Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure
Criteria and Procedures for The Ohio State University Department of Linguistics

Approved by the Faculty: 3/10/1997; 11/30/1998; 1/11/1999; 5/6/2002; 5/20/2002; 11/18/2005; 1/23/2009; 8/27/2012; 8/29/2016; 3/30/2020; 09/27/21; 02/24/2025; 04/07/2025

Last approved by the Faculty: 09/08/2025

Revision Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 10/72025

Table of Contents

I Preamble *4*

II Department Mission *4*

III Definitions *4*

A Committee of the Eligible Faculty **4**

1 Tenure-track Faculty 5

2 Teaching Faculty 5

3 Associated Faculty 6

4 Conflict of Interest 6

5 Minimum Composition 7

B Quorum **7**

C Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty **7**

1 Appointment 7

2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion 8

IV Appointments *8*

A Criteria **8**

1 Tenure-track Faculty 8

2 Teaching Faculty 10

3 Associated Faculty 11

4 Emeritus Faculty 12

5 Joint Appointments 12

6 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty 12

B Procedures **13**

1 Tenure-track Faculty 13

2 Teaching Faculty 15

3 Transfer from the Tenure Track 15

4 TIU Transfer *15*

5 Associated Faculty 15

6 Joint Appointments *16*

7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty 16

V Annual Performance and Merit Review *16*

A Documentation **17**

B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty **18**

1 Fourth-Year Review 18

2 Extension of the Tenure Clock 19

C Tenured Faculty **19**

D Teaching Faculty **20**

E Associated Faculty **20**

F Salary Recommendations **20**

VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews *21*

A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion **22**

1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure 22

2 Promotion to Professor 26

3 Teaching Faculty 27

4 Associated Faculty 28

B Procedures **28**

1 Tenure-Track and Teaching Faculty 28

2 Procedures for Associated Faculty 35

3 External Evaluations 35

VII Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals *37*

VIII Seventh-Year Reviews *37*

IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching *37*

A Student Evaluation of Teaching **38**

B Peer Evaluation of Teaching **38**

I Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty; the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Chapter 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs *Policies and Procedures Handbook*; and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the department and its faculty are subject.

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

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

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

Decisions considering appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the university's policy on equal employment opportunity.

II Department Mission

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

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

The department embraces and seeks to implement the university's shared values initiative. We are committed to academic freedom, to ensuring responsible research practices, to building diverse and inclusive cultures, to fostering an ethic of care and mutual respect, and to promoting justice.

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 department.

The department chair, the dean and the divisional, 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.

In the Department of Linguistics, the Committee of the Eligible Faculty functions as the department's promotion and tenure committee.

1 Tenure-track Faculty

Appointment Reviews

- **Initial Appointment Review**. For an appointment (hiring) review of an assistant professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the department.

- **Rank Review**. A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank is then cast by all tenured 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 and the tenure reviews of probationary professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors.

2 Teaching Faculty

Appointment Reviews

- **Initial Appointment Review**. For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an assistant teaching professor, associate teaching professor, or teaching professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all teaching faculty in the department.

- **Rank Review**. A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank is then cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and all nonprobationary teaching faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of assistant teaching professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors, all nonprobationary associate teaching professors, and all nonprobationary teaching professors.

- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of associate teaching professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors, and all nonprobationary teaching professors.

- For the reappointment reviews of teaching professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors and all nonprobationary teaching professors.

3 Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment or Reappointment Reviews

The appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair based on recommendations from the search committee. In the case of tenure-track faculty with 1-50% appointments, the recommendations from the search committee are based on a vote of the eligible faculty.

Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by the eligible faculty (all tenured and non-probationary teaching faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college dean.

The reappointment of associated faculty is decided by the department chair in consultation with as wide a range of faculty as possible.

Promotion

Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have adjunct titles, tenure-track titles with service at 49% FTE or below, and lecturer titles.

For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track or teaching research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Sections III.A.1 or 2 above.

For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with tenure-track titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section III.A.1.

For the promotion review of a lecturer to senior lecturer, the eligible faculty shall be all tenure-track and nonprobationary teaching faculty at the rank of associate professor and professor.

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 department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the department chair, after consulting with the divisional dean, will appoint one or more faculty members from another tenure-initiating unit within the college so that the minimum of three faculty members is reached.

B Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless 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 department chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

C Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty

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

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted, but participating fully in discussions and voting via remote two-way electronic connection are allowed.

1 Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when a simple majority of the votes, cast by written, confidential ballot, are positive. Eligible faculty who are

not able to attend the meeting in person must participate fully by conference call or video conference in order to cast a vote.

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

2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion

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

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

IV Appointments

A Criteria

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

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, teaching, 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

Since the departmental mission, in similar fashion to the mission of the College and the University, focuses on the pursuit and attainment of international distinction in our discipline, appointment decisions for tenure-track faculty positions must be based on the assessment that the individual to be appointed exhibits strong potential to attain tenure and to advance through the faculty ranks.

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. Procedures for appointment are identical to those for an assistant professor. The department will only make such an appointment for an exceptional

candidate. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to 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 beginning of the third year, or the appointment will not be renewed and the third year is the terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked 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. Minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of assistant professor include an earned doctorate in an appropriate field of study, evidence of potential for scholarly productivity and potential to develop into an internationally recognized scholar, demonstrated potential as an effective teacher at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, a willingness to provide high-quality service to the department, the institution, and the profession, and a strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the ranks in a timely fashion. 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 Committee of the Eligible Faculty determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the College of Arts and Sciences and 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, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs.

