Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure
Criteria and Procedures for The Ohio State University College of Arts and Sciences Department of Speech and Hearing Science

Approved by the Faculty: 12/01/2023

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 06/03/2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PREAMBLE 4

II. DEPARTMENT MISSION 4

III. DEFINITIONS 5
A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty 5
1. Tenure-track Faculty 5
2. Clinical or Teaching Faculty 5
3. Research Faculty 6
4. Associated Faculty 6
5. Conflict of Interest 7
6. Minimum Composition 7
B. Promotion and Tenure Committee 8
C. Quorum 8
D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty 8
1. Appointment 8
2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion 8

IV. APPOINTMENTS 9
A. Criteria 9
1. Tenure-track Faculty 9
Instructor 9
Assistant Professor 9
Associate Professor and Professor 10
2. Clinical and Teaching Faculty 10
a. Clinical Faculty 11
Clinical Instructor 11
Assistant Clinical Professor 11
Associate Clinical Professor or Clinical Professor 11
b. Teaching Faculty 11
Teaching Instructor 11
Assistant Teaching Professor 12
Teaching Professor or Teaching Professor 12
3. Research Faculty 12
Research Assistant Professor 12
Research Associate Professor or Research Professor 12
4. Associated Faculty 12
Adjunct Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor 13
Lecturer 13
Senior Lecturer 13
Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor with FTE Below 50% 13
Visiting Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor 13
5. Emeritus Faculty 13
6. Joint Appointments 14
7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty 14
B. Procedures 14
1. Tenure-track Faculty 15
2. Clinical and Teaching Faculty 16
3. Research Faculty 16
4. Transfer from the Tenure-track 16
5. TIU Transfer 17
6. Associated Faculty 17
7. Joint Appointments 17
8. Courtesy Appointments 18

V. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND MERIT REVIEW 18
A. Documentation....19
B. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty....20
1. Fourth-Year Review....21
2. Extension of the Tenure Clock....21
C. Tenured Faculty....21
D. Clinical and Teaching Faculty....22
E. Research Faculty....24
F. Associated Faculty....25
G. Salary Recommendations 25

VI. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS 26
A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion 26
1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure 27
2. Promotion to Professor....30
3. Clinical and Teaching Faculty....31
Promotion to assistant clinical professor or assistant teaching professor. 32
Promotion to associate clinical professor or associate teaching professor....32
Promotion to clinical professor or teaching professor....34
4. Promotion of Research Faculty 35
Promotion to associate research professor 35
Promotion to research professor....35
5. Associated Faculty....35
Promotion to adjunct associate professor and adjunct professor 35
Promotion to associate professor and professor with FTE below 50%....35
Promotion to senior lecturer....35
Promotion of visiting faculty....35

B. Procedures....35
1. Tenure-track, Clinical, Teaching and Research Faculty....36
a. Candidate Responsibilities....36
Dossier....36
Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document 38
External Evaluations....38
b. Committee of Eligible Faculty Responsibilities....38
c. Department Chair Responsibilities 40
2. Associated Faculty....41
3. External Evaluations....41

VII. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS....43

VIII. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS....43

IX. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING 44
A Student Evaluation of Teaching....44
B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching....44
1. Chair Responsibilities....45

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 is 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 departmental 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 mission of the OSU Department of Speech and Hearing Science is to serve and advocate for persons across the spectrum of communication needs by discovering new knowledge about speech, language, and hearing; educating diverse groups of leaders in communication sciences, speech-language pathology, and audiology; and expanding accessibility to communication services for people of all backgrounds.

The department's vision is to be leaders in research, teaching, and outreach for the creation of a diverse, creative and altruistic community of scholars and clinicians that is positioned to effectively serve all people with needs related to speech, language, hearing, balance, and swallowing.

The work of the department encompasses the research, education and clinical service activities required in scholarly pursuits in the areas of speech-language pathology, audiology, speech science, language science, and hearing science. The department maintains an undergraduate major, an undergraduate minor, a PhD program, a Master of Arts in Speech and Hearing Science, and two professional graduate programs: an MA program in speech-language pathology (MA-SLP) and a Doctor of Audiology (AuD) program. The faculty of the department consists of individuals whose research, clinical, and instructional interests and expertise maintain an appropriate balance across the areas of the discipline. The department seeks continuous improvement in all areas of research, instruction, and service to the university and to our discipline.

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 chair, the dean, divisional deans, and assistant and associate deans of the College of Arts and Sciences, the executive vice president and provost, and the president may not participate as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure.

1. ***Tenure-track Faculty***

Initial Appointment Reviews

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

- **Rank Review**: For an appointment at senior rank (associate professor or professor), following the appointment decision, a separate 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, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors.

2. ***Clinical or Teaching Faculty***

Initial Appointment Reviews

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

- **Rank Review:** For an appointment review at senior rank (associate clinical/teaching professor or clinical/teaching professor), following the appointment decision, 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 non-probationary clinical and teaching faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of assistant clinical/teaching professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors, and all non-probationary associate clinical/teaching professors and clinical/teaching professors.

- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of associate clinical/teaching professors, and the reappointment reviews of probationary clinical/teaching professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors, and all non-probationary clinical/teaching professors.

3. ***Research Faculty***

Initial Appointment Reviews

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

- **Rank Review:** For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review at senior rank (research associate professor or research professor), following the appointment decision, a separate vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank is then cast by all tenured faculty and research faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Contract Renewal, or Promotion Reviews

- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of research assistant professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors and all non-probationary research associate professors and research professors.

- For the reappointment and promotion reviews of research associate professors and the reappointment reviews of research professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors and all non-probationary research professors.

