and College levels with two exceptions: External letters of evaluation are not solicited, and the Dean (not the School Director) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

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

The eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the School Director, who conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

Following completion of the comments process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)), the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean or designee makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment, regardless of the School Director's recommendation.

2. Extension of the Tenure Clock

The School follows the provisions of Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#) (D), which sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure-track faculty member may extend the probationary period. Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (E) does likewise for reducing the probationary period. A faculty member remains on duty regardless of extensions or reductions to the probationary period, and annual reviews are conducted in every probationary year regardless of time extended or reduced. Approved extensions or reductions do not limit the School's right to recommend nonrenewal of an appointment during an annual review.

C. Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Performance and merit reviews of all tenured faculty members take place annually. The annual review also serves 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 may exist. It is expected that all tenured faculty will exhibit substantial strength and continued progress in research, teaching and service within the context of the mission of the School. The individual's record of fostering a sense of community, promoting access for all, and valuing/engaging with differing viewpoints from individuals with a wide variety of lived experiences should be considered as a part of this review process (see Appendix C). The review process should take into account that there may be unique obstacles to conducting these types of work. Faculty are encouraged to describe in their narratives relevant obstacles if doing so helps contextualize the record.

Faculty Review: Each year, the Director, in consultation with the Chair of the Eligible Faculty, will convene the Committee of Eligible Faculty for the purpose of reviewing all associate professors. The comments and recommendations provided in this meeting will be used when

writing annual review letters for associate professors. The primary responsibility for the letter's content and for its communication to the faculty member rests with the Director. Reviewed faculty members may respond in writing to the annual review letter and such response will be included in their personnel file along with the Director's letter.

The assessment of performance will include both strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate. This review should play a critical role in monitoring progress toward promotion to the rank of Professor.

If an associate professor has asked for feedback on the possibility of promotion, or if a member of the committee believes that an associate professor could be ready for promotion within the next few years, the committee should discuss the record to aid the Director in addressing this topic in the annual review letter.

For Professors, a formal annual performance and merit review is conducted each year by the Director. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the School of Communication, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the School, the college, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. The individual's record of fostering a sense of community, promoting access for all, and valuing/engaging with differing viewpoints from individuals with a wide variety of lived experiences should be considered as a part of this review process (see Appendix C).

Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment, mentoring, and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest-ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty.

If a professor has an administrative role, the impact of that role and other assignments will be considered in the annual review. The School Director prepares a written evaluation of performance against these expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

As for all other ranks, these annual reviews are intended to be constructive and candid, and to communicate aspects of performance that need improvement as well as strengths.

Feedback: Associate professors will receive an annual review letter from the Director that is informed by comments made in the meeting of the Eligible Faculty. The (co-) Chair(s) of the Promotion and Tenure committee typically assists the Director in the drafting of these letters. The letter provided to the faculty member is considered a draft in that any factual errors can be corrected by the faculty member (with appropriate documentation) before the letter becomes part of the personnel file.

The Director will meet with every associate professor annually to discuss the faculty member's performance and future goals and plans. In this meeting, the Director will convey to the faculty members feedback regarding their performance in the teaching, research, and service categories.

D. C/P Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Performance and merit reviews of C/P faculty take place annually. The review is a critical component of monitoring progress and serves as a basis for annual salary recommendations. It is also a resource for C/P faculty in developing and carrying out professional plans and serves as an aide in calling attention to performance problems where they may exist.

It is expected that C/P faculty will exhibit substantial strength and continued progress in teaching and service within the context of the mission of the School, university rules and years in service as a C/P faculty member.

In addition to demonstrating excellence in teaching and service, we expect C/P faculty to:

- Embody the highest ethical and professional standards of the discipline,
- Maintain current knowledge in the C/P faculty member's area of expertise,
- Demonstrate understanding and commitment to the goals of the School.

The annual performance and merit review process for C/P probationary and nonprobationary faculty is identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty respectively, except for how the Committee of Eligible Faculty is defined (see Section III.A.2).

In the penultimate contract year of a nonprobationary C/P faculty member's appointment, the TIU head 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. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

1. Formal Performance Review

The formal performance review of C/P faculty (which is required prior to each contract renewal) shall follow the same process as the promotion review of probationary tenure-track faculty, but with four important differences. First, the review criteria reflect the expectations of the C/P faculty member's current rank. Second, the process is not necessarily associated with promotion. Third, external reviews are not always required; they are only used for reappointments that also include a promotion.

If the formal performance review will be the basis for a promotion, the review should focus on whether the candidate meets the requirements of higher rank (see section VI.A.3). If not, the review only needs to focus on the more general expectations laid out in section V.D.

The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate's materials, including annual review letter, the dossier, and teaching review materials. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by secret ballot whether to renew the probationary appointment.

The eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the School Director, who conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the appointment.

E. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

General. Associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment.

Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment must be reviewed annually. No later than October 15 of the final year of the appointment the School Director will decide whether or not to reappoint.

Formal annual reappointment review of lecturers, and other associated faculty carrying out instruction, such as compensated visiting faculty, will be conducted by the Chair of the Communication Program Committee and Chair of the Journalism Program Committee (as appropriate) and may be based on input from and consultation with the tenured faculty. The annual review serves as a basis for calling attention to outstanding performance and performance problems where they may exist.

Documentation. During the Spring of each year, the Chairs of the Communication and Journalism Program Committees will be provided with all documents necessary for reviewing the full-time lecturers and other temporary instructors during the previous calendar year. These documents include SEI reports and open-ended comments from all of the sections that each lecturer has taught.

Review. The time-frame for the review will be the previous calendar year. A review of each full-time lecturers' and other instructors' performance will be sent to these faculty members at the end of Spring.

Annual reviews should be constructive and candid. The Chairs of the Communication and Journalism Program Committees should use the review process as a means to be supportive and helpful to the lecturers or other instructors as well as to candidly and clearly communicate aspects of performance that need improvement.

Following the annual review, the chairs make a recommendation to the School Director regarding renewal/nonrenewal. The School Director's recommendation on reappointment of all associated faculty is final.

F. Regional Campus Faculty

The annual performance and merit review of regional campus tenure-track faculty is conducted according to the process established on that campus, with a focus on teaching and service. Following the review by the regional campus, the regional campus dean meets with the School Director for evaluation of the faculty member's research and creative activity during the review period. The regional campus dean provides an annual performance and merit review letter. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the School, the School Director discusses the matter with the regional campus Dean/Director in an effort to

clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

Regional campus C/P faculty are reviewed according to the process established on that campus, with the review focusing on teaching and service. The regional campus dean will provide the School Director a copy of a C/P faculty member's annual performance and merit review letter.

Regional campus associated faculty are reviewed according to the process established on that campus, with the review focusing on teaching and service, as applicable.

G. Salary Recommendations

The School Director recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the Dean or designee of the College, who may modify these recommendations. The recommendations are based on the current annual performance and merit review as well as on the performance and merit reviews of the preceding 24 months. Fairness relative to peers can also be considered in accordance with college guidelines.

Raises for regional campus faculty are determined by the regional campus Deans/Directors after consultation with the Director of the School.

For tenured and tenure-track faculty, the greatest consideration for merit increase is given to the research component of the faculty assignment. Assessment of research accomplishments is centered on the amount and quality of scholarly research published in well-respected outlets and generation of significant grant support for research. A three-year window is used in assessing research performance (five years for grant activity), so that the normal fluctuations in research productivity are not unduly rewarded or go unrewarded if they don't coincide with years in which raises are higher than usual. Submitted research proposals for significant grants, if reviewed positively but not funded, will also be considered in the salary exercise as research activity in the year submitted (but not as part of the three-year rolling average). Evidence of fostering a sense of community, promoting access for all, and valuing/engaging with differing viewpoints is viewed as a plus when assessing performance in this area (see Appendix C).

Quality teaching and service are important factors, especially if there are exceptional strengths (e.g., winning a university teaching award; winning a national award in a journalism/communication organization; elected to high office in a national organization) or weaknesses in these two components of the position. Like research, teaching is reviewed over a three-year to address over-time trends, and to give due credit for rare but significant accomplishments (e.g., major awards).

For C/P and associated faculty, merit increases will be based on consideration of their teaching records, their service contributions (such contributions are optional for associated faculty) and, when relevant, their professional or pedagogically oriented research.

For all faculty members, teaching contribution is assessed by a variety of criteria such as formal self-reported student evaluations (SEIs), peer reviews of instructional substance (e.g., quality of syllabi, materials and assignments, etc.) and process (e.g., enrollment figures, dropout rates, classroom visitation, engagement of students, etc.), importance of the course to the School's graduate and undergraduate programs and so forth. Substantial attention also is paid to

mentorship activities: supervision of high-quality dissertations, masters and honors theses, supervision of directed research and directed reading, support for undergraduate research assistants, and scholarly papers and presentations authored or co-authored by students.

Assessment of service includes a judgment of the extent of effort, accomplishment and value to the School, and includes whether one's professional expertise is devoted to a task within the School, the college, the university, the state of Ohio, the nation and in professional organizations. Especially time-intensive service roles with a significant administrative component (e.g., Director of Graduate Studies, Chairs of the Communication and Journalism Program Committees) may be compensated with a course reduction and/or summer support. Such reductions often need approval from the college administration.

Annual review information will help guide salary recommendations, although additional considerations may impact these recommendations. In a separate letter there will be a salary recommendation (for Columbus faculty).

In formulating recommendations, the School Director may consult with the Executive Committee and/or Associate Director. The School Director will proactively engage in an annual fairness audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate within the School. The Director will also conduct a fairness audit across the field if and when relevant data are available. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

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

VI. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

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.

A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

1. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) provides the following general criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure:

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.

Tenure is not awarded below the rank of associate professor at The Ohio State University.

The award of tenure is an acknowledgement of excellence and future potential for preeminence. It is therefore essential to evaluate and judge the probability that faculty, once tenured, will continue to develop professionally and contribute to the School's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university.

Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Above all, candidates are held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. For example, if a candidate's primary teaching role is and will continue to be undergraduate teaching, then excellence in undergraduate teaching is required. A mediocre performance in this area would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another aspect of teaching that is a significantly smaller part of the individual's responsibilities.

Excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service is moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the [American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

The School of Communication is a leading research and Ph.D. granting program in the field. Tenure reflects a level of achievement for early career scholars that provides a high degree of confidence that the candidates will develop and sustain over the course of their career a record of outstanding research accomplishment and scholarly impact in their areas of expertise consistent with a strong national and international scholarly reputation. Tenure also reflects a high level of capability as classroom instructor and research mentor, and a demonstrated capacity to contribute as a citizen of the School, University, and profession, as well as to society as a whole.

The tables below summarize both the criteria for promotion and examples of the types of documentation that can be used when assessing these criteria. For additional discussion of these criteria, see Appendices A and C.