Appointment at the rank of associate professor or professor requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to these ranks. At a minimum it is expected that individuals appointed as associate professor will be internationally recognized researchers with a high-quality body of scholarship, demonstrated excellence in teaching and service to the field, and a strong potential to advance to the rank of professor in a timely fashion. At a minimum it is expected that individuals appointed as professor will have an established international reputation as a leading scholar in the field with an outstanding body of scholarship and a demonstrated record of excellence in teaching and service to the field.

Appointment at the rank of associate professor normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at the rank of associate professor is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

Appointments at the rank of professor without tenure are not possible.

External hires at the associate professor or professor level with tenure will demonstrate the same accomplishments in research/creative work, teaching and service as persons promoted within the university. For all, the substantial probability that a high rate of quality research/creative work and excellence in teaching and service will continue needs to be established. The claim that promotion of the candidate will improve the overall quality and standing of the unit needs to be supported.

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

2 Teaching 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 teaching faculty must be for a period of five years. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for assistant and associate teaching professors must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for teaching professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. These extended 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).

Tenure is not granted to teaching faculty. 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. For faculty in their second and subsequent appointment terms, the teaching faculty member may be reappointed by the affirmative vote of the eligible faculty as defined in Section III.A.2

Teaching faculty appointments exist for faculty members who focus primarily on supporting the educational mission of the department. Teaching Faculty members are expected to contribute to the department's research and education mission as reflected in undergraduate and graduate program development and teaching. Teaching Faculty appointments are made in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-7. Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the department.

Teaching Instructor. Appointment at the rank of teaching instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant teaching professor, but requirements for the terminal degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. The department will only make such an appointment for an exceptional candidate. An appointment at the teaching instructor level is limited to three years. A teaching instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant teaching professor by the end of the penultimate year of the three-year period, or the appointment will not be renewed and the third year is the terminal year of employment even if performance is otherwise adequate and the position itself will continue.

Assistant Teaching Professor. An earned terminal degree in the relevant field is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant teaching professor. Evidence of ability to teach well is necessary.

Associate Teaching Professor. Appointment at the rank of associate teaching professor requires that the individual have an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field, and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria—in teaching, professional practice and other service, and scholarship—for promotion to this rank. Appointment at the rank of associate

teaching professor requires production and dissemination of scholarly materials, which can include a combination of publications in academic journals or edited collections, conference presentations, and authorship or co-authorship of pedagogical materials such as textbooks or websites (print or open access).

Teaching Professor. Appointment at the rank of teaching professor requires that the individual have an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field, and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria—in teaching, professional practice and other service, and scholarship—for promotion to this rank. Appointment at the rank of teaching professor requires production and dissemination of scholarly materials, which can include a combination of publications in academic journals or edited collections, conference presentations, and authorship or co-authorship of pedagogical materials such as textbooks or websites (print or open access).

3 Associated Faculty

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a few weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. Associated faculty may be reappointed. Appointments of all associated faculty must be reviewed and approved by the College of Arts and Sciences.

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct titles are used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to tenure-track, or teaching faculty of equivalent rank. The adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who provide academic service to the department, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees, for which a faculty title is appropriate. The term of appointment is for one year with renewal contingent on continued significant contributions. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

Lecturer. Appointment as lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a Master's degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught. Evidence of ability or potential to provide high-quality instruction is also required. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure, but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for lecturers cannot exceed three years.

Senior Lecturer. Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a doctorate in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The initial appointment for a senior lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for senior lecturers cannot exceed three years

Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%. An earned terminal degree is the minimum requirement for appointment of tenure-track titles at 49% FTE or below. Appointment at tenure-track titles is for individuals at 49% FTE or below, either compensated (1-49% FTE) or uncompensated (0% FTE). The rank of associated faculty with tenure-track titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty. Compensated tenure-track titled faculty

appointed at 49% and below will have reduced expectations based on the terms of their appointment.

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. They may be renewed annually for no more than three years at 100% FTE.

4 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, teaching, 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 faculty member will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the department chair outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-3) will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair. The department chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean or designee.

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

5 Joint Appointments

Joint appointments are created to leverage a faculty member's unique expertise to advance the mission areas of the academic units involved and promote cross-disciplinary collaboration. To establish a joint faculty appointment, a memorandum of understanding (MOU) is developed by all affected TIUs, centers, and/or institutes. The MOU will clearly define the distribution of the faculty member's time commitment to the different units. The MOU will also state the sources of compensation directed to the faculty member, distribution of resources, the planned acknowledgement of the academic units in publications, the manner in which credit for any grant funding will be attributed to the different units, and the distribution of grant funds among the appointing units. Unless other arrangements are specified in the MOU, the TIU in which the faculty member's FTE is greater than 50% will be considered that faculty member's TIU. Joint-appointed faculty may vote on promotion and tenure cases only in their TIU.

6 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

B Procedures

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, teaching, 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 information on the following topics:

- recruitment of tenure-track faculty, teaching, 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

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 Chapter 5, section 4.1 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection.