4. ***Associated Faculty***

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- The initial 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 and in consultation with the chair's Executive Advisory Committee.

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

- The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair in consultation with the chair's Executive Advisory Committee.

Promotion Reviews

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

- For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track, clinical/teaching, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Sections III.A.1, 2 or 3 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 reviews of a lecturer to senior lecturer, the eligible faculty shall be all tenure-track and non-probationary clinical/teaching faculty at the rank of associate professor and professor.

5. ***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.

6. ***Minimum Composition***

In the event 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 of Social and Behavioral Sciences, will appoint a faculty member from another department within the college.

B. Promotion and Tenure Committee

All promotion and tenure responsibilities are handled by the various compositions of the Committee of Eligible Faculty. The department uses the terms 'Promotion and Tenure Committee' and 'P&T Committee' interchangeably with the 'Committee of Eligible Faculty.'

C. 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.

D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters only "yes" and "no" votes are counted. Abstentions are not allowed in promotion and tenure reviews. 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 two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment tenure-initiating unit (TIU) prior to their appointment. The department chair will solicit discursive comments and the result of the vote of the Committee of Eligible Faculty from the partnering TIU prior to making the final recommendation to the college about the appointment. If the partnering TIU reached a decision that is different from SHS's Committee of Eligible Faculty, the chair will convene an additional meeting of the committee to consider the new information before reaching a decision for recommendation to the college.

2. *Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion*

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

In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment TIU prior to their reappointment, promotion and/or tenure. The department chair will solicit discursive comments and the result of the vote of the Committee of Eligible Faculty from the partnering TIU prior to making the final recommendation to the college about the appointment. If the partnering TIU reached a decision that is different from SHS's Committee of Eligible Faculty, the chair will convene an additional

meeting of the committee to consider the new information before reaching a decision for recommendation to the college.

IV. APPOINTMENTS

A. Criteria

The Department of Speech and Hearing Science 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; the potential for them to advance the department's mission, 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 if 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, clinical/teaching, research, 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. A formal review and selection process, including interviews using pre-designed evaluation rubrics, is 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*

Appointment decisions for tenure-track faculty will be based on criteria that reflect strong potential to attain tenure and advancement 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. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. 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 of appointment or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's Committee of Eligible Faculty, the department chair, the dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA). Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked without a formal request for an extension of the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor. Minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor include an earned terminal degree in speech and hearing science or a related field (recognizing that speech and hearing science is an area of scholarship that is inherently multi- and interdisciplinary in nature), evidence of potential for scholarly productivity and potential to develop into an internationally recognized scholar,

demonstrated potential for high-quality teaching, and a willingness to provide quality service to the department, the college, the university, and the professions served by the department will be the primary criteria on which candidates will be assessed. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service, unless a formal extension of the probationary period is granted by the department, college, and the Office of Academic Affairs. 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 Eligible Faculty determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked without a formal request for an extension of the probationary period.

Associate Professor and Professor. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor with or without tenure, professor with tenure, and 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 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.

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.

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

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

2. *Clinical and 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 clinical and teaching faculty members must be for a period of five years. The initial contract at all ranks is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for assistant and associate clinical/teaching professors must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for clinical/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 be terminated only 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 clinical/teaching faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. The terms of a contract may be re-negotiated at the time of reappointment.

Promotion is not required for the reappointment of clinical and teaching faculty. Unlike tenure-track assistant professors, assistant professors in clinical and teaching appointments may maintain that rank indefinitely. The issuing of new contracts is not directly tied to the promotion process.

a. Clinical Faculty

Clinical Faculty appointments are made in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-7. Clinical faculty members are scholars whose primary contributions are to the teaching mission of the department across its professional programs of audiology and/or speech-language pathology. In some instances, the clinical faculty may make teaching contributions to the undergraduate programs as a secondary responsibility. Clinical faculty teaching may come as didactic course instruction, clinical precepting, and/or individual scholarly instruction. Individuals appointed to a clinical faculty position might have any of a variety of educational degrees.

For speech-language pathology, the minimum required degree for clinical practice in the U.S. is a master's degree, and thus it is possible that the degree of a clinical-track faculty member in that area might be an MA, MS, MEd, EdD, SLPD or PhD, depending on the program from which they graduated. For audiology, a practicing audiologist might have a degree of MA, MS, AuD, or PhD, again depending on the program from which they graduated and the time they graduated (individuals who earned their degree before 2007—the year that the AuD became the entry-level degree for the profession of audiology—might have an MA or MS degree). The individual will likely be required to be eligible for licensure at the state level (through the Ohio Speech and Hearing Professionals Board) and potentially to hold national clinical certification in their area of expertise.

Clinical Instructor. Appointment is normally made at the rank of clinical instructor when the appointee has not completed the requirements for the terminal degree. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. As noted above, an appointment at the instructor level is limited to a three-year contract. In such cases, if the instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant clinical professor by the end of the penultimate year of the three-year contract period, a new contract will not be considered even if performance is otherwise adequate and the position itself will continue.

Assistant Clinical Professor. An earned terminal degree and the required licensure/certification are the minimum requirements for appointment at the rank of assistant clinical professor. Evidence of ability to teach is highly desirable.

Associate Clinical Professor or Clinical Professor. Appointment at the rank of associate clinical professor or clinical professor requires that the individual have an earned doctorate in a relevant field and the required licensure/certification, and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria in teaching, service, and scholarship.

b. Teaching Faculty

Teaching faculty members are scholars whose primary contributions are to the teaching mission of the department through didactic course instruction. The primary responsibility will be in the undergraduate program, but graduate course instruction may also be included in a teaching faculty member's portfolio. Teaching faculty may also perform individual scholarly instruction for undergraduate and graduate students. 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 is normally made at the rank of teaching instructor when the appointee has not completed the requirements for their terminal degree. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to a three-year contract. In such cases, if the instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of

assistant professor by the end of the penultimate year of the three-year contract period, a new contract will not be considered even if performance is otherwise adequate and the position itself will continue.