TEACHING

Teaching includes undergraduate and graduate instruction in formal courses, seminars, and individual studies. Directing student research is both a research and teaching activity. Advising students, and academic and career counseling (graduate and undergraduate) is a teaching activity. Departmental criteria for a positive evaluation and examples of documentation include the following:

Criteria	Examples of documentation ^a
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Command of substantive knowledge. • Ability to produce rigorous course materials that contribute to student learning of course topic. • Ability to deliver course content clearly and effectively. • Ability to create a positive classroom experience for students. • Emerging evidence of undergraduate and/or graduate student mentoring. • [Optional b] Demonstrated ability to account for how a wide variety of lived experiences impacts learning. • [Optional] Demonstrated ability to promote understanding of student differences in the classroom and to build connections across those differences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cumulative Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) reports for every class taught. Note that trends and/or patterns of responses in evaluations within each course taught by the same instructor are more important than scores for any one course. • Internal peer review of syllabi, assignments, and other materials. • Peer observations of classroom instruction. • Description of the development of new and effective instructional techniques and materials, including syllabi, examinations, case studies, field trip agenda, computer software, problem sets, etc. • Evidence of recognition, honors, or awards for distinguished teaching • Instruction-related publications. These may include peer-evaluated publications designed primarily to communicate with other educators (e.g., journal articles on curricula, course innovations and student placement; textbooks, chapters in textbooks or peer-reviewed books of readings; articles, papers, reviews, and other non-reviewed class materials). • Descriptions of academic advising, mentoring, direction of undergraduate and graduate students in research papers, theses, and dissertations and/or service on such committees; counseling of graduate and undergraduate students in career development and related matters. • Descriptions of leadership in development of courses and curricula that goes beyond normal teaching and service expectations. • Documentation of participation in university teaching workshops and/or training

Notes:

- a. This is not an exhaustive list of examples, nor are candidates required to provide all types of documentation shown.
- b. Optional criteria are those that can enhance a candidate's record but whose absence is not penalized

SCHOLARSHIP	
<p>The School recognizes that scholarship may take many forms including empirical research, theoretical innovation, the development of improved empirical techniques, and the creative application of existing concepts and empirical methods to problem solving. Each faculty member is expected to develop a research program, the focus and scope of which reflects important communication problems, professional interests, and the School's mission. School criteria for a positive evaluation and examples of documentation include the following:</p>	
Criteria	Examples of documentation ^a
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A visible high-quality research program that consists of an established body of peer-reviewed work in the discipline's major journals or leading specialty or interdisciplinary journals and/or research monographs published by major academic publishers. • A record of consistent and ongoing research productivity with indications that this will continue. • Evidence that the candidate has moved beyond mentored research, demonstrating intellectual leadership over a coherent research program. • Scholarly and social impact, including an emerging national reputation as a scholar. • [Optional b] Demonstrated active efforts to seek intramural and extramural support from appropriate sources given one's research specialties. • [Optional] Record of scholarship addressing historically understudied topics. • [Optional] Evidence that one's research has influenced the design of subsequent research activity, policy formulation, implementation, or evaluation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copies of all books, articles, and scholarly papers published or accepted for publication and a description of the percentage effort contributed by the faculty member. • Copies of letters from editors for any manuscript(s) accepted for publication but not yet published. Each letter must state that the manuscript has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed. • Copies of all scholarly papers for which a revise and resubmit has been received. There should be an accompanying letter from the editor stating the nature of the requested revision. • Descriptions of in-progress work, including status, anticipated contribution, target outlet, etc. • Impact factors of journals in which one has published. • Citation record (e.g., Web of Science, Google Scholar). • Evaluations of research in annual review letters. • Documentation of grants, patents, and contracts received. • Documentation of any research awards (internal and external) received. • Documentation of keynote presentations at international conferences. • Documentation of invited talks at symposia, conferences, other field specific venues that demonstrate the recognition of the thought leadership of the candidate. • External evaluations of scholarship solicited by the department.

Notes:

- a. This is not an exhaustive list of examples, nor are candidates required to provide all types of documentation shown.
- b. Optional criteria are those that can enhance a candidate's record but whose absence is not penalized

SERVICE	
Candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure must demonstrate satisfactory performance in service. Service to the university and the college is generally not expected at the probationary level. School criteria for a positive evaluation and examples of documentation include the following:	
Criteria	Examples of documentation ^a
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Conscientious service on School committeesFaculty/department citizenship including regular participation in departmental activities (e.g., faculty meetings, job talks)Emerging professional service to the discipline[Optional ^b] Emerging professional service to the college or university[Optional] Leading or contributing to efforts to promote the university's shared values.[Optional] Emerging professional service to the community and/or public directly related to one's professional expertise.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Evaluations of service contributions in annual review letters and/or provided by individuals who served with the candidate on a committee.Descriptions of manuscript reviews performed, including both <i>ad hoc</i> and as a member of an editorial board.Descriptions of grant reviews performed.Descriptions of leadership roles within professional organizations aligned with research expertise.Recognition (awards and prizes) for service.Documentation of research-related invited lectures, off-campus speaking engagements, public-facing essays (e.g., the <i>Conversation</i>), media interviews, advisory board service, etc.Descriptions of other services performing in a community setting.Descriptions of other services promoting shared values.

Notes:

- This is not an exhaustive list of examples, nor are candidates required to provide all types of documentation shown.
- Optional criteria are those that can enhance a candidate's record but whose absence is not penalized.

2. Promotion to Rank of Professor

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) establishes the following general criteria for promotion to the 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 scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated leadership in service.

In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#), assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another. Promotion should reflect the reality that (a) not all faculty members have the same distribution of assignments (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence equally in all evaluation dimensions; and (c) there is a multi-faceted institutional responsibility that must be achieved by the skills of the faculty collectively. Promotion to professor should be awarded not only to those faculty who have demonstrated impact in their scholarship of research and creative inquiry, teaching and learning, and service, but also to those who have exhibited excellence in the scholarship of leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the school, college, and university.

The School 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 is required. Internal cases for promotion and external hires at that rank should be comparable to the quality of external candidates who could be hired.

Promotion to professor in the College of Arts and Sciences requires excellence in scholarship, teaching and service beyond that achieved prior to tenure. The record in all three areas also must be such that it inspires strong confidence of continued professional growth and productivity in ways relevant to future directions of the School. Excellence in scholarship means attainment of measurable national and international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of high-quality published research that contributes to the understanding and study of theoretical and/or substantive issues significant to the discipline of communication as a whole and/or one or more of the component subfields studied here at the School of Communication. A successful candidate will have achieved national distinction as a scholar based on high-quality productivity and have an established a strong national and international reputation. Citation records are important indicators of scholarly impact consistent with promotion to professor and are accordingly weighed relatively heavily. The substantial probability that a high rate of quality scholarship will continue needs to be established; a strong record of publication in quality journals is needed subsequent to tenure and promotion. Efforts to obtain external support for research are normally expected of candidates for professor, though the School and College recognize that availability of support varies by specialization. Success in significant grant generation is also a marker of national recognition and potential for scholarly and substantive impact and provides further evidence for readiness for promotion to rank of professor. Potential social impact of the research contribution is also considered, including whether research has implications for addressing important social problems (see Appendix B).

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. Documented efforts to develop and/or to help others develop their pedagogy skills also serve as an important indicator of teaching excellence (see Appendix C for other examples). A strong record of mentorship as a dissertation and thesis advisor and as a co-author with students, is another important criterion for promotion to professor.

Excellence in service means providing a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more publics—including the School, the college, the University, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, the nation and professional organizations. As professors are expected to take an active role in School leadership and governance, a strong record of service to the School is generally expected (though in some cases the record may focus more on service to the University and discipline). Some significant professional service roles, current or past, are also typically expected of candidates for professor. Service activities that help build community and promote success for all are important forms of service (see Appendix C).

See OAA Dossier Guidelines, *Policies and Procedures Handbook*, Volume 3; Expectations for Associate Professors Before Promotion to Professor [Appendix B].

3. C/P Faculty

Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor or Professional Practice Associate Professor at the School of Communication requires a master's degree in communication or journalism or a related field and substantial industry/professional experience in the area of appointment. The individual must also show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service; have a documented high level of competence in professional practice; and display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of the School.

Excellence in teaching refers to providing to all students the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning in practice-oriented courses and providing to the most capable and motivated students an enhanced learning experience. The record in these two areas also must be such that it inspires strong confidence of continued professional growth and productivity in ways relevant to future directions of the School. The claim that promotion of the candidate will improve the overall quality and standing of the School and program area needs to be supported. Internal cases for promotion and external hires at this rank should be equally strong.

Excellence in teaching for C/P faculty is demonstrated through peer reviews of instructional substance (e.g., syllabi, materials and assignments, feedback on assignments and exams), process (e.g., enrollment figures, dropout rates) and, to a lesser degree, SEIs.

Excellence in service for C/P faculty means making available a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more publics—including the School, the college, the university, the Columbus community, the state of Ohio, and professional organizations, as well as on the national level. Evidence of service excellence is provided not only through the individual's record of offices held and organizational involvement but also through peer evaluation, where peers may be faculty members, collaborators, or others who have first-hand knowledge of service contributions.

Excellence in professional practice is shown through continued engagement with the relevant field. This might take the form of professional production, such as a journalist who regularly engages in reporting for a professional news organization. It can also be evidenced through engagement with other practitioners through practice-oriented professional organizations or associations.

There is no mandatory time-frame for promoting C/P assistant professors. Promotion to C/P associate professor is neither automatic nor to be expected in all cases. The eligible faculty may recommend consideration for promotion in the following cycle when conducting annual reviews. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Clinical Professor or Professional Practice Professor at the School of Communication requires that a faculty member have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching and/or practicum supervision and professional practice; leadership in service to the School and to the profession; and a scholarly record reflecting contributions to pedagogy and/or professional practice.

The record in these areas must be such that it inspires strong confidence of continued professional growth and productivity in ways relevant to future directions of the School. The School expects that individuals ready for promotion to C/P professor will be role models for less senior instructors, the students, and for the profession. Internal cases for promotion and external hires at this rank should be equally strong.

Outstanding C/P faculty teaching is evidenced through peer reviews of instructional materials (e.g., syllabi, materials and assignments, feedback on assignments and exams) and process (e.g., enrollment figures, dropout rates) and, to a lesser extent, SEIs. Teaching awards from the university, industry, professional associations, etc. also provide good evidence of teaching excellence.

Outstanding performance in C/P faculty service includes making available a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more publics—including the School, the college, the university, the Columbus community, the state of Ohio, and professional organizations, as well as on the national and global level. Evidence of service excellence is provided not only through the individual's record of offices held and organizational involvement but also through peer evaluation, where peers may be faculty members, collaborators, or others who have first-hand knowledge of service contributions. In addition, individuals who are considered for C/P professor should have demonstrated exceptional strengths in service as evidenced, for example, by holding high office in national organizations. Teaching loads for C/P faculty may be reduced on the basis of service activity.

Sustained excellence in professional practice is demonstrated through continuous and on-going engagement with the field as characterized at the Associate Professor level.

Meaningful scholarly contributions to pedagogy and/or professional practice are typically demonstrated through peer-reviewed journal articles on these topics and/or the publication of textbooks by a reputable press. Other types of activities, including leading scholarly workshops or giving scholarly presentation at professional associations may also be informative.

Evaluation of publications, including journal articles and books, is primarily based on the merits of the work, but the publication venue can also play a role. Although there is more latitude regarding where articles are published (e.g., Web of Science indexing is valued but not expected), work published in predatory outlets (see Appendix A, Section A.2) will be heavily

discounted. Although book publishers use a different review process than journals, most reputable publishers require that books undergo an editorial review process. Books published without such a review process (e.g., self-published work) will typically require more scrutiny, and may need additional review (e.g., soliciting assessment by external evaluators).

Appointment to C/P professor involves additional responsibility and privilege. Professors should be significantly engaged in service supporting the School. Evidence of willingness and ability to participate constructively in School administration is also a consideration in appointment to professor of clinical communication.

There is no mandatory time-frame for promoting C/P faculty holding the rank of associate professors. Promotion to C/P professor is neither automatic nor to be expected in all cases. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

4. Associated Faculty

Promotion to Senior Lecturer. Lecturers may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank as described in Section IV.A.4.

Promotion of Visiting Faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for promotion.

5. Regional Campus Faculty

Expectations for regional campus tenure-track faculty differ somewhat from those for faculty on the Columbus campus. The primary mission of the regional campuses is to provide high quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities. The relative emphasis on teaching and service expected of regional campus faculty will, therefore, ordinarily be greater. While the School expects regional college faculty to establish a program of high-quality scholarship and publication, it recognizes that greater teaching and service commitments and less access to research resources for regional campus faculty require different research expectations. In general, although regional faculty are not expected to have a research output that is as high as that for Columbus faculty for promotion purposes, the overall quality of this research is expected to be comparable. See OAA Dossier Guidelines, [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), Volume 3; Expectations for Assistant Professors Before Promotion to Associate Professor [Appendix A]; Expectations for Associate Professors Before Promotion to Professor [Appendix B].

In evaluating regional campus C/P associated faculty for promotion, the School will use the same criteria as described above for the promotion of faculty in each of these categories

B. Procedures

The School's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

1. Tenure-Track and C/P Faculty on the Columbus Campus

a. Candidate Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the candidate are as follows:

Start of calendar year:

- [Optional] Request non-mandatory promotion review be conducted in the following academic year. This is typically conveyed via the activity report (for tenured faculty) and/or in an email to the Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair and/or Director.
- Note that C/P faculty are strongly encouraged to request promotion to take effect in the same year as reappointment/contract renewal. This ensures that the promotion review will align with the mandatory formal performance review.

Late spring:

- Review the list of potential external evaluators developed by the School Director 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 School Director decides whether removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

Early Autumn:

- Candidates must submit a complete draft of their dossier (following the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline) and associated documentation (see below) to the Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) by early autumn at the latest. Candidates are encouraged to begin assembling these materials well before this deadline.
- The candidate should explicitly describe efforts related to fostering a sense of community, promoting access for all, and valuing/engaging with differing viewpoints from individuals with a wide variety of lived experiences in all domains (research, teaching, and service; see Appendix C) in the corresponding section.