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

In the normal course of departmental planning, after some discussion in a general department meeting with student representation, a decision will be made as to the area of linguistics in which to hire. The dean of the college, in consultation with the divisional deans, provides approval for the department to commence a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise.

The department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty and one appointed non-voting student representative. The faculty composition of the committee may be determined by self-selection (i.e., all faculty who want to may be permitted to serve on the committee). The final recommendation from the search committee is based on a vote of the eligible faculty.

Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo the trainings identified in the SHIFT Framework for faculty recruitment. 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 SHIFT 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 the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor, with or without tenure, or Professor, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs.

In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the department chair decides, in consultation with the divisional dean, which candidate to approach first. At that time, the department chair must discuss the details of the offer, including compensation, with the divisional dean and receive approval before extending an offer.

The department 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.

2 Teaching Faculty

Searches for teaching faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate will give a presentation during the interview that addresses issues in teaching or professional teaching practice.

3 Transfer from the Tenure Track

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a teaching appointment if appropriate to the individual's circumstances and to departmental and college needs, and if funding for the salary has been identified. Tenure or tenure eligibility is lost upon transfer, though rank is retained. Such transfers must be approved by the department chair, the college dean, and the executive vice president and provost.

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

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

4 TIU Transfer

Faculty requests to move from one TIU to another must be approved by a simple majority of eligible faculty in the receiving TIU, by both TIU heads, the college dean(s), and the Office of Academic Affairs. The eligible faculty in such cases are the tenure-track faculty eligible to vote on faculty appointments at the transferee's rank. See Section III.A.1 above.

Approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements for the change have been made and requires the establishment of mutually agreed-upon arrangements among the affected TIU heads, college dean(s), and the faculty member. An MOU signed by all parties, including the Office of Academic Affairs, must describe in detail the arrangements of the transfer. Since normally the transferring faculty member will fill an existing vacancy in the receiving unit, the MOU will describe the resources supporting the position, including salary, provided by the receiving unit.

The College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs can provide guidance to non-tenure-track faculty about the process for transferring from one TIU to another.

5 Associated Faculty

The appointment 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 department chair based on recommendation from the search committee. The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair in consultation with as wide a range of faculty as possible. Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty

may be proposed by any faculty member in the department and are decided by the department chair in consultation with as wide a range of faculty as possible. The department chair will consult with the faculty as appropriate when making decisions for the renewal of associated faculty appointments. Visiting faculty (at the rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor), are appointed by the department chair as part of a formal search in consultation with faculty according to their expertise and subject to the approval of the dean or designee. These full-time, compensated appointments are made on an annual basis and are renewable up to three years. The department encourages visits of international scholars, however, the department chair may limit the number of visitors in a manner consistent with available departmental resources. The department chair must assure that at least one faculty member is willing to take responsibility for sponsoring the visitor.

Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one to three years, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances. Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are made on an annual basis and rarely semester by semester. After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment may be offered. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued.

6 Joint Appointments

The Department may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another OSU TIU as described in Section IV.A.5. The potential for a joint appointment is typically evaluated during the recruitment process and, as such, is subject to all criteria outlined above for each faculty category.

Approval of the joint appointment by the Office of Academic Affairs and the College of Arts and Sciences is dependent on establishing a mutually agreed-upon arrangement between the TIU heads, college dean(s), and the faculty member. An MOU signed by all parties, including the Office of Academic Affairs, must describe in detail the arrangements of the joint appointment. Administrative approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements have been made.

7 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track or teaching faculty member from another Ohio State tenure-initiating unit. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the eligible faculty, the department chair extends an offer of appointment. The department chair 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.

V Annual Performance and Merit Review

The department follows the requirements for the annual performance and merit review 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 for all probationary faculty, an opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all other compensated faculty members, 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.

The department chair may designate the responsibility for annual performance and merit reviews to appropriate unit administrators. The designee or a subcommittee of the eligible faculty may provide a written assessment to the department chair. However, unless the Office of Academic Affairs has granted an exception to a large unit, the department chair must schedule a face-to-face meeting with all probationary faculty as part of the review. An opportunity for a face-to-face meeting with the department chair or the chair's designee must be provided to all tenured and non-probationary faculty.

In all cases, accountability for the annual review process resides with the department chair.

Depending on a faculty member's appointment type, the annual performance and merit review is based on expected performance in the previous calendar year in teaching, scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the department'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. Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.

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.

The department chair is required (per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35) to include a reminder in the annual performance and merit 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.

Annual review letters should not merely be descriptive summaries of activities but should evaluate performance in relation to the unit's mission and the faculty member's assigned workload and previously articulated goals and expectations for the year. The annual review should also describe, when appropriate, actions the unit or its head will undertake to support the faculty member in achieving goals. When relevant, annual review letters should recognize engagement with partners beyond the university, which may take the form of research/creative work, teaching, or service. Department chairs may also comment upon and/or recognize ways in which individual faculty members exemplify and reinforce the university's shared values, including creating unit cultures that are inclusive, supportive, and characterized by civility and mutual respect. The full range of activities assigned to a faculty member should be formally recognized and, when done well, rewarded.

A Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to the department chair by the date requested by the department chair (typically, the beginning of February following the calendar year to be reviewed):

- Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline (*required for probationary faculty*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (*non-probationary faculty*)
- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)
- cover letter summarizing contributions in the previous calendar year in teaching, research, service, and any other areas requested by the department chair (*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.