Assistant Teaching Professor. An earned doctorate in a relevant field or a master's degree and equivalent experience is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant teaching professor. Evidence of ability to teach is also required. This will primarily come in the form of having taught didactic courses previously. A history of student mentorship in clinical or research environments and participation on student project committees is also desirable.

Associate Teaching Professor or Teaching Professor. Appointment at the rank of associate teaching professor or teaching professor requires that the individual have an earned doctorate in a relevant field or a master's degree and equivalent experience and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria in teaching, service, and scholarship for these ranks. Appointment at the rank of teaching professor requires production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice.

3. *Research Faculty*

Research Faculty appointments are made in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-7. Research faculty are scholars whose primary focus is on advancing the research mission of the department. They may also engage in service at the department and professional levels. Appointment of research faculty entails three- to five-year appointments. The initial appointment is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to research faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent appointments will be offered, regardless of performance.

Research faculty can comprise no more than 20% of the number of tenure-track faculty in an individual unit. Appointments at the rank of research assistant professor, research associate professor or research professor require approval of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs.

Research faculty are required to provide at least 80% of their salary through external funding sources, such as grants or contracts. Up to 20% of salary can be supported by department funding sources in order to provide the research faculty member the opportunity to write grants/contracts and engage in service. If external funding should expire during a contract, the research faculty can request up two years of bridge funding from department funds at up to 50% of their salary. The bridge funding is dependent upon funds being available from the department and are made available at the discretion of the department chair.

Research Assistant Professor. Appointment at the rank of research assistant professor requires that the individual have an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in a relevant discipline and a record of high-quality publications that indicate the ability to sustain an independent, externally funded research program.

Research Associate Professor or Research Professor. Appointment at the rank of research associate professor or research professor requires that the individual have a research doctorate and a substantial record of independent scholarship consistent with what is expected for promotion of a tenure-track faculty member to these ranks.

4. *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 associated faculty at senior rank must be reviewed and approved by the College of Arts and Sciences.

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor. Adjunct titles are used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to tenure-track, clinical, teaching, or research faculty of equivalent rank. The term of appointment is for one year with renewal contingent on continued significant contributions. Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give academic service to the department, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees, for which a faculty title is appropriate. The adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track, clinical/teaching, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track, clinical/teaching, or research 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 and evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure, but they may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer should generally not exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for lecturers cannot exceed three years.

Senior Lecturer. Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual have a terminal degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction; or a master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience with documentation of high quality. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The initial appointment for a senior lecturer should generally not exceed one year. 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. Associated faculty can be appointed with tenure-track titles (assistant professor, associate professor, professor). This is used 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.

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. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for only three consecutive years.

5. *Emeritus Faculty*

Emeritus faculty status is an honor given in recognition of sustained academic contributions to the university as described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-36.

Faculty 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.1-4) 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. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule 3335-5-04, emeritus status will not be considered.

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

6. *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.

7. *Courtesy Appointments for Faculty*

Occasionally, the active academic involvement in the department by a tenure-track, clinical, teaching, or research faculty member from another department at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in this department. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course on occasion, or a combination of these.

A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized. The offer of a courtesy appointment is initiated by the department chair and requires approval by the Committee of Eligible Faculty.

B. Procedures

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, clinical, teaching, research, 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. A formal review and selection process including 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 Faculty Appointments Policy for information on the following topics:

- recruitment of tenure-track, clinical, teaching, research, 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 Office on Academic Affairs Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection.

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 who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the department. The search committee will be led by a committee chairperson. In some cases in which the position is interdisciplinary in nature, it is expected that members of the search committee will be drawn from other TIUs as well.

Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo the trainings identified in the SHIFT Framework for faculty recruitment. In addition, all employees/faculty involved in the hiring and selection process must review and acknowledge the EEO Recruitment and Selection Guidelines in the BuckeyeLearn system.

The 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 the university's commitment to EEO principles 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 the Office of Academic Affairs to reflect on the hiring cycle each year and evaluate areas that may need improvement and additional support.

After the interviews, the eligible faculty meets to discuss perceptions and preferences and to vote on each candidate. If an offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If an offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor, with or without tenure, or professor with tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the 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 is advised to 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. *Clinical and Teaching Faculty*

Searches for clinical and teaching faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty except that the presentation of a candidate for a teaching faculty position during the interview is on teaching and/or pedagogy rather than scholarship.

3. *Research Faculty*

Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty except that during the interview, it is primarily the candidate's research credentials that are evaluated.

4. *Transfer from the Tenure-track*

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a clinical, teaching, or research appointment if appropriate to the individual's circumstances and 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. Transfers must be approved by the chair, the dean of the college, and the executive vice president and provost.

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

Transfers from a clinical, teaching, or research appointment to the tenure-track are not permitted. However, clinical, teaching, or research faculty members may apply for open tenure-track positions and compete in the national search required for such positions.

5. *TIU Transfer*

Requests by tenure-track faculty 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 arrangement 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 of transferring from one TIU to another.

6. *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 chair in consultation with the chair's Executive Advisory Committee. Compensated associated appointments can be made for a period of one to three years, unless a shorter is appropriate to the circumstances. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued.

The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair in consultation with the chair's Executive Advisory Committee. Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department and are decided by the chair in consultation with the chair's Executive Advisory Committee.

Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three years.

Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are made on an annual or semester basis. After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment may be offered.

7. *Joint Appointments*

The department may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another Ohio State TIU as described in Section IV.A.6. 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.

8. *Courtesy Appointments*

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track, clinical, teaching, or research faculty member from another Ohio State tenure-initiating unit by providing a written request and rationale supporting the appointment.

The chair will review the curriculum vitae and associated documents of the potential appointee and will consult with the faculty before making the initial appointment. Courtesy appointments will be initiated when the chair determines that the potential contribution of the appointee to the academic work of the department, as well as the needs of the department, justifies such an appointment.

The chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified and takes recommendations for non-renewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular faculty 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 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 department 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 TIU head.

Criteria considered in the annual review and merit processes:

- Depending on a faculty member's appointment type, the annual performance and merit review is based on expected performance 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.

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

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

- In judging contributions to the department's research missions, quality shall be the primary concern. Quantity of scholarly production is important but secondary to quality.

- In the area of teaching, it is recognized that an instructor's student evaluations of instruction (SEIs) and peer evaluations of teaching can provide useful data, but they can also be misleading when evaluated in isolation. Therefore, a variety of teaching assessments will be utilized to provide a holistic evaluation of a faculty member's teaching. The department recognizes that what is taught (and the amount of information that students retain) is as important as how it is taught. Therefore, student learning outcomes and retention are evaluated with programmatic assessment data. These data will be considered when evaluating faculty performance in teaching, as will peer and student evaluations of instruction.

- In the area of service, consideration will be paid to the time commitment for the assignment, the level of the assignment (department, college, university, profession), the outreach contribution, and the accomplishments in the service role over the previous year.

The 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, compensated faculty members must submit the following documents to the department chair no later than January 31:

- Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline (*required for probationary faculty and recommended for associate professors*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (*non-probationary faculty*).

- An updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*).

The chair will indicate when in the Spring semester that they will begin annual reviews, and faculty will be allowed to provide updated materials at that time.

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.

Faculty-solicited evaluations from any party for purposes of the annual performance and merit review will not be accepted.

B. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the chair and the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. The annual review is completed during the Spring semester or as specified by the college or the Office of Academic Affairs. The chair will provide the appropriate timetable for submission of all materials.

Before the Eligible Faculty meet to evaluate probationary tenure-track faculty, the department chair appoints a senior faculty member to be the reporter for the meeting. The chair will not attend the meeting but will be available as needed by the Committee of Eligible Faculty to provide any additional information requested and to participate in discussions. Members of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty who are absent from the meeting may provide short comments regarding their evaluation of the untenured faculty members in the areas of research, teaching, and service to the Committee chair, who will read them during the meeting.

Following this meeting, the reporter will provide to the department chair a written report of the results of the review for the untenured faculty member to which they were assigned. This reporter will solicit comments and/or suggestions from all other members of the committee in preparing an accurate and balanced report. This report will provide an evaluation (including both strengths and weaknesses) of the untenured faculty member in terms of research, teaching, and service and any recommendations in terms of future performance.

After receiving this review, the department chair will provide their own written evaluation for each untenured faculty member. If there are differences between the assessment of the department chair and the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the department chair will explain to the members of the Committee the reasons for their departure from the Committee's evaluation.

Copies of these evaluations shall be provided to the probationary faculty member. The department chair and probationary faculty member will meet to discuss these written evaluations and to discuss the faculty member's future plans and goals. The evaluation and discussion should be constructive and candid. This review process is a means to be supportive and helpful to probationary tenure-track faculty but, at the same time, provide a candid and clearly-communicated evaluation of that faculty member's performance—especially in terms of those aspects that need improvement if the probationary faculty member is to make acceptable progress toward tenure.

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, the evaluation by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, and the faculty member's comments, if received, are forwarded to the dean of the college. In addition, the annual review letters

become 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 exceptions that external evaluations are optional and the dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or non-renewal of the probationary appointment.

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

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

The eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department chair. The department chair conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the departmental review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04) is followed, and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or non-renewal.

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 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 chair conducts an independent assessment, may meet with the faculty member to discuss their performance and future plans and goals, and prepares a written evaluation on these topics.

The faculty member may provide written comments on these reviews and the department chair may respond in writing if warranted.

Professors are reviewed annually by the chair, who may meet with the faculty member to discuss their performance and future plans and goals. The annual review of professors is based on their having continued to achieve excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the department, 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 in 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 chair prepares a written evaluation of performance against these expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review and the chair may reply in writing if warranted.

D. Clinical and Teaching Faculty

The annual performance and merit review process and documentation for probationary and non-probationary clinical and teaching faculty are identical to those for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty, respectively with the following exceptions:

- Non-probationary clinical and teaching faculty may participate in the review of clinical and teaching practice faculty of lower rank.

- Annual reviews of both probationary and non-probationary assistant clinical professors and assistant teaching professors by the Committee of Eligible Faculty do not become part of the packet submitted to the college for reappointment or promotion reviews. Instead, they are intended to provide candid informal guidance from the committee on the faculty member's progress toward reappointment or promotion.

- In addition to a chair's review, the chair may request an additional review (no more often than every two years) of associate clinical professors and associate teaching professors by the Committee of Eligible Faculty. The Committee of the Eligible Faculty will provide an evaluative report that provides feedback to the associate professor regarding progress toward promotion.

While the annual review process and documentation for clinical and teaching faculty are identical to those of tenure-track faculty, the criteria on which decisions will be made are different and customized to each faculty member based on the unique set of responsibilities outlined in their Professional Plan.