Documentation should be provided in electronic form whenever possible.

- Candidates must work with the POD to address any problems identified with the dossier (e.g., formatting issues, lack of documentation) in a timely manner. A complete and accurate dossier should be ready within the first few weeks of the autumn semester.

While the POD and Promotion and Tenure Committee make reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by the candidate.

- Every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#). 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.
- Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

Teaching Documentation

The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a tenured or nonprobationary candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated. Required documentation includes:

- Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the School's peer evaluation of teaching program (details, including number, provided in this document)
- Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class in the review period.
- 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.
- Evidence of teaching activities reported in the dossier, including:
 - Mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers.
 - Extension and continuing education instruction.
 - Involvement in curriculum development.
 - Awards and formal recognition of teaching presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences.
 - Evidence of adoption of teaching materials at other colleges or universities

Scholarship Documentation

For scholarship documentation, a full history of publications and creative work should be included, as this information provides context to the more recent and relevant research record and/or demonstrates scholarly independence. Information about scholarship produced prior to the year of the start date (for probationary faculty) or year of last promotion (for tenured or nonprobationary faculty) may be provided. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

However, it is the scholarship performance since the year of the start date or year of last promotion that is to be the focus of the evaluating parties. Required documentation includes:

- Copies of all books, articles, and 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 proposed and/or funded.
- Other relevant documentation of research, as appropriate (e.g., favorable published reviews of a faculty member's book)
- Evidence of scholarship activities reported in the dossier, including:
 - Documentation of creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus including artwork, choreography, collections, compositions, curated exhibits, moving images, multimedia, performances, radio, recitals, recordings, television, and websites.
 - Documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options and commercial licenses.
 - Documentation of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work.

In some cases, it may be appropriate to include additional supplemental materials, such as letters from publication or grant proposal coauthors to clarify the contribution of the candidate to certain publications or proposals. The decision to seek letters from coauthors will be made by the School Director after consulting with the candidate and the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The requests to coauthors will be made by the School Director or the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Service Documentation

The time period for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated. Required documentation includes:

- Documentation of the quality of service that enhances the record of service activities (e.g., letters from committee Chairs)
- Evidence of service activities reported in the dossier including:
 - Involvement with professional journals and professional societies,
 - Consultation activity with industry, education, or government,
 - Clinical services,

- Administrative service to School,
- Administrative service to College,
- Administrative service to university and Student Life,
- Advising to student groups and organizations,
- Awards and prizes for service to profession, university, or School.

The complete dossier, including required documentation, is forwarded when the review moves beyond the School. Supplemental documentation is for use during the School review only, unless reviewers at the college and university levels specifically request it.

When the dossier is submitted, the candidate must also indicate the APT document under which the candidate wishes to be reviewed. Candidates may use the School's current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion (or reappointment in the case of C/P faculty), whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, for tenure-track faculty the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year. If a candidate wishes to be reviewed under an APT other than the current approved version available [here](#), a copy of the APT document under which the candidate has elected to be reviewed must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the School.

b. Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee and its Chair are as follows:

- To review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the Director and 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 60% 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](#) for one year. Faculty Rule [3335-7-08](#) makes the same provision for nonprobationary C/P faculty. 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.

- A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the School Director, 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:

- Suggest names of external evaluators to the School Director. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section VI.B.4 below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.

Early Autumn:

- Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) reviews candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including confirming all relevant documentation for publications, awards, citations, etc.), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and works with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs [annual procedural guidelines](#).
- POD and/or P&T Committee Chair 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 focused on reviewing the documentation requirements and review process. It is not a review of the candidate's record.

Mid-Autumn:

- P&T Committee meets to discuss its assessment of the candidate's performance in scholarship, teaching, and service, and seeks to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case.
- Chair, with support from the Committee, drafts a letter summarizing the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship, and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.
- After the meeting of the Committee of Eligible Faculty, the P&T Committee Chair finalizes the letter for each case 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 School Director.

- - If the candidate submits a written response to the letter from the Eligible Faculty, the P&T Committee Chair, with support of the Committee, prepares a response for inclusion in the dossier if one is required.
 - P&T Committee Chair, with support from the Committee, provides written evaluation and recommendation to the School Director 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 School's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this School's cases.

c. Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the members of the Committee of Eligible Faculty are as follows:

- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed. All members of the Eligible Faculty are encouraged to read at least some of the candidate's research publications to help them assess the quality of the work.
- 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.

d. School Director Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the School Director are as follows:

- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. For tenure-track assistant professors, the School Director will confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an [MOU](#) at the time of promotion with tenure.

Late Spring Semester

- Select a faculty member to serve as the Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) in the following academic year. The POD cannot be P&T Committee Chair and should be of a higher rank than the individual(s) seeking promotion.
- Solicit an evaluation from a TIU head of any TIU in which the candidate has a budgeted joint appointment. The TIU head from the joint appointment unit must provide a letter of evaluation to the primary TIU head. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.

For tenure-track faculty (only)

- Work with the P&T Committee Chair, the candidate, and (potential) other faculty to develop a list of potential external letter writers, and to get OAA approval for this list. Identifying 10-15 potential letter writers is recommended.
- Solicit external evaluations from OAA approved letter writers until the required number have agreed. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

Autumn Semester (and potentially into following spring):

- Make each candidate's dossier available for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which the case is to be discussed and voted.
- Charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- 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.
- Attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the Director may leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- Provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- Meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- Inform each candidate in writing after completion of the School review process of:
 - Recommendations by the Committee of Eligible Faculty and School Director
 - Availability for review of the written evaluations by the Committee of Eligible Faculty and School Director
 - Opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the School Director, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the School Director, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- Provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- Forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline.
- Receive the P&T 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 School Director's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the appropriate party in the college.

2. Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Promotion to Senior Lecturer. The School's Director may consult with the Chair(s) of the undergraduate program committee(s) when assessing whether the lecturer meets the criteria for promotion.

Promotion of Visiting Faculty. Visiting faculty are not eligible for promotion.

3. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

Regional campus tenure-track faculty are first reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus Dean/Director. The regional campus review focuses on teaching and service.

The regional campus Dean/Director forwards the written evaluation and recommendation of the regional campus review to the School Director, from which point the review follows the procedures described for the Columbus campus faculty. A request to promote requires agreement by the dean and the School Director.

Regional campus C/P faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean. Following the review, the dean consults with the School Director. A request to promote follows the same procedures as tenure-track faculty except that external letters are not needed unless scholarship is a component of the assigned role.

Associated faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean. The decision of the regional campus dean is final.

4. External Evaluations

The School of Communication will seek external evaluators based on expertise and excellence in the candidates' area of specialization and with appointments consistent with College and OAA guidelines; insofar as possible, for tenure-track faculty these will be predominately from evaluators at Ph.D. programs in the Communication field from the following programs:

- Arizona State University
- Cornell University
- Indiana University, Bloomington
- Michigan State University
- Northwestern University
- Pennsylvania State University

- Rutgers University
- University at Buffalo
- University of California, Davis
- University of California, Los Angeles
- University of California, Santa Barbara
- University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
- University of Maryland, College Park
- University of Michigan
- University of Missouri
- University of North Carolina
- University of Pennsylvania
- University of Texas, Austin
- University of Wisconsin
- Washington State University

Justification will be provided in each case when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.

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. External evaluations may be obtained for C/P faculty, though the emphasis should reflect the expectations of the position. The decision to seek external evaluations relevant to teaching or service for a C/P faculty member will be made by the School Director after consulting with the candidate and the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

A conflict of interest for external reviewers exists if the reviewer is or has been to the candidate: a) a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor; b) a research collaborator, which includes someone who has been a coauthor on a publication within the past 3 years, including pending publications and submissions; c) a collaborator on a project within the past 3 years, including current and planned collaborations; d) in a consulting/financial arrangement with the candidate within the past 3 years, including receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services); e) a relative or close personal friend; or f) in any relationship, personal or professional, that could reduce the reviewer's objectivity. Also excluded are reviewers from the same institution, or those who had previous employment in the same institution within the past 12 months, or those who are being considered for employment at that institution.

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who can give an "arms' length" evaluation of the research record and is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This school will only solicit evaluations from professors with institutional affiliations predominately in the programs listed above. 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.

Because the School cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters may be sought than are required, and they should be solicited no later than the end of May 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 School Director, and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is typically requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) 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 School requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The School requests are modeled on the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format for letters requesting external evaluations. A sample letter for tenure-track faculty can be found [here](#). A sample letter for C/P faculty can be found [here](#).

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 School Director, who will decide what, if any, action is warranted (e.g., 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 School's written evaluations or brought to the attention of the Office of Academic Affairs for advice.

VII. Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals

Only the candidate may appeal a negative tenure, promotion, or reappointment decision.

Performance that is adequate for annual reappointment may not be adequate for the granting of promotion or tenure with promotion for faculty on the tenure track or, in the case of C/P faculty, for securing a reappointment.

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule [3335-5-05](#).

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.

VIII. Seventh Year Reviews

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) 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.

IX. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

It is expected that all faculty will be responsible teachers, and among other things, their classes will meet regularly; they will remain up-to-date in course content; be available for weekly office hours; conduct teaching evaluations in a professional manner; and strive to perform as effective teachers.

The School employs multiple methods for reviewing teaching. These consist of a) the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) for each course, b) peer observations, and c) formal peer assessment of teaching materials, and d) annual reviews of teaching.

Additionally, if the Committee of Eligible Faculty or the Director have concerns or questions about aspects of teaching that appear to be problematic, additional reviews, including peer observation and assessment of teaching materials (beyond the number required) may be recommended or required. The Director may also recommend the use of the university's instructional training resources.

Table 1. Teaching Review Requirements

Position	SEI	Peer Observations	Formal Evaluation of Teaching Materials	Review of Teaching
C/P Assistant	Every course	At least once per two years of appointment, at least two times before reappointment	At least once per two years of appointment	Annually
C/P Associate	Every course	At least once per two years of appointment,	At least once per two years of appointment	Annually

		at least two times before reappointment		
C/P Professor	Every course	At least once per three years of appointment, at least two times before reappointment	At least once per three years of appointment	Annually
Assistant Professor	Every course	At least two times before tenure review	Twice before tenure review	Annually
Associate Professor	Every course	Once every 2 years, at least two times before promotion review	Once every 4 years, at least once before promotion review	Annually
Professor	Every course	Never	Every 4 years	Annually

A. Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI)

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) is required in every course offered in this School of Communication. The School recognizes that SEIs can be a useful tool for assessing student satisfaction with a class. Research has shown, however, that they do not measure instructional quality. Student satisfaction is important, and SEIs can provide insights into students' perspectives, but satisfaction is not more important than other considerations, including instructional quality and rigor.

All faculty in the School are expected to have their students use the electronic SEI data collection tool for each course they teach during the year. Faculty should also encourage students to complete the SEIs, though faculty have considerable latitude about how they do this.

The university will provide SEI data, including response rates, scores, and open-ended responses to each faculty member and to the School, including the Director.

To account for known limitations and biases of SEIs, the School has adopted the following guidelines, based on current best practices, for how and when these assessments are used.

- a. The School will use SEIs primarily to assess how student satisfaction with each class taught by a faculty member changes over time. Other comparisons are not recommended. Comparing across classes ignores known biases related to topic, course difficulty, class size, etc., while comparing across faculty ignores biases based on instructors' demographic characteristics.
- b. The School will not rely heavily on the comparison group statistics provided by the university. These aggregate scores ignore important differences in content and instructor attributes that are known to bias SEIs.

- c. The School will be cautious when interpreting SEIs for courses with a response rate below 50%, acknowledging that they are often more biased.
- d. Open-ended comments in student evaluations are not used in promotion and tenure decisions. Research suggests that this form of feedback is uniquely biased.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Observations are conducted by tenured faculty and results are reported using the format specified by the School's teaching observation template. Observations are scheduled as follows:

- a. At least two times before a tenure review, untenured assistant professors will have their peer teaching observation for a representative course. Peer observations for C/P assistant professors will be conducted in the second year and typically every other year after that.
- b. Tenured associate professors will have peer observations every two years and at least twice prior to promotion review. C/P associate professors seeking promotion will have observations occur as close as possible to the review for promotion. Because of scheduling issues, candidates for promotion need to notify the Chair of the P&T Committee at least one year in advance of her or his intention to be considered for promotion.
- c. Peer observations are not required of tenured professors (but see below).
- d. In cases where the Director discerns that a particular faculty member or lecturer is facing teaching difficulties, the Director may require peer observation of classroom teaching performance and/or recommend the use of the university's instructional training resources.