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

B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the department chair in consultation with the eligible faculty. Upon reviewing all available evidence, the eligible faculty can choose to recommend to the department chair that the faculty member be continued as a probationary member of the faculty or that her/his employment not be renewed beyond the following year. The department chair makes his/her own judgment of the case, with the same outcomes possible.

The department chair meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals; and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The department chair may consult with the Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty for review of the wording of the letter, and an indication is given of the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member, areas in which the faculty member can improve her/his performance, and substantive suggestions for achieving improvement. Annual reviews are intended to be constructive and candid, a means of being supportive of and helpful to untenured faculty but also of communicating clearly aspects of performance that need improvement.

If the department chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The department chair'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 and the department chair may respond in writing if warranted. The department chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the dean of the college or designee. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the written comments, if provided).

If the department chair 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.

1 Fourth-Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluations are optional and the dean makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

External evaluations will be solicited when the department chair or the eligible faculty determines that they are necessary to conduct the fourth-year review, such as in cases when the candidate's scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or there is a need for outside expertise in order to evaluate the scholarship. The department will follow the procedures for soliciting external evaluations described in Section VI.B.3. of this document.

The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department chair, who conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal. If either the department chair or the dean recommends nonrenewal of a faculty member's probationary contract, the case will be referred to the college's Promotion and Tenure Committee, which will review the case, vote and make a recommendation to the dean. The dean, in consultation with the divisional dean, makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

2 Extension of the Tenure Clock

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) 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 department's right to recommend nonrenewal of an appointment during an annual review.

C Tenured Faculty

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the professors in the department who comment on the faculty member's performance in relation to department and individual goals and on progress toward promotion. The department chair or designee conducts an independent assessment, may meet with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The department chair or designee may consult with the Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty for review of the wording of the letter, and an indication is given of the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member, areas in which the faculty member can improve her/his performance, and substantive suggestions for achieving improvement. These annual reviews are intended to be constructive and candid, a means of helping tenured faculty to arrive at appropriate goals for the coming year. Faculty have the right to reply to annual reviews and the department chair or designee may respond in writing if warranted. These written comments are placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair or designee, who prepares a written evaluation. 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 tenure initiating

unit, 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 department, the college, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, in civil and collegial interaction with colleagues, staff, and students, and the recruitment 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 an associate professor or professor has an administrative role, the impact of that role and other assignments will be considered in the annual review. The department chair or designee prepares a written evaluation of performance against these expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review and the department chair may respond in writing if warranted.

D Teaching Faculty

The annual performance and merit review process for teaching probationary and non-probationary faculty is identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty respectively, except that non-probationary teaching faculty may participate in the review of teaching faculty of lower rank.

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

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review generally proceeds in the same manner as the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure track faculty. There is no presumption of renewal of contract. All reappointment decisions are at the discretion of the college dean.

E Associated Faculty

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

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

F Salary Recommendations

In making salary recommendations, the department follows the College of Arts and Sciences requirement to:

- adopt procedures for the distribution of merit salary and other rewards that recognize the importance of qualitative rather than merely quantitative contributions in each area of faculty activity.
- guard against rigid formulas or weightings of research/creative work, teaching, and service that might limit recognition of extraordinary one-time commitments in one or more areas of variations in workload, or of shifts in responsibilities at different stages of professional development.
- Make recommendations for merit salary increases and other rewards that are consistent with that TIU's APT document and other relevant policies, procedures, practices, and standards established by: (1) the college, (2) the Faculty Rules, (3) the Office of Academic Affairs, and (4) the Office of Human Resources.

The department chair makes annual salary recommendations to the dean or designee, who may modify them. The recommendations are based on the current annual performance and merit review. The criteria for merit salary increases are essentially the same as those for tenure and promotion.

Except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increases, all funds for annual salary increases are directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and the active promotion of an enriching working and learning environment through collegiality, civility, and openness to diverse ideas and opinions.

In formulating recommendations, the department chair may consult with colleagues, as necessary, in order to assess the quality of the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service during the previous calendar year. The department chair should proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in it. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

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

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

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

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

Although institutional citizenship and collegiality are expected, they cannot be used as an independent criterion for promotion or tenure. The department recognizes, however, that these positive attributes define the ability of a faculty member to contribute effectively to exemplary teaching, scholarship, and service.

A commitment to these values and principles is demonstrated, for example, by participation in faculty governance and community outreach; activities related to the University's Shared Values; adherence to principles of the responsible conduct of research; constructive conduct and ethical behavior during the discharge of responsibilities and authority; and the exercise of rights and privileges consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics.
This department is committed to assessing the practice of these values and principles as part of all performance evaluations.

1 Promotion to 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 department'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.

Consistent with these guidelines, promotion to associate professor with tenure in the College of Arts and Sciences requires excellence in both research/creative work and teaching. Evidence of service to the unit and the promise of excellence in service beyond the unit are desirable. Excellence in research/creative work means attainment of measurable national or international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of high-quality published research and/or other relevant creative endeavors. A successful candidate will have an emerging national reputation as a scholar or creative artist. Excellence in teaching means the provision to all students of the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning and, to the most capable and motivated students, an enhanced learning experience. Excellence in service means the provision of a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more publics – including the university, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations. The service contribution during the probationary period of assistant professors is limited by design. The most important judgment is that the candidate will achieve excellence in service in the future.