The criteria for clinical faculty are structured according to the following hierarchy:

1) Teaching: Teaching will include an examination of their performance in terms of clinical education. This will include teaching in didactic courses, clinical supervisor/preceptorship, clinical placement of graduate students into external clinical sites and evaluation of the

performance of those sites, and membership on student committees (e.g., AuD capstones, MA-SLP posters or theses, undergraduate theses).

2) Service: Service activities include those to the department, the college, the university, and to the professions of speech-language pathology and audiology, outreach efforts, and the development of specialty clinics to provide services to new populations in central Ohio.
3) Scholarship: For clinical faculty, scholarship can come in the form of peer- and editor-reviewed publications, presentations at state or national conventions, news articles, and/or supporting the clinical research of tenure-track faculty members.

The criteria for teaching faculty are structured according to the following hierarchy:

1) Teaching: Teaching will include an examination of their performance in terms of didactic and precepting education. This will include teaching in undergraduate and graduate courses and membership on student committees (e.g., AuD capstones, MA-SLP posters or theses, undergraduate theses). Teaching professional development and curricular innovation will also be valued highly.
2) Service: Service activities include those to the department, the college, the university, and to the professions of speech-language pathology and audiology, and outreach efforts.
3) Scholarship: For teaching faculty, scholarship can come in the form of peer- and editor-reviewed publications, presentations at state or national conventions, news articles, and/or supporting the research of tenure-track faculty members.

While promotion is not compulsory for clinical and teaching faculty, they must undergo a reappointment review at the end of each contract. The issuing of new contracts is not directly tied to the promotion process.

In the penultimate year of a probationary clinical or teaching faculty member's appointment, the annual review by the Committee of Eligible Faculty will include a formal vote to recommend to the chair whether to reappoint or deny reappointment. The Committee reporter will draft a letter to the chair outlining the nature of the discussions about the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship. The discussions will be guided by the expectations set forth in the faculty member's Professional Plan. The letter should outline the expectations in each area and then compare the faculty member's performance to those expectations. The review then proceeds in the same manner as the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty, including a formal review by the college promotion and tenure committee in spring semester. All reappointment decisions are at the discretion of the college dean. If the reappointment is not granted, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 must be observed. There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

In the penultimate contract year of a non-probationary clinical or teaching faculty member's appointment, the department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue by consulting with the eligible faculty and the divisional dean. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 must be observed. If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review generally proceeds in the same manner as the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure track faculty. All reappointment decisions are at the discretion of the college dean. If the reappointment is not granted, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 must be observed. There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

E. Research Faculty

The annual performance and merit review process and documentation for probationary and non-probationary research faculty are identical to those for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty, respectively with the following exceptions:

- Non-probationary research faculty may participate in the review of research faculty of lower rank.

- Annual reviews of both probationary and non-probationary research assistant professors by the Committee of Eligible Faculty do not become part of the packet submitted to the college for reappointment or promotion reviews. Instead, they are intended to provide candid informal guidance from the committee on the research faculty member's progress toward reappointment or promotion.

- In addition to a chair's review, the chair may request an additional review (no more often than every two years) of research associate professors by the Committee of Eligible Faculty. The Committee of the Eligible Faculty will provide an evaluative report that provides feedback to the associate research professor regarding progress toward promotion.

While the annual review process and documentation for research faculty are similar to those of tenure-track faculty, the criteria on which decisions will be made are different for research faculty compared to tenure-track faculty. The criteria for research faculty will be structured according to the following hierarchy:

1) Scholarship: For research faculty, scholarship is expected to come in the form of peer- and editor-reviewed publications, extramural funding awards in the form of grants and contracts, presentations at national or international conferences,

2) With respect to extramural funding, research faculty are required to fund 80% of their salary through extramural sources. Should extramural funding fall below coverage for 80% of the salary, the research faculty member may continue in the department at a reduced salary for the duration of their remaining contract, as long as lab and office space remain available. Lab and office space availability is determined by the department chair.

3) Service: Service activities include those to the department, the college, the university, and to the professions of speech-language pathology, audiology, and speech and hearing science. The research faculty member will be funded up to 20% of their annual salary by department funds to enable them to take time to engage in these service activities.

While promotion is not compulsory for research faculty, they must undergo a reappointment process at the end of each contract. The issuing of new contracts is not directly tied to the promotion process.

In the penultimate year of a probationary research faculty member's appointment, the annual review by the Committee of Eligible Faculty will include a formal vote to recommend to the chair whether to reappoint or deny reappointment. The Committee reporter will draft a letter to the chair outlining the nature of the discussions about the faculty member's performance in the areas of scholarship and service. The letter should outline the expectations in each area and then compare the faculty member's performance to those expectations. The review then proceeds in the same manner as the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure-track faculty, including a formal review by the college promotion and tenure committee in spring semester. All reappointment decisions are at the discretion of the college dean. If the reappointment is not granted, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will

be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 must be observed. There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

In the penultimate contract year of a non-probationary research faculty member's appointment, the department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue by consulting with the eligible faculty and the divisional dean. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 must be observed. If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review generally proceeds in the same manner as the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure track faculty. All reappointment decisions are at the discretion of the college dean. If the reappointment is not granted, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 must be observed. There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

F. Associated Faculty

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

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

Annual contracts for associated faculty can be for a single course in a single semester. The chair reviews the performance of these associated faculty to determine if the department will hire them for the same (or other) courses in the future.

G. Salary Recommendations

The department chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the Divisional Dean of Social and Behavioral Sciences, who may modify these recommendations subject to final approval by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The recommendations are based on the current annual performance and merit review as well as on the performance and merit reviews of the preceding 24 months.