C. Teaching Materials Review

Teaching materials reviews are conducted by tenured faculty and results are reported using the School's teaching materials review form. The goal of the review is to assess the quality of the instructional materials and to offer suggestions for improvement. Reviews are focused on the following criteria:

- Appropriateness of course objectives,
- Degree to which instructor's personal assessment criteria matches well with the stated course objectives and method of delivery,
- Degree to which classroom instruction, assignments, and new technology are utilized to meet the stated course objectives,
- Currency of readings,
- Consistency of assignments, examinations and course objectives,
- Syllabus construction and clarity,
- Rigor of course requirements, and

- Student reaction and evaluation.

Procedures for conducting the review are as follows:

- Two tenured faculty members (“reviewers”) will be assigned to the individual (“reviewee”) being reviewed.
- Each reviewer will be given all the peer review materials submitted by the reviewee.
- The pair of reviewers will assess all peer teaching review materials independently and will then meet and discuss to reach consensus.

The resulting assessment will be provided to the reviewee, the Committee of Eligible Faculty, and the Director, and it is included in the P&T dossier. The eligible faculty members’ discussion of the candidate’s teaching performance will also be summarized and included in annual review letters.

The teaching materials review process is intended to provide useful feedback to faculty members and to identify possible issues that may need attention. If an initial peer review identifies issues, the appropriate Committee Chair (Graduate, Journalism Program Committee, or Communication Program Committee) will work with the faculty member to make sure the syllabus or course content issues are addressed in accordance with School policy and expectations. A brief summary of how the issues were corrected should be included in the dossier or activity report in the following review cycle.

Teaching material reviews for tenure-track assistant professors will take place at least twice before a tenure review. Tenure-track associate professors will be reviewed once every two years and at least twice before promotion review. Teaching materials reviews for C/P assistant and associate professors will be conducted at least once per two years of appointment. C/P professors will have their materials reviewed every four years.

1. Reviewee Requirements

Faculty undergoing a teaching material review will submit materials for each course they have taught through the School prior to their first evaluation of teaching methods and materials. For any evaluation following the first evaluation, materials for all courses that have not been covered in a prior review should be included. The materials to be submitted for each course offered during the period under review are:

- Course Objectives and Personal Assessment Form
- Narrative describing the contact hours within the course and how they were distributed (online versus in class, etc.)
- The Syllabus for each course offering
- All exams, written assignments and handouts for each course offering
- SEI reports from all courses taught at Ohio State (Cumulative SEI) during the review period.

All peer teaching review materials will be due in electronic form to the main office on the same date as set by the School's Director for submission of all annual review materials. The review committee will also have access to prior teaching review reports.

D. Annual Reviews of Teaching

Assistant, C/P, and associate professors can expect their overall teaching performance to be assessed by the relevant eligible faculty as part of the annual review process. The eligible faculty of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shares their assessment with the Director and this information forms that basis for the teaching section of the annual review letters. Teaching observations, teaching material reviews, and (with the proviso identified above) SEIs are discussed during the annual reviews meeting. Additionally, where applicable, aspects of graduate teaching in non-formal settings, such as research collaboration, mentoring, and guidance are addressed annually. The annual reviews take account of the abilities, strengths and weaknesses of each faculty member, and also comment on the teaching trajectory, anomalies, or particularly stellar achievements. The annual review also serves to aid the director in determining course load and teaching quality in assessing performance. If Eligible Faculty members or the Director have concerns or questions about aspects of teaching that appear to be problematic, additional aspects of teaching assessment may be recommended.

X. APPENDIX A

Expectations for Assistant Professors before Promotion to Associate Professor

School of Communication

To reiterate the criteria provided in the body of the APT document: The School of Communication is a leading research and Ph.D. granting program in the field. Tenure reflects a level of achievement for early career scholars that provides a high degree of confidence that the candidates will develop and sustain over the course of their career a record of outstanding research accomplishment and scholarly impact in their areas of expertise consistent with a strong national and international scholarly reputation. Tenure also reflects a high level of capability as classroom instructor and research mentor, and a demonstrated capacity to contribute as a citizen of the School, College, University, and profession, as well as to society as a whole. Faculty are encouraged to engage with issues related to fostering a sense of community, promoting access for all, and valuing/engaging with differing viewpoints from individuals with a wide variety of lived experiences (see Appendix C). Such work should only be conducted insofar as appropriate to their research program, teaching aspirations, and their approach to service. The distinctive challenges of research in this area are taken into account when assessing candidate's research records (see below). Although active engagement with such issues in teaching, service, and research enhance a candidate's record, it is not an expectation for tenure or promotion.

The material that follows is intended to provide more explanation and context regarding these promotion and tenure criteria as outlined in the APT document. Our hope is that this additional context will help candidates better understand how the eligible faculty approaches the tenure evaluation process and decision, and in so doing will help them better develop their own career decision-making. The guidance provided below should be interpreted in light of the APT text in the body of the APT document, if any terms or phrases might otherwise be considered open to multiple interpretations.

A. Scholarship

Success as an academic in a leading Ph.D. granting program requires a deep passion for and commitment to original and significant research and scholarship. Excellence typically reflects intellectual curiosity and capability, desire to contribute to knowledge and to society, and commitment to carrying out the best research of which one is capable. Criteria for research and scholarly excellence consistent with tenure in the School of Communication include quality, placement, productivity, distinctiveness of contribution and development of independence from one's advisors and other early mentors, cohesiveness, and potential for cumulative scholarly and social impact, as reflected primarily by peer reviewed publications, and, for some candidates, grants. This assessment can be a complex process, and is discussed in detail below.

1. Quality

Research quality includes the significance, impact, and originality of intellectual/theoretical contribution, methodological rigor and in some cases methodological innovation, insight provided regarding significant social phenomena, and research designs that yield or involve the

kind of data that support the intended contribution. A variety of means and criteria are used to assess research quality.

One of the key indicators of research quality is a function of the peer review process. The top-ranked general interest journals in each discipline, for example, typically provide especially careful and critical review of theoretical and/or substantive contribution, methodological rigor and where appropriate methodological innovation, research design, and potential scholarly impact. There is a clear presumption that work published in such journals has passed a high level of scrutiny from reviewers and editors who are leaders in their disciplines, examining work in competition with submissions from the best researchers in the discipline or, in some cases, across multiple disciplines.

Assessments of journal ranking are aided by the use of the Impact Factors and comparative rankings as reported, by discipline, in the Journal Citation Report. These Impact Factors are in part a function of the size of the discipline, whether the research specialty area is currently “hot,” or if the journal focuses on review articles that receive heavy citation. Still, low impact factors (e.g., those in the bottom quartile of their respective field) may suggest a less demanding journal, an extremely highly specialized journal, or a new journal that is yet fully to establish its reputation. Such outlets may be appropriate for some research and useful in building a research program (e.g., publishing on a new measure, an initial pilot study, or some small-scale research led by a graduate student) but should not represent a major element in the case for tenure and will receive little weight in the evaluation process.

Placement should always be considered alongside other indicators. Such evidence is discussed below. A record of prestige placements does not obviate the expert examination of quality and likely scholarly and social impact over the course of a career, and having some such placement(s) is not a guarantee of a successful tenure review.

Journal placement has several known limitations as an indicator of quality. Placement in high impact journals is a better fit for some scholars than for others. For example, research that considers social identity (e.g., race or gender) as a variable of study has historically not been published in the top journals of the field as frequently as work on other topics. The eligible faculty should be mindful of this when assessing placement of such work.

An exceptional form of success involves positive peer review outcomes when those who submit and review include top scholars across many disciplines. There are a handful of highly ranked multi-disciplinary (sometimes referred to as “general science”) journals that serve researchers across the sciences and social sciences. Likewise, when a candidate is successful as principal investigator in receiving major grant funding (e.g., NIH and NSF regular awards, NIH and NSF career awards, and major grants from Departments of Defense, Energy, and other federal agencies), this also demonstrates successful experiences in rigorous peer review from top experts in competition with leading scientists and scholars from a broad range of disciplines. We emphasize that such successes are by no means an expectation and indeed may be unusual at the assistant professor level; the presence of such success, however, is quite impressive with respect to peer review assessment of research quality and significance. Here, again, expert examination of the work in question is expected.

Placement in leading general-interest journals in communication and allied disciplines, or successfully competing for grant funding on a national scale, are not the only ways to evidence superior research quality. Another way to demonstrate such research quality is an impressive record of more specialized publication in well-respected and influential sub-disciplinary or specialized interdisciplinary journals, especially for a researcher/scholar primarily focused on understanding a specific domain of communication activity and human behavior. The requisite level of quality, however, is less convincingly attested by placement alone. In such cases, the tenured faculty and Director will of necessity depend more heavily upon expert evaluations including external reviews and committee assessments of quality, level of productivity, how intellectually cohesive and theoretically and methodologically sound the work appears to be, and its potential for intellectual impact and the potential social importance of research findings. Within this context, external support from highly competitive funding sources such as NIH or NSF, including smaller grants typically intended as a first step towards building larger projects, is valuable (but by no means obligatory) additional evidence with respect to quality as assessed by peer review.

2. Productivity

Productivity is a very important predictor of a candidate's actual and potential intellectual and social impact, and of the likelihood of continuing research activity after promotion. In assessments of productivity, a number of factors must be weighed together and holistic judgments must be made.

Publication quantity. It is impossible to specify a single, fixed number of publications required of all faculty members. There are a variety of factors that predictably influence tenure expectations. Placement quality is a factor: When placement in top disciplinary (e.g., "flagships") or multi-disciplinary general-interest publications is limited or non-existent, a relatively larger number of more specialized publications generally are to be expected. Evidence of intellectual leadership and intellectual cohesiveness (see below) are factors that also influence judgments of productivity. When assessing the rate of publication, it is important to attend to the research areas and/or topic. There are important differences in publication norms between different parts of the discipline, with some associated with much higher rates of publication than others. When assessing productivity, these differences must be considered.

Pattern of productivity. The pattern of productivity is another factor considered by the School. A pattern of productivity in early years that diminishes markedly, or conversely a pattern of quite modest productivity with a sudden burst of publication prior to tenure review raises questions about the likelihood of continued scholarly productivity after tenure. Publications from graduate school or other institutions prior to coming to OSU are considered as part of the candidate's research record, and a year or so of slowdown while transitioning to a new institution is to be expected. However, if the pattern of productivity shows substantially less success at OSU than elsewhere, that may raise concerns about the likelihood of success after tenure.

Pipeline. Papers currently submitted or under revision, and recent conference papers likely to move into journal submission, are used to assess the pipeline and provide a sense of the candidate's momentum; placement of papers under review or in revision is of interest in the assessment process. In addition, external grant efforts, even if unfunded, also indicate potential scholarly impact in the future. The competition for grants involves top researchers from many

disciplines, and even well reviewed but unfunded applications made during tight funding times suggest a high level of research capability. Scoring and ratings of unfunded grant proposals can be listed in the dossier and discussed in the research narrative. Such a record of publications in process and unfunded as well as funded grant submissions will be considered in the discussion of research pipeline and can prove useful as evaluators assess future potential.

Scholarly monographs. Scholarly monographs can be an important contributor to judgments of productivity and quality if they are clearly scholarly contributions and not textbooks (though such monographs are in no regard an expectation); the quality of the publisher, reputation of the manuscript reviewers and/or series editor, the publication status at time of tenure review, the nature and presence of book reviews in scholarly journals, and the expert judgments of evaluators within and outside the School, are important to this assessment. Candidates interested in such an approach should consult with their mentors and the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Editing anthologies is discussed below.

Book chapters. As noted above, a good record of publication in quality peer-reviewed influential journals (see *Quality*, above) is an essential element in a tenure record. As a consequence, book chapters carry little or no weight in assessment of research productivity or quality. However, under some circumstances such publications can help in articulating the cohesiveness of a research program and/or visibility in the field. An opportunity later in the probationary cycle to make a case for the cohesiveness and impact of one's research program in a book chapter can be used to help support one's arguments for programmatic contribution and intellectual cohesiveness in the tenure portfolio. However, if presentation of a research agenda or theoretical perspective can be accomplished through publication in peer-reviewed journals (e.g., the *Communication Theory*, *Annals of the International Communication Association*), that is to be preferred over book chapters. Careful selectivity in agreements to do book chapters or edit anthologies is recommended, and assistant professors are advised to confer with their mentors.