The substantial probability that a high rate of quality research/creative work and excellence in teaching and service will continue needs to be established. The claim that awarding tenure to the candidate will improve the overall quality and standing of the unit needs to be supported.

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

TEACHING	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
• Demonstrated excellence in teaching. Excellence in teaching means providing to all students the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning in linguistics and providing to the most capable and motivated students an enhanced learning experience. An excellent teacher of linguistics is one who meets the formal obligations of course instruction in the Department of Linguistics, demonstrates an interest in students, stimulates students' interest in their subject, and succeeds in conveying knowledge of linguistics to students.	• Mentorship and advising of undergraduate and/or graduate students • Excellence in teaching is documented through student evaluations, and peer reviews of teaching (these may include reviews of, e.g., syllabi, materials and assignments, and feedback to students on assignments and exams, as well as direct observation of lectures and other aspects of course conduct). • Attention is also paid to supervision of high-quality dissertations, masters and honors theses, and scholarly papers, presentations by students, student accomplishments or placements, and curriculum development and/or innovation. • Evidence from work of students indicating teaching effectiveness

	• Evidence drawn from evaluation forms standardly used by the department (SEIs as described in Section IX below). • Evidence of especially successful or innovative teaching techniques. • Special teaching accomplishments, awards, etc. • Written evaluations from colleagues of candidate teaching and/or advising activity. • Peer evaluations of instruction • Copies of syllabi, examinations, and other class materials. • Narrative descriptions of teaching in dossier.

SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORKS/RESEARCH	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
• Demonstrated excellence in research through significant contributions to the field. Excellence in research means attainment of measurable national or international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of high-quality scholarly research. Significant contributions are those which offer new knowledge; information that aids colleagues in the field in carrying forward their own research; which tests new or traditional hypotheses in such a manner as to help evaluate their validity; which suggests applications of linguistics to other disciplines; and/or which apply concepts from other disciplines to linguistics in ways which generally advance knowledge. A research record that demonstrates clear distinction in linguistics, as is appropriate for faculty at a major research institution. The published work should provide evidence of an established and coherent research program. • Candidates must demonstrate increasing independence and scholarly leadership over time. There should also be an increasing trajectory of significant scholarly outcomes over time.	• The committee will evaluate both the quality and quantity of contributions, which may include published work, presentation of scholarly papers at professional meetings, and research grants. Special emphasis will be placed on quality. • The typical expected quantity of published work is approximately five major pieces or the equivalent during the review period, but this should not be taken as either necessary or sufficient for promotion. A major piece consists of a high-quality peer-refereed article or research product of commensurate quality, including but not limited to a research monograph published by a major press, a paper in a rigorously refereed conference proceedings, a chapter in an editor-refereed volume, or a high-quality data repository. • The quality of the publication and the nature of the publication medium are considered. In general, monographic and comprehensive works (books, articles, etc.) based on original research will be attributed the highest value when published in high-quality venues, especially when peer-reviewed. Papers which undergo critical scrutiny before publication (e.g., by journal or anthology editors) will be more highly valued than those that do not. • The quality and quantity of scholarly activity at professional meetings will be evaluated. Papers, formal commentaries on the papers of others, and participation in colloquia will be evaluated. • With respect to published reviews of scholarly works for journals, the committee will appraise

	the scholarship of the reviews and the nature of the journals in which they appear. • Candidate descriptions of research accomplishments in the dossier narrative. • Additional evidence, such as citation of his/her publications in works by other scholars and successful grant proposals. In all cases, the committee shall carefully consider the source of the additional evidence and the weight which they should be accorded. • Recognition among other scholars in the field as evidenced in citations and external evaluations. • The committee will evaluate scholarly recognition in the form of requests to serve on editorial boards of scholarly journals, to chair sessions at professional meetings and conventions, or to serve on program committees for such meetings; recognition in the form of prizes, awards, grants, or fellowships based on scholarly esteem and reputation will also be appraised. • External letters of evaluation by scholars outside the university.

SERVICE	
Criteria	**Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
• Candidate uses his/her talents for the betterment of the department, the college, the university, and the profession. • Excellence in service consists of recognizing one's responsibilities to the organization and carrying out these responsibilities effectively and in a timely manner. • Service should be carried out with energy and commitment to the mission of the department, the college, the university, and the broader field of linguistics. • Leadership consists of identifying the needs and problems of the organization and taking the initiative in addressing them. • The amount of the service contribution during the probationary period of assistant professors is limited by design, but the	• Service on departmental, divisional, college, and university committees. • Assignments outside formal committee work that are nevertheless essential to the work of the department and must be assigned to individual faculty members: for instance, visiting the classes of untenured colleagues, associated faculty, and teaching associates, revising curricula, creating databases or other departmental tools, or supervising library acquisitions. • Presentations made in the classes of others, editing of or contributions to departmental publications, lectures to the departmental faculty, and similar activities. • Service to the academic world: for instance, service in state, regional, national, or international professional organizations in linguistics (as office-holder, as member of a committee, or in ad hoc assignments on behalf of the organization), work as a consultant in academic contexts, work on editorial boards as a referee for scholarly journals, work on federal or foundation panels as a grant reviewer, acting as a

quality of the service contribution must be evident.	referee for faculty members under review at other universities, and similar activities. • Any other information that the candidate, the committee, and the department chair may consider pertinent to the committee's evaluation. Each faculty member should keep a record of his/her service and make it available to the department chair and to the eligible faculty for review.