Salary increases are formulated in dollar amounts rather than percentage increases, with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries. 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 assuring, to the extent possible given financial constraints, that salaries are aligned with the market and are internally equitable. Accordingly, 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.

As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the department chair divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory) and

considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate. After merit salary increases have been finalized at the college and university levels, the chair shall inform each faculty member of their increase.

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

Faculty members who fail to submit the required documentation (See Section V-A above) 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.*

In addition, the Arts and Sciences APT provides an addendum to this Faculty rule in terms of promotion to professor. The addendum states that:

> *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.*

The goal of the promotion process is to allow the department to retain and reward faculty members who serve the department's mission (see Section II above) at a high level.

A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

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. As noted above, except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increase, all funds for annual salary increases will be directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and the active promotion of an enriching working and learning environment through collegiality, civility, and openness to varied ideas and opinions.

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 will not be awarded below the rank of associate professor.

The award of tenure is an acknowledgment 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.

The department will establish and exercise high standards for the awarding of tenure, since a positive tenure decision has a powerful impact on the quality and future of the department. Every candidate should be held to a standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. 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. The pattern of performance over the probationary period should yield a high degree of confidence that the candidate will continue to develop professionally in ways relevant to the future of the department.

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 department must be able to support that claim that the promotion and tenure of the candidate will improve the overall scholarly quality and standing of the department. Internal cases for promotion to a higher rank and external hires at that rank should be equally strong and meet the same standards. Internal cases should also be comparable to the quality of external candidates who could be hired, controlling for rank and stage of career.

Specific criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure in the Department of Speech and Hearing Sciences include consideration of the following:

Scholarship:

Criteria	**Examples of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met**
Candidate must have demonstrated the building of a successful independent research program that contributes to the department's mission and the needs of society.	1) Articles in peer-reviewed journals and/or presentations at conferences that clearly demonstrate creation of an independent research/scholarship program over time, and contribute substantively to knowledge or clinical outcomes in the candidate's area of focus. 2) Conference papers (both refereed and otherwise), monographs, books, book chapters, textbooks based on scholarship, magazine articles and on-line publications, patents and invention disclosures. 3) Sustained grants and contracts, when appropriate for the field, including foundations, federal agencies, major industry, or private sector – may be as Primary Investigator or Co-Investigator. 4) Research awards (internal and external). 5) Invited talks at symposia, conferences, other field specific venues that demonstrate the recognition of the thought leadership of the candidate. 6) Citation counts for published works. 7) External review letters indicating the strength and impact of the candidate's work.

The building of a successful independent research program is the most important area on which a tenure candidate will be evaluated.

While the primary metric through which a successful research program is demonstrated is through publications in peer-reviewed journals appropriate to the faculty member's expertise, probationary tenure-track faculty are encouraged and expected to seek external support for their research efforts (serving on grant/foundation proposals as a Principal Investigator, Co-Investigator or Consultant), but securing external funding is not required for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

Teaching:

Criteria	Examples of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidate must have demonstrated effective instructional techniques and materials appropriate for the objectives and level of the course	1) Peer reviews of instructional substance (e.g., syllabi, materials and assignments, feedback on assignments and exams) and process (e.g., clarity of speech and visual materials, engagement of students) indicate high-quality instruction. 2) Student evaluations of instruction scores and comment summaries indicate student engagement and learning. 3) Documentation in the dossier narratives of efforts taken to address scores and comments in the student evaluations that indicate areas for improvement.
Candidate should have demonstrated curricular enhancement and innovation in the courses taught in the department's graduate and undergraduate programs	1) Documentation in the dossier narratives of attendance for continuing education on topic or focus area and/or adoption of new materials in class 2) Completed Foundations, Impact Teaching through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning 3) Completed Teaching at Ohio State through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning 4) Awarding of "Endorsement" from Drake Institute of Teaching and Learning
Candidate should have demonstrated supervision of high-quality dissertations, capstone projects, and masters and honors theses.	1) Dissemination of the work in research journal articles authored by the students. 2) Scholarly presentations of the work by students at research and clinical conferences at the local, state, national, and international levels.

Service:

Criteria	Examples of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidates must have demonstrated excellence in service through a combination of contributions to the department, college, university, people of Ohio, and/or the professions served by the department.	1) Service on department committees, with quality of the contributions assessed through documentation in annual review letters. 2) Journal article reviews. 3) Outreach efforts to the community as documented in the dossier narratives.

	4) Service on college and university committees, with quality of contributions assessed through documentation in annual review letters. 5) Service on professional organization committees, with quality of contributions assessed through documentation in annual review letters. 6) Editorial board positions. 7) Section/associate editor positions. 8) Recognition (awards and prizes) for service.

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 charts in Section VI.A.1], with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national or international reputation in the field. 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.

The department aligns with the university's and college's positions that there are multiple pathways to promotion to professor. Each candidate for promotion will have a unique distribution of achievements in scholarship, teaching, and service. The department encourages innovation in all three areas. With innovation comes a recognition that there is no one model of a successful faculty member to which all candidates for promotion must adhere.

Internal cases for promotion and external hires at that rank should be equally strong and meet the same standards. Internal cases also should be comparable to the quality of external candidates who could be hired.

Scholarship: A successful candidate for promotion to professor will have achieved national and international distinction as a scholar based on high-quality research productivity. It is also expected that a successful candidate will have been successful in seeking external funding for their research (at a level of NIH R01 grant or equivalents), though annual review letters will document any changes in the funding environment that may influence how this expectation is considered. Scholarship outcomes are expected to reflect the candidate's role as principal investigator in a significant proportion of the work. There should also be a continuing trajectory of significant scholarly outcomes over time, as indicated by citation numbers and the candidate's reputation in the field as conveyed through the external review letters.