Non-Web of Science journals. Indexing by the Web of Science serves as an imperfect proxy for publication quality. Publication in journals that are not indexed in the Web of Science, as noted above, may be useful on occasion in building a research program (e.g., publishing on a new measure or some small-scale preliminary research one wishes to cite in future or providing a venue for early work led by a graduate student). Works published in such journals must be evaluated on their merits before their contribution to the overall level of productivity can be assessed.

One exception is the *Howard Journal of Communications*, which will be regarded in terms of productivity/placement as equivalent to other specialized Communication journals indexed in the Web of Science. This exception has been made by vote of faculty because of the lack of a Web of Science communication journal focused on issues of race, ethnicity, sexuality, and other dimensions of marginalization, and because of the perceived quality of the journal. All other focal research areas in the School have specialized communication journals indexed by the Web of Science. The faculty believe it is important to provide a specialized outlet in a communication journal to School faculty who study these areas.

Candidates are strongly discouraged from publishing in what are sometimes referred to as “pay to play” or “predatory” journals. “Predatory journals and publishers are entities that prioritize self-interest at the expense of scholarship and are characterized by false or misleading

information, deviation from best editorial and publication practices, a lack of transparency, and/or the use of aggressive and indiscriminate solicitation practices" (for more on predatory journals, click [here](#)). Although there are no commonly accepted lists of predatory publishers, such journals are typically excluded from well-established indexing services. Therefore, publications in journals that are not listed with Web of Science, EBSCO, or Scopus will normally be entirely ignored when assessing a candidate's record, and indeed can weaken rather than strengthen the impression of quality for that record.

Conference proceedings. Conference proceedings are considered much as other forms of publication: if they are listed in Web of Science, they are considered a form of journal publication and attention is paid to impact factor and ranking within a discipline's journals. If not, they are considered an alternative form of non-Web of Science publication and are given little weight in evaluation.

Encyclopedia entries. These carry no weight in tenure and promotion (nor in annual reviews). They typically might be undertaken as a favor to an editor or other colleague, or if the topic is so closely related to the scholar's interest that writing it takes little time. Generally, we advise assistant professors to avoid them. We recommend candidates consult with their mentor and/or the Chair of the P&T Committee if they are in doubt as to how to handle an invitation to contribute such an entry. In some cases, some handbooks with substantive chapters written by highly visible scholars may refer to themselves as encyclopedias; in such cases the candidate should provide relevant explanation in the research narrative.

3. Scholarly leadership, distinctive contributions, programmatic research/intellectual cohesiveness, significance to the field of communication, and potential for cumulative impact

Scholarly leadership means that a candidate's research directions and ideas are driven by their own capacity and expertise and by one's ability to articulate these ideas and design research to pursue them. By capacity and expertise we refer to a) evidence for a strong grasp of relevant theory, reflected in an ability to contribute to theory building or to take original or distinctive approaches to applying theory to important social problems that demonstrates a grasp on the relevant theories and extends their application in scientifically as well as socially valuable ways, b) the ability to design and conduct studies that propose and effectively test hypotheses arising from such thinking, and c) methodological expertise that permits the necessary data collection and data analysis, or collaboration with appropriate data analysis experts for highly specialized analyses. Regardless of what happens with any given collaborator, the research program can be expected to continue and develop apace, resulting in continued significant publication and impact and widespread recognition of the candidate as an authority in his or her own right. It is essential that evaluators conclude that the candidate has the capacity to be productive and to make a distinctive contribution without dependence on a specific individual or group of collaborators or mentors. Some scholars will always, and appropriately given their research foci, tend to work in collaborative teams. However, the University and School must be confident of continued successful research contributions after tenure when the candidate will be expected to increasingly lead such collaborative research efforts.

An intellectually cohesive or programmatic research portfolio is one in which distinctive research topics or questions are pursued in a way that suggests the development of an identifiable research identity for the candidate that clearly promises to mature in time to world-class scholarly expertise in the understanding and study of theoretical, methodological, and/or substantive issues significant to the discipline of communication as a whole and/or one or more of the component subfields studied here at the School of Communication. Such cohesiveness is important because it typically leads to cumulative scholarly and perhaps social impact consistent with a national/international scholarly reputation. Clear programmatic foci readily distinguishable from that of collaborators and mentors provide evidence of intellectual independence and distinctive contributions, even when the corpus is primarily collaborative.

The most direct way to evidence intellectual leadership is through publishing articles in excellent journals that are either single-authored or first-authored with other untenured colleagues as co-authors or coauthored with students where the candidate serves as either first or supervisory author (e.g., being second author behind a student or being last author). The more such publications exist, the more readily intellectual leadership can be inferred. However, we recognize that this model is not applicable to all candidates. In some areas, access to appropriate data sets or research populations, addressing especially complex social or scientific problems, or engagement in ambitious field research, is often possible only through collaboration with more senior colleagues. Such cases place greater demands both on the candidate and on our faculty as evaluators with regard to assessment of distinctive intellectual contribution and intellectual leadership; we emphasize, though, that such a scholarly approach can certainly be compatible with demonstration of intellectual leadership and distinctive contributions.

All of the following may prove valuable for making accurate evaluations: a strong record of first or supervisory-authorship, detailed information about the contribution of various team members (especially senior co-authors), letters from senior collaborators explaining their role versus the candidate's unique contribution, a clear programmatic focus or substantive/methodological expertise that suggests the candidate was responsible for the key contributions in collaborative research, and information about co-author expertise that suggests lack of overlap with the expertise and contribution of the candidate. We recommend candidates clearly explain in their research narrative how their contribution to each relevant collaborative article contributes and exemplifies their distinctive research contribution. We also positively view co-authorship roles in which distinctive contributions arising from the candidate's expertise are crucial to research success even though the candidate is not leading the research project or publication, but these should be documented and in addition to and not instead of work led by the candidate. Obviously, it is best in such cases that all or almost all collaborative work is not done with the same team, as the unique contribution of the candidate in such cases becomes harder to discern and will require more convincing documentation.

Generally, it is expected that in the first few years after the PhD or completion of a postdoc that there will be publications co-authored by advisors and other mentors, but there should also be growing evidence of independence from these mentors beginning as soon as practicable. We do recognize that in some cases there may be continuing involvement with a mentor on some publications (this may happen in a variety of areas, health and data science are typical examples) when access to hard-to-obtain data or populations depends on contacts and resources of such faculty. In those cases, it is essential to provide documentation regarding the limited role of the

senior faculty member, and the School will normally seek a report from the senior faculty member concerning their role. Please see Appendix E regarding involvement with collaborative and team science projects and suggestions as to how to document one's role in such projects.

In any event, we strongly encourage at least some scholarship that is sole-authored or authored with graduate student co-authors only to better demonstrate the capacity to conduct, write up, and publish high-quality research on one's own, even if the portfolio emphasis is on team science and collaborative work. This also permits evaluators to compare the intellectual quality of such manuscripts to collaboratively-produced manuscripts to help confirm that collaborative work led by the candidate reflects the quality they are capable of without the assistance of their collaborators. Grants received (or with respect to pipeline, proposals submitted) by the candidate as Principal Investigator (alone or when Principal Investigator duties are shared) also provide evidence of intellectual leadership in conjunction with other such evidence, even though these often require senior collaborators to be viable; senior collaborators might be overgenerous about authorship but are unlikely to cede or share fiscal control over a significant grant unless it is justified by the extent of the candidate's intellectual leadership and contribution.

Candidates whose expertise is primarily methodological may have challenges in that their role is often collaborative. In such cases, some independent journal publications on methods may help address the issue of independence and programmatic quality; other such candidates may take the lead on independent articles addressing substantive questions, while employing their methodology. In such cases, the intellectual cohesiveness may center more on creative and original application of methodology, innovation and development of important methods, and application to important questions, rather than on topical cohesiveness.

Programmatic quality and cohesiveness are important predictors of a scholar's prospects for having a broad scholarly (and perhaps social) impact over the arc of a career. True mastery over the research literature and relevant methods can typically only be accomplished in a limited number of domains. It is the accumulation of research and contributions that normally builds a career, a reputation, and a record of substantive contributions. Such cohesiveness is assessed subjectively by the faculty and by external reviewers. Candidates' research narratives, and if available programmatic discussions in a theory article or book chapter, can assist evaluators in making such judgments.

Significance of theoretical, substantive, and/or methodological contributions to the field of communication is of course most readily demonstrated by publication in highly-regarded journals in the communication field. If a major portion of the candidate's work is published in journals from other fields, the P&T committee and the committee of the eligible faculty will make a qualitative assessment of the scholarly merit and significance of the candidate's work with respect to important issues, questions, and/or methods in the communication field or in its component sub-disciplines.

It should be noted (see Teaching section below) that faculty are strongly encouraged in their work with graduate students to publish with them in well-respected general interest and leading specialty journals in Communication, even when much or most of their publication record is in journals outside of Communication. Absence of such publication in strong Communication journals with graduate students can be a matter of significant concern. Such publication is an important aspect of a faculty member's mentorship role in training and preparing graduate

students for the academic job market in Communication, where most of our students go. The Eligible Faculty should provide continuing feedback regarding progress in this direction during annual reviews. Faculty who come to the School trained in disciplines other than Communication therefore are strongly encouraged to familiarize themselves with relevant theoretical and empirical literature in Communication (syllabi in *Contemporary Communication Theory* and appropriate Communication graduate electives are a good starting point). Doing so is also important to effective teaching of undergraduate and graduate communication classes.

4. Scholarly and Social Impact

We seek scholars who contribute to the empirical, research-based understanding of communication phenomena in ways that are intellectually and socially important. Potential for scholarly and social impact involves, in part, subjective assessment of the candidate's scholarly contribution and expertise by internal and external evaluators.

Placement of research in quality communication journals clearly attests to the significance of work to understanding communication-related phenomena. Placement of research in quality journals in allied disciplines may frequently be the more appropriate choice given the topic, methods, or desire to impact a wider intellectual audience; however, it does mean that the candidate will need to articulate to evaluators the kinds of contributions they seek to make as scholars to understanding communication phenomena.

A relevant measure of scholarly impact involves the number of citations, especially to work led by the candidate. Web of Science citations is a required element of the dossier. Candidates have the option of providing Google Scholar and/or Scopus data, information about news coverage, etc., in their research narrative (with relevant tables appended to the dossier as necessary) to further document impact of their research. Citation both within and outside of the Communication field is welcome; as we encourage faculty members to have the broadest intellectual influence of which they are capable.

Citations do have issues as a criterion in evaluating candidates for tenure. Being a co-author, even third or fourth author, in graduate school with a prominent mentor on what proves to be an influential publication can lead to relatively high citation counts even in the absence of impact of the candidate's own work. Conversely, if the best work of the candidate is in the year or two prior to review, there is little time for citations to build. Nonetheless, an unusually low citation count signals reason for concern; there would have to be a high degree of confidence and strong supportive evidence given productivity, placement record and pipeline that this picture would change for a positive decision to be made. Conversely, a strong count for first-authored work can be quite impressive for an assistant professor. Therefore, the citation pattern is examined so as to help make inferences regarding the long-term prospects for intellectual impact.

We welcome and value citation from outside the Communication discipline as well as within it; however, if the candidate has little or no citation from scholars publishing in Communication or closely allied specialty journals, this may signal a matter of concern. Proportions of citations, however, are not an issue. For example, a respectable absolute count of citations within Communication, or journals in which Communication scholars in the relevant subfield frequently publish, that represent a small percentage of a large citation count overall, would not be seen as a problem.

Evidence for social impact is welcome but, as there are no ready metrics for such influence and because the social impact of foundational research may be better understood after a generation rather than after a few years, it is not essential. Evidence for social impact includes documented use of one's research by policymakers or in judicial decisions, news coverage in major reputable publications in contexts suggesting the scholarly value of the research for understanding some social issue, and invitations to participate in state or federal expert panels. Social impact can also be shown more locally. Such social impact evidence can enhance evidence for a scholar's potential influence, but do not replace citation and other more conventional metrics.

Contributions to quality curated sites such as *The Conversation* or the *Psychology Today* blog are valued as a form of community outreach and are addressed under Service.