In the evaluation of untenured associate professors for tenure, the same criteria will apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

2 Promotion to 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.*

The College of Arts and Sciences establishes the following additional criteria for promotion to the rank of professor:

> *Promotion to professor in the College of Arts and Sciences takes the pursuit of research and creative excellence as our core value. The college also recognizes that a career may consist of various phases in which a concentration on research/creative work, teaching, or service creates a composite professional life. Promotion to professor typically requires excellence in scholarship/creative work. Where 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 research/creative work.*
>
> *Excellence in research/creative work means attainment of measurable national or international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of high-quality published research and/or other relevant creative endeavors. A successful candidate will have achieved national distinction as a researcher or creative artist and have an emerging international reputation. Excellence in teaching means the provision to all students of the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning and, to the most capable and motivated students, an enhanced learning experience. It can be measured by the attainment of national or international recognition, as evidenced by pedagogical publications, awards, honors, and/or critical student outcomes. Excellence in service means the provision of a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more publics – including the university, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, the nation, and professional organizations.*

The specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure (see Section VI.A.1), with the added expectation of:

- sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions,
- a record of continuing professional growth,
- evidence of established national or international reputation in the field,
- excellence in service to one or more publics including the university, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, and professional organizations.
- The typical quantity of published work for promotion to the rank of Professor is an additional six major pieces, as described in Section VI.A.1. In this case, the published work should provide evidence of a deep and sustained research program, and the candidate is expected to have established a national and international reputation.

The teaching, service, and scholarly work upon which the evaluation is based must be subsequent to that upon which promotion to associate professor was based.

When assessing a candidate's national and international reputation in the field, a national and international reputation for the scholarship of teaching may be counted as either teaching or scholarship.

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 department, college and university.

3 Teaching Faculty

Promotion to Assistant Teaching Professor. For promotion to assistant teaching professor, a faculty member must have completed their doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field and be performing satisfactorily in teaching, professional practice, and service. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor. For promotion to associate teaching professor, a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service; have a documented high level of competence in professional practice; display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of this department; and produce and disseminate scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. The typical quantity of published work is approximately one major piece every two years or the equivalent, but this should not be taken as either necessary or sufficient for promotion. Here and elsewhere, a major piece consists of a monograph or an article in a peer-refereed journal or proceeding, or a chapter in an editor-refereed volume. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Teaching Professor. For promotion to teaching professor, a faculty member must have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching and professional practice; leadership in service to the department and to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. The typical quantity of published work is approximately one major piece every two years or the equivalent, but this should not be taken as either necessary or sufficient for promotion. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

4 Associated Faculty

Promotion to Adjunct Associate Professor and Adjunct Professor. The relevant criteria for the promotion of adjunct faculty members shall be the same as those for the promotion of tenure-track or teaching faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, above.

Promotion to Associate Professor and Professor with FTE below 50%. The relevant criteria for the promotion of associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are those for the promotion of tenure-track faculty above.

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.3.

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

B Procedures

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 for tenure-track faculty, 3335-7-05 for teaching faculty, and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Chapter 3 of the *Policies and Procedures Handbook*.

1 Tenure-Track and Teaching Faculty

Candidate Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the candidate are as follows:

Dossier. A candidate must submit a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. Candidates are fully responsible for the contents of the dossier and 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. All material the candidate deems relevant will be brought before the eligible faculty and department chair. While the Committee of the Eligible Faculty makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by him or her.

The time period for teaching 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, reappointment, 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 or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

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

- Evidence from work of students indicating teaching effectiveness
- Evidence drawn from evaluation forms standardly used by the department (SEIs as described in Section IX below), as well as any other methods that the candidate may deem appropriate.
- Evidence of especially successful or innovative teaching technique.
- Special teaching accomplishments, awards, etc.
- Solicited testimony from colleagues. Former or current students may not provide testimony in promotion and tenure cases.
- Results of visitations by members of the committee and other faculty. All faculty eligible for promotion to associate professor and professor are visited in their classes according to the schedule outlined in Section IX below by tenured members of the departmental Peer Review of Teaching Committee.
- Copies of syllabi, examinations, and other class materials.
- Other information that the candidate, the committee, and the department chair believe to be pertinent.

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 start date (for probationary faculty) or date of last promotion or reappointment may be provided. Any such material should be clearly indicated. However, it is the scholarship performance since the start date or date of last promotion that is to be the focus of the evaluating parties.

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

- Candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure will be evaluated on both the quality and quantity of scholarly output, but special emphasis will be placed on quality. In all cases, candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to have a research

record that demonstrates clear distinction in linguistics, as is appropriate for faculty at a major research institution. The typical quantity of published work for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure is five major pieces, as described in Section VI.A.1, from date of hire. The published work should provide evidence of an established and coherent research program.

- Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor will be evaluated according to the same criteria as those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with the criteria strengthened in the following ways:

    - The teaching, service, and scholarly work upon which the evaluation is based must be subsequent to that upon which promotion to associate professor was based.
    - The typical quantity of published work for promotion to the rank of Professor is an additional six major pieces, as described in Section VI.A.1. In this case, the published work should provide evidence of a deep and sustained research program, and the candidate is expected to have established a national and international reputation.