Teaching: The candidate will have demonstrated excellence in teaching as defined as providing to all students the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning in speech and hearing science and providing to the most capable and motivated students an enhanced learning experience. This will include advising doctoral students and their dissertations. Measures of excellence in teaching will be the same as those used for evaluating assistant professors for promotion and tenure (see Section VI-A-1).

Service: The candidate will also have demonstrated excellence and leadership in service, with the expectation that the candidate will be able to demonstrate not only participation in service activities, but also demonstrable impact of their service on the department, college, university, the state of Ohio, and/or the professions the department serves. As described in the table in section VI.A.1 above, documentation for quality of the relevant service contributions will be found in annual review letters and dossier narratives. Leadership in service to the department could include leadership on department committees, creating and maintaining development opportunities, and contributions toward promoting the department nationally and internationally. Leadership in service to the college or university could include membership and leadership roles on committees in Social and Behavioral Sciences, the College of Arts and Sciences, the University Senate and its related committees, or committees established by other colleges or university-level offices. Leadership in service to the community could include creating or maintaining efforts for community outreach and engagement. Leadership in service to the discipline could include leadership roles in one or more of the national organizations that serve the professions of speech-language pathology or audiology (e.g., American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, the American Academy of Audiology) or editorial roles in journals that serve the disciplines.

3. ***Clinical and Teaching Faculty***

Teaching is the primary responsibility of the clinical and teaching faculty, with clinical faculty responsible for clinical education and teaching faculty focused on didactic coursework. Secondary responsibility is for providing service to the department, profession, the community and, if the

opportunity arises, the college or university. Tertiary responsibility involves scholarship. Specific workload distributions within those three areas are defined by the faculty member's Professional Plan.

Promotion to Assistant Clinical Professor or Assistant Teaching Professor. For promotion to assistant clinical professor or assistant teaching professor, a faculty member must hold a doctoral or other terminal degree in the relevant field or hold a master's degree along with relevant experience, meet the required licensure/certification in the specialty and be performing satisfactorily in teaching and service. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor or Associate Teaching Professor. For promotion to associate clinical professor or associate teaching professor, a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of this department. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to associate clinical professor and associate teaching professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Additional details are provided below. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Teaching:

Criteria	Examples of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidate must have demonstrated effective instructional techniques and materials appropriate for the objectives and level of the course	1) Peer reviews of instructional substance (e.g., syllabi, materials and assignments, feedback on assignments and exams) and process (e.g., clarity of speech and visual materials, engagement of students) indicate high-quality instruction. 2) Student evaluations of instruction scores and comment summaries indicate student engagement and learning. 3) Documentation in the dossier narratives of efforts taken to address scores and comments in the student evaluations that indicate areas for improvement.
Candidate should have demonstrated curricular enhancement and innovation in the courses taught in the department's graduate and undergraduate programs	1) Documentation in the dossier narratives of attendance for continuing education on topic or focus area and/or adoption of new materials in class 2) Completed Foundations, Impact Teaching through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning 3) Completed Teaching at Ohio State through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning 4) Awarding of "Endorsement" from Drake Institute of Teaching and Learning
Candidate should have demonstrated advising and committee work for dissertations, capstone projects, and masters and honors theses.	1) Documented record of advising scholarly projects. 2) Documented record of committee work on scholarly projects.

Service:

Criteria	Examples of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidates must have demonstrated excellence in service through a combination of contributions to the department, college, university, people of Ohio, and/or the professions served by the department.	1) Service on department committees, with quality of the contributions assessed through documentation in annual review letters. 2) Contributions toward development and engagement with donors as documented in dossier narratives and annual review letters. 3) Contributions toward promoting the department as documented in dossier narratives and annual review letters. 4) Building/administering specialty clinics as documented in dossier narratives and annual review letters. 5) Outreach efforts to the community as documented in the dossier narratives. 6) Service on college and university committees, with quality of contributions assessed through documentation in annual review letters. 7) Service on professional organization committees, with quality of contributions assessed through documentation in annual review letters. 8) Recognition (awards and prizes) for service.

Scholarship: In the Department of Speech and Hearing Science, promotion to associate clinical professor or associate teaching professor requires a contribution of meaningful and impactful scholarly activities, which may include the production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. Expectations for this component of the promotion criteria will be lower than for teaching or service. For clinical and teaching faculty who have a unique interest and opportunity for more scholarly activity, this area can be emphasized more heavily in the Professional Plan and therefore weighed more heavily in the workload allocation and promotion decisions by the Committee of Eligible Faculty and chair. For those who want to emphasize their service contributions more heavily, scholarship responsibilities can be reduced, but there will typically remain an expectation of some contribution in this area.

Criteria	Examples of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidate must have demonstrated contributions to knowledge and/or pedagogical practice in alignment with the department's mission, the professions served by the department, and the needs of society.	1) Activities to support tenure- and research-track faculty's scholarly activities, as documented in the annual review letters and dossier narratives. 2) Presentations at research or clinical conferences. 3) Co-authorship of articles in peer-reviewed journals. 4) Conference papers (both refereed and otherwise), monographs, books, book chapters, textbooks based on scholarship,

	magazine articles and on-line publications, patents and invention disclosures. 5) Contributions on grants and contracts, with expectations of roles as Co-Investigator, consultant, or Key Personnel. 6) Invited talks at symposia, conferences, other field-specific venues that demonstrate the recognition of the thought leadership of the candidate.