In summary, a candidate's research portfolio is assessed as a whole. Tenured faculty must assess evidence that a candidate is an excellent scholar who has a very high likelihood of making continuing distinctive, significant research contributions over the course of their career, resulting in a substantial national and international research reputation and impact as a leading scholar in her/his area of specialty. The candidate's task is to perform at a level during the probationary years that permits such a confident determination. There are various routes through which this can be demonstrated, as noted above. We advise that people place articles as well as they can, publish as much quality work as they can manage, pursue funded research if it is a fit for their research direction and if they can do so while maintaining a good publication record. All these should help document a record of scholarly leadership and a distinctive and cohesive research program that has clear scholarly and/or social impact, with well-evidenced potential for significant and on-going impact over a career.

B. Teaching

The School values the teaching role highly and takes pride in the excellence of our faculty as instructors and mentors. Instruction and mentorship are a natural extension of a love for and commitment to knowledge and understanding that is central to the academic life. Tenure requires at the least a solid level of performance as a classroom instructor. Mentorship is emphasized in promotion and tenure decisions; excellence in mentoring students is an essential role in a top PhD program. True excellence in the instructional and mentorship roles, combined with a good record of performance in service, may have an impact in those tenure cases in which the research portfolio is quite strong, but there nonetheless is some disagreement among eligible faculty about some of the parameters of the research portfolio given the high level of expectations at the School of Communication. This is the case for two reasons: it is clear that the faculty member can contribute as a research mentor, teacher, and colleague in ways that significantly benefit the School, and because in our experience across-the-board high performance suggests a level of capability and commitment that is usually reflected in continued strong research performance over a career. Conversely, such a research record is unlikely to be given the benefit of the doubt when instruction, mentorship, and/or service are unimpressive. Conversely, teaching and service excellence do not substitute for excellence in research, and tenure is not possible without a very strong research record consistent with a top research unit, which promises continued scholarly success over a career; there are other academic institutions that are better suited to faculty for whom research excellence is not a defining characteristic.

1. Instruction

Classroom instruction is a central element of the teaching role. Instruction is assessed by internal peer review of syllabi, assignments, and other materials, including assessment of course content coverage, rigor, access for all, and use of class time; through peer visits to the classroom; and, to a lesser extent, by assessing ratings on the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI). For candidates for promotion and tenure, some early challenges are not uncommon; in such cases, we look for a clear pattern of improvement on these criteria over time to levels indicative of high quality instruction. Professional development efforts are also important part of the teaching record, including, for example, developing skills related to pedagogy that creates equal opportunity for all and builds community for students from all backgrounds. Creation of new courses, curriculum innovations, and creation of widely accessible teaching resources, if part of the record, are included in the assessment of candidates' instructional role, though they are not expected of probationary faculty.

2. Mentorship

Mentorship is particularly important to the teaching role in a one of the world's leading PhD programs in Communication. Mentorship is assessed by the performance of the candidate in graduate committees as reported by colleagues, the record of the candidate with PhD and MA advisees, by graduate student placement in quality employment, and in publication with graduate (and if appropriate, undergraduate) students. While we particularly value placement in research-oriented academic environments as indicative of a high level of research training, we also recognize the value of placement in corporate, non-profit, and government settings requiring research training, and in teaching-oriented post-secondary institutions for students who find their passion is for teaching.

To underscore this emphasis on research mentorship, we strongly encourage faculty to co-author with their advisees and other graduate students, and to encourage their students in turn to take the lead on subsequent collaborative work. Often in the social sciences, this is indicated by listing the faculty mentor as "corresponding author"; it may be helpful to arrange with the graduate student lead author that you be listed as such, which permits you greater ability to oversee and mentor the revision process. To further support our emphasis on research mentorship, we favor a pattern in which the faculty member may begin as lead author and then move to co-authorship with a graduate mentee as lead and regard the latter publications with comparable weight as we give to publications led by the candidate. Therefore, there is no pressure to maintain first authorship for the sake of tenure review when it would be reasonable to allow the graduate student to take the lead on the project (assuming there is also a good record of first-authored publications by the candidate).

Because graduate students typically seek employment in the Communication discipline, we strongly encourage collaborative publication with graduate students in journals in the communication discipline to demonstrate mentorship—especially in the leading general interest and specialty journals in the discipline—as that is typically prioritized by search committees in the field. We also appreciate evidence of involvement with undergraduates in research labs and in undergraduate theses and research competitions.

Mentorship of undergraduate students is also valuable, including providing opportunities to these students in research, providing professional guidance, supporting their pursuit of graduate school (e.g., by writing letters of recommendation), etc. Support for students from all backgrounds with a variety of lived experiences is highly valued.

C. Service

Service commitments and responsibilities should rise steadily during the pre-tenure years. While service expectations for untenured assistant professors are substantially less than they are for tenured faculty, it is important for such faculty to demonstrate their commitment to the profession, the School, and the University as well as to the field.

1. Expectations of School service.

Candidates are encouraged to self-nominate or, if someone else nominates you, run for election to School committees. Additionally, candidates can make their interests known to the Director for possible appointment. Most of our assistant professors are members of at least one School committee each year (with the exception of the first year at Ohio State). There may be times in which an assistant professor is not an official member of any single committee. However, even in those years, there are numerous opportunities to participate in faculty governance and development at the School level. School-level service work also includes advising student groups and organizing events that support students academically or professionally, leading professional development workshops, and contributing to events that serve the community.

2. Expectations of service to the academic profession.

Untenured assistant professors are strongly encouraged to actively engage in reviewing manuscript submissions to journals. We also typically see untenured faculty members reviewing for at least one division of a major organization (ICA, NCA or AEJMC) each year or engaging in other equivalent professional organization service very early in their careers. It is common for our assistant professors to review 3-6 journal articles per year on average. Editorial board service on high impact journals serves as an indicator of recognition of the candidate's expertise by senior colleagues. Such service is by no means an expectation, and we don't suggest pushing to be included on an editorial board unless you are a very active reviewer for a journal. We encourage assistant professors to speak to their mentors for guidance on enquiring about a possible editorial board service if you are a frequent reviewer for a given Web of Science indexed journal. Likewise, service as a peer reviewer for NIH, NSF, and other major U.S. and international grant programs indicates recognition for a scholar's special expertise. Leadership roles within professional organizations, typically related to the candidate's research specialty, are also favorably considered.

3. College/University/Columbus/State of Ohio/national service.

Typically, opportunities for this type of service are through invited lecture(s) in other programs, serving as a graduate faculty representative, or serving on committees that overlap with your research or teaching interests. There sometimes are opportunities to speak to groups or organizations off-campus (e.g., in the Columbus area or elsewhere in the state). At the local and national level, there are occasionally opportunities for discussing research with representatives of

the news media (if you wish to pursue these, be conscious of the potential risks as well as benefits and consult with mentors and with University media relations professionals about potential pitfalls). There are an increasing number of outlets for public education and discussion on-line, and publication and “hits” on quality curated sites such as *The Conversation* are considered a form of community outreach. There may be opportunities to serve on local, state or national advisory or review boards or committees. All of these opportunities offer a chance to demonstrate a service commitment to Ohio State and the School. Service to the larger public is not limited to engaging the press. Participation in activities that include service-learning or promoting public policy informed by one’s scholarship is also relevant.

XI. APPENDIX B

Expectations for Associate Professors before Promotion to Professor

School of Communication

In accordance with university code ([3335-6-02](#)), "*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.*"

Promotion from associate professor to professor, then, is recognition of distinguished research, teaching and service. To be promoted to professor, the candidate must have made or clearly demonstrated the ability to make a significant contribution to the stature of the University. He or she must have achieved a distinguished national/international reputation as an outstanding and productive scholar in the field. There should be evidence of momentum such that it leads the University to expect such productivity, and intellectual impact will continue for many years to come. As with earlier ranks, faculty are encouraged to engage with issues related to fostering a sense of community, promoting access for all, and valuing/engaging with differing viewpoints from individuals with a wide variety of lived experiences in ways that are appropriate to their research program, teaching aspirations, and their approach to service (see Appendix C). Although active engagement with such issues in teaching, service, and research enhance a candidate's record, it is not an expectation for promotion. Because the title of associate professor is itself an indication of distinction, promotion to professor is neither automatic nor to be expected in all cases.

The College of Arts and Sciences also recognizes that, “[w]here a candidate has made truly extraordinary contributions in the areas of **teaching** or **service**, that record may warrant promotion in combination with a less extensive, though excellent record of continued productivity in **scholarship**.” In the School of Communication, then, an excellent though less extensive record of continued research productivity may justify promotion from associate professor to professor rank when teaching or service contributions are “truly extraordinary.” In teaching, extraordinary contributions would typically involve outstanding performance as an instructor and mentor, as well as formal recognition in the discipline as well as by the College/University for outstanding teaching accomplishments. Likewise, extraordinary service contributions should be documented both within the School in annual reviews, acknowledgements through awards and other recognition in the University, and through outstanding service contributions to the discipline or society as a whole. Such teaching and service contributions—whether within or beyond the university—must be documented in ways that can be reviewed by external evaluators as well as by the eligible faculty against the criteria stated in the College guidelines and in this APT document.

The School and University use a number of indicators for gauging excellence in these areas.

A. Research

1. Quality

Associate professors are encouraged to consider how they are demonstrating research productivity, not only in terms of quantity of publications but also in terms of quality, impact and continuity. Associate professors should concentrate their efforts on producing high quality peer-reviewed publications that make an impact on the field. Significant grant success can also serve as evidence of the quality of the individual's work.

Placement of original research in high-quality journals (e.g., top disciplinary journals and major sub-disciplinary journals with good impact factors, see Appendix A for a more complete discussion) is an excellent indicator of research quality. This heuristic, however, sometimes disadvantages scholarship animated by questions related to topics traditionally understudied in the discipline (e.g., media representations of individuals from different backgrounds).

The final criterion for excellence in research is obtained through other professors' reading of the research articles produced since tenure. We rely on a reading by the professors in the School as well as the reading of other professors in Communication and allied fields from around the world. The research should provide evidence of a very high quality and sustained productivity since tenure.

Appointment as professor is preceded by national and/or international recognition as a leading scholar in our field, with a programmatic body of research and scholarship that demonstrates continued development of theory, substantive/policy implications, and/or methodological competence significantly beyond that characterized by work that had been completed by the time of tenure. There should also be evidence of momentum such that it leads the University to expect such productivity, and intellectual impact will continue for many years to come.

The quantity and even the placement of published articles or books alone does not demonstrate the intellectual impact of a scholar on a field. The importance of research in any form is a function of its intellectual originality and merit, as well as its reception by peers. A scholar's citation impact and trajectory also are important measures of scholarly influence and standing and therefore have particular utility in assessing a candidate's readiness for promotion to professor. However, if an unduly large percentage of citations are to work done early in the candidate's career, especially to work co-authored with advisors, with limited evidence for impact of more recent publication, it may diminish the impact of citation count with respect to promotion to professor. External letters are also useful in assessing the intellectual impact of a candidate's work.

Finally, when a candidate is successful as principal investigator in receiving major grant funding (e.g., NIH and NSF regular awards, NIH and NSF career awards, and major grants from Departments of Defense, Energy, and other federal agencies), this also demonstrates successful experiences in rigorous peer review from top experts in competition with leading scientists and scholars from a broad range of disciplines.

Textbook writing is considered a contribution to teaching, not to scholarship. Editing books is an acceptable and appropriate activity for a tenured faculty member, but this activity should not be

considered a substitute for publication of original research and are not considered an important indicator of scholarly productivity; rather, they may help serve as a marker of role or reputation in the field, when the collection is an intellectually significant one. Encyclopedia entries typically do not carry weight at all in the review process; in some cases major handbooks are being called “encyclopedias” for marketing purposes, and contributions are comparable to book chapters; if that is the case, explanation can be provided in the research narrative and they may also be considered markers of role or reputation in the field.

2. Productivity

The research record should provide evidence of very high quality and sustained productivity since tenure. We recognize that for some faculty, temporary interruptions in the continuity of research productivity may occur as a result of personal/family circumstances or an evolution of research direction that requires retooling and rebuilding programmatic momentum. While the full record since tenure is considered, primary attention is normally given to the research record in the past five years in assessing the candidate’s prospects for continued excellence and productivity after promotion, and a strong record of productivity, placement, and intellectual cohesiveness is expected over those years.

It is unusual for a candidate to come up for promotion for professor without five years in rank as an associate professor. However, exemplary candidates who have demonstrated outstanding productivity since tenure, excellent journal article placement and other markers of success (e.g., a well-received scholarly monograph, leadership on major funded grant proposals, quality classroom teaching and advising/mentorship, and a commitment to service in line with the expectations of a professor), may be considered earlier.