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

With respect to reviews of scholarly works for journals, the committee will appraise the scholarship of the reviews and the nature of the journals in which they appear.

The committee will evaluate scholarly recognition in the form of requests to serve on editorial boards of scholarly journals, to chair sessions at professional meetings and conventions, or to serve on program committees for such meetings; recognition in the form of prizes, awards, grants, or fellowships based on scholarly esteem and reputation will also be appraised.

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

Any other evidence which the candidate, the committee, and the department chair believe pertinent to his/her development as a scholar will also be considered.

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, reappointment, 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 or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

Service Documentation. In itself, service is not sufficient to earn promotion. Nonetheless, it remains important and should be carried out with energy and commitment to the mission of the department, the college, the university, and the broader field of linguistics. With regard to excellence in service, documentation may include:

- Service on departmental, divisional, college, and university committees.

- Assignments outside formal committee work that are nevertheless essential to the work of the department and must be assigned to individual faculty members: for instance, visiting the classes of untenured colleagues, associated faculty, and teaching associates, revising curricula, creating databases or other departmental tools, or supervising library acquisitions.
- Presentations made in the classes of others, editing of or contributions to departmental publications, lectures to the departmental faculty, and similar activities.
- Service to the academic world: for instance, service in state, regional, national, or international professional organizations in linguistics (as office-holder, as member of a committee, or in ad hoc assignments on behalf of the organization), work as a consultant in academic contexts, work on editorial boards as a referee for scholarly journals, work on federal or foundation panels as a grant reviewer, acting as a referee for faculty members under review at other universities, and similar activities.
- Any other information that the candidate, the committee, and the department chair may consider pertinent to the committee's evaluation. Each faculty member should keep a record of his/her service and make it available to the department chair and to the eligible faculty for review.

The complete dossier is forwarded when the review moves beyond the department. The documentation of teaching is forwarded along with the dossier. The documentation of scholarship and service is for use during the department review only, unless reviewers at the college and university levels specifically request it.

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document. A candidate must indicate the APT document under which the candidate wishes to be reviewed. Candidates may be reviewed using the department'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 last reappointment in the case of teaching 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 department. If a previous APT document is used for a review, only the criteria for evaluation from the earlier document are to be used. All processes and procedures for the review are to align with the currently approved APT document, regardless of whether a previous or current APT document is being used to define criteria for evaluation.

External Evaluations. A candidate is responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair and the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. 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. The department chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.) Under no circumstances should a candidate solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

Committee of the Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

The Committee of the Eligible Faculty is defined in Section III above. The committee chair is appointed annually by the department chair. The department chair is a non-voting member of the

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

- To review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.

- To consider annually, in spring semester for tenure-track faculty and in fall semester for teaching faculty, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.

    - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.

    - A tenured faculty member may be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 only once. Faculty Rule 3335-7-08 makes the same provision for non-probationary teaching 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 department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.

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

    - **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described here.

    - Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the peer programs listed in Section VI.B.4 below. Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on this list.

    - **Early Autumn:** The Procedures Oversight Designee reviews each candidate's dossier for completeness, accuracy, and consistency with process requirements, and works with the candidate to assure that needed revisions are made before the formal review process begins, meeting with the candidate for clarification as necessary and providing the candidate an opportunity to comment on the dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate’s dossier.

    - The chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty or designee drafts an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible

faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.

- Consider the interdisciplinary work of a candidate across multiple units as part of the whole work, especially if the candidate has a joint appointment in another unit or is a member of a Discovery Theme.

- After the dossier is made available for review, the members of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty review thoroughly and objectively the candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.

- The eligible faculty meet to discuss the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service. They seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. Members of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty attend all meetings except when circumstances beyond their control prevent attendance; they participate in discussion of every case, and vote.

- Following the meeting of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the committee chair drafts a report to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting, consulting with the faculty as necessary. This evaluation must specify each of the unit's criteria in teaching, scholarship and service, summarize the faculty perspectives on whether the candidate has met each criterion, and include the sources of evidence in the dossier on which these perspectives are based.

- The committee chair forwards the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.

- After the comment period, the chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty provides a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.

- The chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty provides a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit, consulting with the faculty as necessary. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To charge each member of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.

- 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 department chair 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**: To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the department chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this unit. The department chair will seek a letter of evaluation from the head of the joint appointment unit. 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.

- To solicit evaluations from a TIU head for a joint appointment candidate whose primary appointment is in another unit, from a Discovery Theme director in which the candidate is a member of the core faculty, and from an interdisciplinary center or institute in which the candidate plays an active role.

- To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted on.

- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.

- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.

- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.

- To explain to the eligible faculty any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.

- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:

    - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair

    - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair

    - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten calendar days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.

- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.

- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline.

- To receive the eligible faculty's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the TIU head of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

2 Procedures for Associated Faculty

Adjunct faculty and associated faculty with tenure-track titles for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed in Section VI.B above, with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is negative (a negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases), and does not proceed to the executive vice president and provost if the dean's recommendation is negative.

3 External Evaluations

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews, all adjunct faculty promotion reviews, and all teaching faculty promotion reviews to the level of Teaching Professor. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor or for associated faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations in these cases will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.