Associate professors who have maintained a steady pace of productivity with placement in first-rate journals over a sustained period and have developed a clear programmatic focus leading to a strong national and international reputation in a readily discerned area of expertise may in due time be candidates for promotion to professor even if their rate of productivity is somewhat less than for others who may be more quickly promoted. Evidence for cumulative scholarly impact (e.g., citation count and trajectory) that is comparable to or exceeds that of faculty recently promoted to the rank of professor at peer institutions in the same subfield, evidence that work since tenure is continuing to be well-received and influential in the (sub)field, and a consistent, sustained record of placing programmatic work in high-quality journals, suggests that such candidates may be ready for promotion.

3. Intellectual cohesiveness/programmatic research significant to the field of communication

A research record largely characterized by pursuing a loosely connected set of ideas, especially if the body of work appears to be primarily driven by the interests of graduate students rather than the faculty member’s own research program, is unlikely to result in promotion. The theory, methods and procedures of the research conducted are likely to be less developed. A series of papers that build on one another will probably have a cumulative impact greater than an assortment of papers on unrelated topics. Researchers may construct programmatic research agendas in various ways, but in every case, one should be able to discern cohesive, distinctive, and cumulative research contributions.

Candidates for promotion should be making important contributions to theoretical, methodological, and/or substantive questions significant to the field of Communication and/or the component subfields studied in the School. Significance of theoretical, substantive, and/or methodological contributions to the field of Communication is readily, but not exclusively, demonstrated by publication in well regarded journals in the field. If a major portion of the candidate's work is published in journals from other fields, the P&T Committee and the Committee of the Eligible Faculty will make a qualitative assessment of the intellectual merit and relevance of the candidate's work with respect to important issues, questions, and methods in the communication field and in its component subdisciplines.

Faculty who come to the School trained in disciplines other than Communication are strongly encouraged to familiarize themselves with relevant theoretical and empirical literature in Communication (syllabi in *Contemporary Communication Theory* and appropriate Communication graduate electives are a good starting point in exploring this literature). In addition to supporting quality research significant to the field of Communication, doing so is important to effective teaching of undergraduate and graduate communication classes, and successfully advising and placing graduate students from the School in communication programs. As noted below under teaching, as part of graduate training and mentorship publication with graduate students in high-quality general interest or specialized Communication journals is very desirable, even if much or most of the candidate's publication record is in journals outside of Communication. The Committee of Eligible Faculty should provide continuing feedback regarding progress in this direction during annual reviews.

We welcome and value citation from outside the Communication discipline as well as within it; however, if the candidate has little or no citation from scholars publishing in Communication or closely allied specialty journals, this may signal a matter of concern. Proportions of citations, however, are not an issue. For example, a respectable absolute count of citations within Communication, or journals in which Communication scholars in the relevant subfield frequently publish, that represent a small percentage of a large citation count overall, would not be seen as a problem.

4. Scholarly leadership

There is no question that collaborative research is highly valuable and becomes even more valuable and valued after tenure. It will be important to demonstrate the ability to work with colleagues, graduate students and junior faculty on research projects. However, associate professors still need to make sure that there is strong evidence of scholarly leadership and should still be writing some senior authored pieces in high quality outlets. Having a distinctive research agenda is a key to providing evidence of intellectual leadership. Another way to provide evidence of independent thought and unique contribution to the field is to produce a major scholarly work such as a scholarly monograph that is published by a high-quality publisher and is well-received by reviewers. Faculty members who are active in "team science", typically in teams working on funded research, can demonstrate their scholarly leadership and contribution by serving in the lead role (Principal Investigator or joint Principal Investigator of record) on major successfully funded research applications and resulting publications, in addition to first-authoring peer-reviewed articles.

5. Evidence of societally and policy relevant research

When possible, the associate professor should explore the possibilities of producing fundable societally or policy-relevant research (by societally or policy-relevant research we mean research that has the potential to impact decision-making and resource allocation by government or quasi-governmental entities, or to otherwise directly impact society and the quality of life of Americans or people around the world). Some research areas are more conducive to generating external grants than others, but it is wise for all to explore the possibilities and apply for external funding. Such external funding is an objective endorsement (via rigorous peer review in a highly competitive environment) of the importance of the faculty member's research program with respect to its potential for a larger impact on society and provides evidence of national recognition. Past funding record and future potential to generate external funds are taken into consideration when determining whether someone should be promoted to professor.

Other evidence for social impact is welcome but, as there are no ready metrics for such influence and because the social impact of foundational research may be better understood after a generation rather than after a few years, it is not essential. Evidence for social impact includes documented use of one's research by policymakers or in judicial decisions, news coverage in major reputable publications in contexts suggesting the value of the research for understanding some social issue, invitations to participate in state or federal expert panels, and intervention-based research that effectively promotes the interests of underserved communities. Such social impact evidence can enhance evidence for a scholar's potential influence, but do not replace citation and other more conventional metrics. Contributions to quality curated news sites such as *The Conversation* or the *Psychology Today* blog are valued as a form of community outreach and are addressed under Service.

In summary, the promotion committee and the Director will always look for a cohesive set of excellent publications in highly respected journals and will expect solid evidence of unique contributions, outstanding scholarly reputation and leadership in a sub-discipline of our field, and, when relevant and appropriate given the research program, evidence that the individual has the potential to secure external grants and/or has been successful in doing so.

B. Teaching

Excellent classroom teaching as well as mentoring and guiding graduate students continue to be highly valued activities for associate professors and professors. The means of assessing teaching are the same as for assistant professors. Professional development also continues to be important, though associate professors should also look for opportunities to help their colleagues grow as teachers. Additionally, associate professors are encouraged to become involved in curriculum development, including aspects of course development and overall curriculum issues within the School. Supervising undergraduate honors students and their senior theses are appropriate and encouraged activities.

The graduate student load typically increases during the years subsequent to tenure. We generally expect increased evidence of ability to supervise graduate teaching and research assistants as well as additional collaboration with graduate students on research projects. These additional collaborations with graduate students bring added responsibility. Special care should be taken to make certain that graduate students are able to graduate on time, with high-quality

theses and dissertations, and with a research/publication record that enables them to obtain positions at high-quality institutions. Co-publication with graduate students including articles first-authored by the student, preferably in major Communication journals as they are the most helpful placements in providing students entrée to job opportunities at major universities, is one of the most important indicators of successful mentorship of graduate students and is particularly emphasized when assessing readiness for promotion to professor.

There can be a tension between having a large number of graduate students and being able to direct enough attention to each of them. Therefore, it is wise to exercise caution about the total number of graduate students supervised and the amount of graduate committee involvement, to

find a workable balance between numbers and quality/amount of attention. Similarly, faculty with areas of specialization that are less likely to invite large numbers of advisees may be well-advised to balance this through greater service on graduate committees, directed reading/research, and other contributions to the program. In the end, the faculty member is responsible for his or her record with graduate students, and this record will include their number, the quality of their work, their placement at research-oriented institutions and other forms of placement success, and the timeliness of completion of their degrees. All of these factors are considerations in the faculty member's teaching record.

C. Service

After tenure, it is expected that faculty members will take on increasingly important service roles in the School, college, University, field, as well as more publicly oriented service. These roles can include serving on School and University committees, serving in leadership roles on these committees or providing solicited or even unsolicited help on any variety of activities, especially in regard to tenure and promotion reviews, curricular design or implementation, and other areas that are important to School, College or University functions.

1. Expectations of School service.

During associate professor years, it is critical to be a conscientious and dependable member and where appropriate Chair of School committees, and to serve as a positive role model and mentor for junior faculty. Professors are deeply engaged in helping chart the direction of the School and bearing much of the administrative load. Because appointment to professor involves these additional responsibilities, evidence of the willingness and ability to participate constructively in School administration is an important consideration in appointment to professor, and experience as a committee chair is a valued indicator of such willingness and ability.

Associate professors are encouraged to run for election to School committees. Additionally, they should make their interests known to the Director, who can appoint faculty members to certain committees. Generally speaking, most of our associate professors are members of at least one School committee each year. There are numerous additional opportunities to participate in faculty governance and development at the School level. Being a good citizen of the School includes involvement in the work that needs to be done. There is often need for help in teaching reviews and observations as well as developing reports on research. Mentoring an assistant professor can also be a valuable service by more senior associate professors. Contributions in these areas are always appreciated and demonstrate a commitment to the School and its faculty.

School-level service that fosters a sense of community, promotes access for all, and engages with differing viewpoints from individuals with a wide variety of lived experiences is also highly valued among those who have the relevant expertise. Examples include leading workshops for faculty and/or students or creating substantively important new professional opportunities for students especially in need of support, such as first-generation students, economically challenged students, or students from rural and urban areas.

2. Expectations of service to the academic profession.

Leadership roles in the discipline also are important and can include reviewing journal articles, serving as an editorial board member, and serving in key leadership roles for organizations or organizational divisions.

Associate professors are strongly encouraged to actively engage in reviewing manuscript submissions to journals and becoming active on editorial boards. We suggest that associate professors accept invitations to editorial boards for Web of Science journals whenever possible. Editorial board service on strong journals, and editorships, are looked on favorably at the School and College level. Additionally, we expect associate professors to assume leadership roles in our national organizations (ICA, NCA, and AEJMC) to the extent possible. These include being a division head, serving on or leading an organizational committee, or assuming higher offices.

3. College/University/Columbus/State of Ohio/national service.

It also is important to serve the College and University in any number of service roles. Associate professors often have opportunities to participate on College or University committees, interdisciplinary University programs, the university senate or other deliberative body, or may be invited to participate on ad hoc panels or committees investigating a potential policy change or the implications of outside forces on OSU governance. Additionally, there are sometimes opportunities to speak to groups or organizations off-campus (in the Columbus area or elsewhere in the state, the country, or the world) when their interests or needs intersect with your teaching and research. At the local and national level, there are occasionally opportunities for discussing your research with representatives of the news media who believe your insights/expertise will be of interest to their readers or viewers (we recommend that you seek the assistance of experienced senior faculty and University media relations personnel to help ensure that your communications with the media serve you, the School, and the University positively). Candidates may also wish to note hits on the *Conversation* or other curated sites intended to provide balanced, thoughtful academic consideration to a wider public, as another form of community outreach.

Service to the larger public is not limited to engaging the press. Participation in activities that include service-learning or promoting public policy informed by one's scholarship is also relevant.

You may also be asked to serve on grant or program review panels or advisory groups nationally (which have the advantage of providing further evidence of your national reputation as an expert

in your area of research). These responsibilities are over and above those of serving as a graduate faculty representative or serving on committees that overlap with your research or teaching interests. We encourage your participation in those activities and opportunities, as they are part of the role of a senior scholar.

XII. APPENDIX C

Recognizing Activity that Reflects Ohio State's Shared Values

The School of Communication is committed to the [Ohio State Shared Values](#), which include a commitment to equal opportunity in all aspects of our work. In practice, this means that we encourage open-minded exploration, risk-taking, and freedom of expression while advocating for access, affordability, opportunity, and empowerment for all.

The School intentionally fosters a sense of belonging where all are valued, regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, physical and psychological disabilities, economic status, or other sources of marginalization. Further, our mission includes a commitment to acknowledging and addressing individual and systemic effects of bias and discrimination.

This appendix briefly describes some important ways that faculty can embody this commitment in each of three core assessment areas: research, teaching, and service.

Research that:

- **Focuses on socially important research questions:** The research project's central focus, or animating question, involves an issue that upholds Ohio State's shared values yet is traditionally understudied in the field. It includes work that builds on or extends relevant theory (e.g., objectification theory; social identity theory, integrated identity threat theory) as well as more formative research. It also includes work that has consequence for our understanding of and ability to respond to social problems such as prejudice, poverty, and inequality.
- **Relies fundamentally on concepts that uphold Ohio State's shared values:** Research in which direct examination of concepts related to understanding and combatting, for instance, inequality and discrimination, is a central contribution.
- **Involves socially important interventions:** Research that aims to intervene on matters directly related to upholding Ohio State's shared values. For example, work that focuses on advancing the interests of underserved communities (e.g., low SES).
- **Is enhanced through professional development:** Attending a workshop, conference, or other type of event that improves research knowledge and/or skills related to upholding Ohio State's shared values. For example, this might include efforts to become more conversant with relevant theories or practices.

Teaching that:

- **Engages with divergent viewpoints and students from all backgrounds:** Delivering material that, for instance, directly engages with topics related to equal access and support for all.

- **Welcomes students from all backgrounds:** Engaging in classroom activities that promote understanding of differences, and building connections across students with a wide variety of lived experiences.
- **Accounts for how having differing viewpoints and lived experiences impacts learning:** This includes using assignment structures that meet the needs of all students, using examples that reflect the experience of people with different backgrounds, etc.
- **Is enhanced through pedagogical development:** Attending a workshop, conference, or other type of event that focuses on learning about, and/or skill building around issues that uphold Ohio State's shared values. While framed as a part of teaching, this option also reflects your role as a learner in this area.

Service that:

- **Promotes Ohio State's shared values.** For example, faculty might advise a student group that supports people who have been denied equal access and/or suffered past institutional discrimination in the United States.
- **Promotes professional development:** For example, lead workshops or other professional activities that help others improve their research and/or teaching skills related to building supportive communities, promoting equal access, and improving the success and retention rates for students of all backgrounds. Leading such an event should only be undertaken by individual with requisite expertise acquired, for example, through participation in professional development activities led by others.
- Helps recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff from individuals who have a wide variety of lived experiences: This includes providing mentorship to help create a more positive and supportive environment for all. It also includes mentoring at all levels including undergraduate and graduate students, assistant and associate professors, etc.
- **Promotes awareness** of the value of work that promotes fairness and equality for all.
- **Engages the community:** Participation in community events in ways that serve the community and contribute to upholding Ohio State's shared values in more applied ways. This might include service-learning activities or promoting public policy informed by one's scholarly expertise.

XIII. APPENDIX D

Mentoring Guidelines

The School of Communication employs a formalized mentoring system. Any assistant or associate professor, tenure-track or C/P faculty, may request a professor to serve as a mentor. In our School, all assistant professors, shortly after they begin employment, are required to put in writing in a memo to the Director whether or not they desire a mentor, and that mentor's name (if one is desired). The assistant professors should ask their designated mentor(s) if he/she is willing to serve in this capacity. This decision must be made by the second full semester of appointment. The School recommends that the mentor be in the same track (tenure or C/P) as the mentee, and it discourages assistant professors from selecting more than two mentors.

The mentor's purpose is not to serve as an advocate for the mentee, but rather as a resource for questions concerning research, teaching or service. As a member of the tenured faculty, a mentor's first obligation is to the School. The mentor is expected to participate in an objective way during deliberations of the eligible faculty and of the P&T Committee, if the mentor serves on that committee.

During the annual review process, mentors sometimes provide clarifying information to the promotion and tenure committee when particular issues come up related to teaching, research or service. Detailed knowledge of a mentee's struggles or accomplishments may unduly influence an objective assessment if the mentor develops a close relationship with a mentee. If a mentor moves beyond expression of his or her objective assessment of the candidate to advocacy for the candidate during an evaluation, the Director, or the Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty, or the Procedures Oversight Designee (POD), may first point out the apparent advocacy and if it continues suggest the mentor recuse him/her self during the evaluation. Undue advocacy is reflected when a mentor goes beyond stating his or her viewpoint and respectfully acknowledging points of disagreement to rebutting colleagues repeatedly, and/or when the tone of the mentor's comments becomes unduly heated.

The School recommends at least an annual meeting between mentors and mentees to discuss progress and issues. The mentee should initiate these meetings. Faculty mentoring should cover the following areas:

1. Information about the system of governance (policies and procedures) within the unit and university.
2. Research: provide guidance on scholarly activities (reading manuscripts, suggesting publication outlets, providing feedback on grant proposals), advice on how to achieve short-term and long-term goals.
3. Teaching: reinforce the message that teaching is an important component of annual reviews and the promotion and tenure process, provide guidance on teaching issues.
4. Service: provide information about service expectations.
5. Suggestions regarding work-life balance as requested or needed.

While mentors can provide an important role in reaching promotion, the junior faculty member has ultimate responsibility for compiling a record of scholarship, teaching and service that merits promotion and tenure. Mentees must take responsibility for their own growth and success, be proactive in seeking out information and guidance, and be open to constructive feedback. Ultimately, the mentor is one faculty member among many. Any advice a mentor provides must be considered only within the context of the mentee's goals and capabilities. The decisions and choices that untenured faculty make are ultimately their own.

XIV. APPENDIX E

P&T Guidelines for Collaborative Research

General guidelines and suggestions for Assistant Professors to evaluate and select collaborative research opportunities, and document the nature of their contributions, are below.

First of all, it is important to recall that collaborative research will be evaluated as an integral part of the candidate's entire research program and performance, including the nature of the candidate's distinctive intellectual contribution as well as the composition and cohesiveness of her or his research program. As stated in Appendix A, "Criteria for assessing the potential for an outstanding research career include quality, productivity, distinctive intellectual contribution and cohesiveness, and potential for scholarly impact. Potential social importance of the research contribution is also considered...Distinctive intellectual contributions and capacity to do quality work independent of guidance from senior faculty are assessed by looking at the intellectual cohesiveness of the research program, at work published without senior collaborators, and at documentation of the candidate's intellectual leadership and distinctive contributions in their collaborative research efforts..."

Here we focus on the most sensitive situations: collaboration of an Assistant Professor with senior faculty members. Consistent with the expectations for research as stated in Appendix A, we suggest the following to junior faculty and their senior collaborators when engaging in collaborative research, which are also guidelines for the Eligible Faculty when evaluating collaborative research of an Assistant Professor candidate during both mandatory and non-mandatory reviews.

1. To the extent possible, collaborative projects should align closely with the junior faculty member's distinctive research program on which she or he can take the lead, and serve as the lead author on resulting publications.
2. Ensure that projects on which the junior faculty member is not taking the lead are ones that are not time-intensive for the junior faculty member (excepting when the lead author is a graduate student working with the junior faculty member, per Appendix A).
3. If the junior faculty member's specialization and role is a certain "method" or "approach," the team and the Eligible Faculty may need to recognize and overcome the unintentional bias against "methodological contribution" (in comparison to "theoretical contribution") that underestimates effort and contribution by "the method person" especially when the method is complex and critical for answering the research questions. For example, some methods or approaches (e.g., neuroscientific, psychophysiological, computational, network) implies certain theorization and perspectives on the research topics, and have significant implications for each step of the project, including the conceptualization and design of the study. In such cases, "the method person" in fact is likely to take a relatively central role on the project, along with "the theory person."
4. Conversations with the mentors, the Chair of the Eligible Faculty, the Director, and other senior faculty members regarding the junior faculty member's role can be useful.

5. To better understand the contribution of the junior faculty member, document the explicit contributions of the junior faculty. See below for a template form that the junior faculty member is encouraged to take advantage of to propose (at the planning stage) and document her or his contribution to each project or publication. The form will be signed by the PI, lead author, and/or senior authors on the publications. The form can be revised to better suit the nature of the work.
6. Discourage junior faculty members from relying on work done in collaboration with senior faculty members for the majority of their significant publications, or from becoming too closely associated with a single senior faculty member and his/her research program. What is too much should be a matter of ongoing discussion with the mentors, the Chair of the Eligible Faculty, and the Director, and addressed each year in the annual review process. Remember, per Appendix A, it is important to demonstrate distinctive research identity, intellectual leadership, and programmatic coherence: Collaborative work can contribute to this demonstration or not, and it is important to think carefully about how such collaborative work fits into one's overall portfolio.
7. Consider significant co-authored work by junior faculty members with senior faculty members, in which a convincing case is made that the work would not have been possible, at least at a comparable level of excellence, without the contribution of the junior faculty member, as a significant and valued contribution. Such work would not replace work led by the junior faculty member, but still would form a valued part of the research portfolio. This is especially important for faculty whose expertise is largely methodological. Also see the suggestion above regarding "the method person."
8. Recognize when a senior coauthor, or former graduate school or post-doc mentor, is participating primarily because they are sharing a data set that they have had a substantial resource investment in creating, or are providing access to such data, study populations, or research facility as a function of their contacts or position, and have a modest direct contribution to the study design, analysis, and write-up. When there is documentation of this limited role (e.g., letters from the senior coauthors), the research can be considered clearly led by the candidate and not considered a "mentored" publication. Meanwhile, the research record should still include some high-quality work led by the candidate with no senior co-authors.
9. Last, note that extensive collaboration of an Eligible Faculty member (e.g., tenured faculty) may lead to exclusion of the collaborator from serving on the Committee of the Eligible Faculty for the candidate's review case because of conflict of interest. The considerations, as stated in the APT, are that a faculty member will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of a candidate if that faculty member has been:
 - a co-author on more than 50% of the candidate's publications since the candidate's appointment or last promotion, including pending publications and submissions;

- a collaborator on more than 25% of his or her projects since appointment or last promotion, including current and planned collaborations. (See Section III.A.4 in the APT for a fuller description conflict of interest.)

The School also recognizes that there may be instances in the patterns of collaboration or the quality of collaborative work suggests a conflict of interest even though less than 50% of the total work is with a specific colleague. Additionally, there may be conflicts in instances in which the candidate may have collaborative work with multiple co-authors, and the sum of the collaborative effort is greater than 50% of the total work even though any specific individual's collaboration is less than 50%.

An Example of Documenting Research Contribution to Collaborative Research (Multi-authored Publications)

Your name: _____

The publication reference:

The PI(s), lead-author(s), and/or senior author(s) other than the faculty above, please sign here to show your agreement on the following evaluation:

Sign _____ Date _____

Sign _____ Date _____

Sign _____ Date _____

Sign _____ Date _____

Tasks	How much work is required by the tasks for this publication (compared to most other publications in our field?)	My contribution to the tasks	Explanation of your role (You can add additional narrative pages.)
1. Conceptualization (articulating basic research question, proposing theoretical ideas and mechanisms & specification of hypotheses)	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A or little <input type="checkbox"/> less <input type="checkbox"/> similar <input type="checkbox"/> more	<input type="checkbox"/> none <input type="checkbox"/> some <input type="checkbox"/> most <input type="checkbox"/> all	
2. Developing study design	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A or little <input type="checkbox"/> less <input type="checkbox"/> similar <input type="checkbox"/> more	<input type="checkbox"/> none <input type="checkbox"/> some <input type="checkbox"/> most <input type="checkbox"/> all	
3. Study implementation (including stimuli, programming, IRB)	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A or little <input type="checkbox"/> less <input type="checkbox"/> similar <input type="checkbox"/> more	<input type="checkbox"/> none <input type="checkbox"/> some <input type="checkbox"/> most <input type="checkbox"/> all	
4. Overall project/team management	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A or little <input type="checkbox"/> less <input type="checkbox"/> similar <input type="checkbox"/> more	<input type="checkbox"/> none <input type="checkbox"/> some <input type="checkbox"/> most <input type="checkbox"/> all	
5. Recruitment & data collection	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A or little <input type="checkbox"/> less <input type="checkbox"/> similar <input type="checkbox"/> more	<input type="checkbox"/> none <input type="checkbox"/> some <input type="checkbox"/> most <input type="checkbox"/> all	
6. Data preprocessing and analysis (including programming)	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A or little <input type="checkbox"/> less <input type="checkbox"/> similar <input type="checkbox"/> more	<input type="checkbox"/> none <input type="checkbox"/> some <input type="checkbox"/> most <input type="checkbox"/> all	
7. Writing	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A or little <input type="checkbox"/> less <input type="checkbox"/> similar <input type="checkbox"/> more	<input type="checkbox"/> none <input type="checkbox"/> some <input type="checkbox"/> most <input type="checkbox"/> all	
8. Revision(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A or little <input type="checkbox"/> less <input type="checkbox"/> similar <input type="checkbox"/> more	<input type="checkbox"/> none <input type="checkbox"/> some <input type="checkbox"/> most <input type="checkbox"/> all	
9. Securing funding & resources (e.g., grants, hires, equipment)	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A or little <input type="checkbox"/> less <input type="checkbox"/> similar <input type="checkbox"/> more	<input type="checkbox"/> none <input type="checkbox"/> some <input type="checkbox"/> most <input type="checkbox"/> all	
10. Overall	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A or little <input type="checkbox"/> less <input type="checkbox"/> similar <input type="checkbox"/> more	<input type="checkbox"/> none <input type="checkbox"/> some <input type="checkbox"/> most <input type="checkbox"/> all	
11. Please explain how this work fits into your research program.			