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. A credible and useful evaluation:

- Is written by a person at an appropriate peer or aspirational institution. In keeping with college guidelines, the department will generally obtain evaluations from faculty at R01 institutions that are members of the Association of American Universities (AAU) and the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA). The department further defines peer or near-peer institutions to include the top 30 programs according to the QS World University Rankings for Linguistics. Justification will be provided in each case in which a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will solicit evaluations from professors with institutional affiliations predominately in the programs listed below. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.

- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and/or the usefulness of the letters received, more letters are sought than are required, and they are solicited no later than the end of the spring semester prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the department chair, and the candidate. All potential evaluators must be approved by the College of Arts and Sciences through the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. No written justification is required for tenured professors at peer or near peer institutions as defined above. If the potential evaluator is from an academic institution that is not clearly a peer or aspirational peer for Ohio State, or if the potential evaluator is from a nonacademic institution (e.g., a public policy think tank, a private art academy or music conservatory, a museum, a biomedical company, or a governmental agency), a brief written justification is required. The department's justification should be based on the prestige of the institution, the credentials and experience of the evaluator, and/or the specific relevance of the evaluator's expertise to the candidate's activities. International evaluators from strong institutions are allowed. The research credentials of the evaluators should generally mirror those of a professor at the professor rank at Ohio State. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors. The department should provide justification if more than a minority of the evaluations are from associate professors (e.g., candidate's work is in a small or new field for which more senior people are not available, evaluators have gained prominence as national or international experts in the field). For reviews of associate professors, all evaluators must be professors (or equivalent). Emeritus professors are acceptable as long as they are active researchers.

If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 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 none of the person(s) suggested by the candidate agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format for letters requesting external evaluations. A sample letter for tenure-track faculty can be found here. A sample letter for teaching 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 department chair, who will decide what, if any, action is warranted (requesting permission from the Office of Academic Affairs to exclude that letter from the dossier). It is in the candidate's self-interest to assure that there is no ethical or procedural lapse, or the appearance of such a lapse, in the course of the review process.

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

VII Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals

Only the candidate may appeal a negative tenure, promotion, or reappointment decision. Faculty members who believe they have been evaluated improperly for tenure, promotion, or reappointment may appeal a negative decision to the University Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

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 teaching 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

The College of Arts and Sciences values excellence in teaching across disciplines and at all levels of instruction. Student and peer evaluations of teaching provide tools for assessing faculty teaching effectiveness and for providing faculty with regular opportunities for improvement.

Evaluation of teaching should be holistic, considering a variety of evidence of accomplishment in the classroom: for example, student evaluations (quantitative and narrative), peer evaluations, examples of curricular or pedagogic innovation, and efforts to improve teaching by taking advantage of college or university resources.

In no case should the evaluation of teaching rely exclusively on quantitative instruments (such as the SEI), which have been shown to be unreliable indicators of overall performance in the classroom.

Evaluation of teaching should also be contextual, taking into account the particular challenges of teaching different kinds of material to different kinds of audiences, and situating each year's performance in relation to previous years and to goals set by the department.

A Student Evaluation of Teaching

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

B Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Peer evaluation of teaching is required for all faculty members in the College of Arts and Sciences. Peer evaluation should fulfill two basic goals: 1) provide constructive feedback to faculty on both the content and the quality of their instruction, and 2) help faculty to continually improve the overall effectiveness of their teaching at all levels. The department chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process.

Annually the department chair appoints a faculty member to chair the Peer Review of Teaching Committee. The committee chair recruits a number of committee members sufficient to meet the volume and necessary timing of peer review activity expected that year, without overburdening any of the members. The term of service is one year, with reappointment possible. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the tenured and nonprobationary teaching faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the department. Although there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible.

The Peer Review of Teaching Committee should:

- Review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and teaching faculty at least once per year during the first three years of service, and at least twice more before the commencement of the mandatory tenure review of tenure-track faculty or mandatory reappointment review of teaching faculty, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. When assistant professors are reviewed for tenure and promotion and when probationary teaching faculty are reviewed for reappointment, they are required to have a minimum of five peer evaluations of teaching from the probationary period. No more than two evaluations should be prepared by the same colleague.

- Review the teaching of tenured associate professors and nonprobationary assistant and associate teaching professors at least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned, having at least two peer reviews of teaching during the six-year period preceding a promotion review.

- Review the teaching of tenured professors and nonprobationary teaching professors at least once every four years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.

- Review, upon the department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review, to the extent that time and staffing permit. Such reviews might be triggered by a variety of circumstances, including low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.

- Review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time and staffing permit. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning.

Reviews conducted upon the request of the department chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the department chair or faculty member and may or may not include class visitations.

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations (the first three situations listed above) are comprehensive and should include class visitation and review of course syllabi and related instruction materials. In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should focus on such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the class visitation, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give feedback and also submits a written report to the department chair, copied to the candidate. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if he/she wishes. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

Written reports of peer evaluation of teaching should focus not only on classroom performance but also on curricular choices, implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and engagement with current disciplinary knowledge. Written reports should be completed by the end of the semester of review and submitted to the department chair, copied to the faculty member. The faculty member may provide written comments on this report and the peer reviewer may respond in writing to those comments if he or she wishes. All such comments are appended to the report for inclusion in the faculty member's promotion and tenure dossier, unless the faculty member requests the comments be excluded.

The department chair may request peer reviews of the teaching of any faculty member who, in the chair's judgment, would benefit from review. Typically, such reviews are in response to low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance to improve teaching.