Promotion to Clinical Professor or Teaching Professor. For promotion to clinical professor or 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; leadership in service to this department and to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Teaching: Continued excellence in teaching will be demonstrated through the same metrics as those used for evaluations of promotion to associate clinical professor and associate teaching professor (see Section VI-A-3 above). Candidates shall also demonstrate leadership in teaching by advising AuD capstones or MA poster projects and/or creating new educational experiences. For teaching faculty, leadership in teaching may also demonstrated by college, university, or professional awards for teaching excellence. The authorship of educational textbooks, chapters, and articles may also be considered as evidence of leadership in teaching in addition to evidence of the production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy.

Service: Candidates for promotion shall demonstrate leadership in service to the department, the college, the university, the community, and/or to the professions of speech-language pathology, audiology, or the disciplines in speech and hearing science. Leadership in service to the department could include leadership on department committees, creating and maintaining development opportunities, and contributions toward promoting the department nationally and internationally. Service to the college or university could include membership on committees in the College of Arts and Sciences or the University Senate and its related committees or committees established by other colleges or university-level offices. Leadership in service to the community could include creating or maintaining efforts for community outreach and engagement. Leadership in service to the discipline could include leadership roles in one or more of the national organizations that serve the professions of speech-language pathology, audiology (e.g., American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, the American Academy of Audiology), or speech and hearing science. It may also include editorial roles in journals that serve the disciplines.

Scholarship: The requirements in scholarship for promotion to clinical and teaching professor are similar to those required for promotion to associate clinical professor and associate teaching professor, respectively but promotion to teaching professor specifically requires the production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. Types of evidence demonstrating that this criterion has been met may include sole or co-authorship of books, textbooks, chapters, and editor-reviewed or peer-reviewed articles relevant to pedagogy or practice as well as the presentation of this form of scholarship at national or international conferences.

4. *Promotion of Research Faculty*

Promotion to Research Associate Professor. For promotion to research associate professor, a faculty member must have a record of excellence in scholarship, including a substantial record of high-quality focused research consistent with an appointment devoted solely to research. Publications must appear in high-quality peer-reviewed venues and be judged by external evaluators as having substantial positive impact on the field. A record of significant and continuous peer reviewed extramural and/or commercial funding for research as a principal investigator or co-investigator and a substantial probability that such funding will continue is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation. The claim that retention of the candidate will improve the overall scholarly quality and standing of the department must be supported. The scholarship records of internal cases for promotion and external hires at this rank should be equally strong. Additionally, the research records of research faculty and tenure-track faculty at this rank should be comparable. As a secondary responsibility, assistant research professors are expected to provide service to the discipline. This service can come through participation on committees in national and international professional organizations and editorial contributions to journals in the discipline. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Research Professor. For promotion to research professor, a faculty member must have a record of excellence in scholarship including a national or international reputation built on an extensive body of high-quality peer-reviewed publications with demonstrated impact on the field. Evidence of national or international recognition in the field may be demonstrated through invited presentations, external letters of evaluation and/or national awards for scholarship. A record of significant and continuous peer-reviewed extramural and/or commercial funding as principal investigator is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding and a substantial probability that external research support will continue. The scholarship records of internal cases for promotion and external hires at this rank should be equally strong and meet the same standards. The claim that retention of the candidate will improve the overall scholarly quality and standing of the department must be supported. Promotion to research professor further requires leadership in service to the discipline. This may be demonstrated by taking leadership positions on committees in national and international professional organizations and editorial board positions in journals in the discipline. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

5. *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, clinical, teaching, or research 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.4.

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 Rules 3335-6-04 for tenure-track faculty, 3335-7-05 for clinical/teaching faculty, 3335-7-32 for research faculty, and Chapter 3 of the *Policies and Procedures Handbook*.

1. *Tenure-track, Clinical, Teaching, and Research Faculty*

a. Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier and providing a copy of the APT under which they wish to be reviewed, if other than the department's current document. If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators compiled for their case according to departmental guidelines. Each of these elements is described in detail below.

- **Dossier**

Every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist. 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 completed.

The time period for teaching documentation (including all courses' SEIs) to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty, it is the date of last promotion or reappointment to present or the last five years prior to the promotion decision, whichever time period is shorter. 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 for an evaluation of a candidate's teaching performance includes student ratings and written comments, peer review, indicators of the magnitude of service to the Department's undergraduate and graduate teaching missions. Examples of documentation include:

a. Student evaluations of an instructor will be obtained using the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) instrument. Evaluations must be conducted for every lecture course and seminar course taught in the Department. Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) must be presented. Individual SEI student evaluations will be compared to the College and University mean evaluations. Overall mean scores as well as the response patterns to individual SEI items will be examined during Departmental reviews. Faculty members will also be asked to collect discursive comments using the SEI tool; a summary of these comments will be provided to the Chair and to the eligible faculty for use in the tenure/promotion review.

b. Teaching will also be evaluated on a periodic basis through peer visits to the classes with reports to the Chair concerning the peer-evaluation of teaching conducted. See Section IX-B-1 for required numbers of peer evaluations. It is the responsibility of the chair to ensure that these peer evaluations have been completed and properly documented.

c. Dossier narratives are opportunities for the candidate to describe the contributions they have made to the teaching mission, including creation of new courses/curricula, modifications to existing courses/curricula, use of innovative teaching approaches, and the ways they have modified their teaching in response to peer and student feedback.

Scholarship

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.

a. In addition to the list of publications, descriptions of the candidate's contribution to the work and the impact factor of the journal must be included.
b. Citation counts for published works, including those prior to the appointment start date and/or date of last promotion.
c. A list of grants and contracts, both intra- and extra-mural in support of research or scholarly endeavors. Information should include direct and indirect costs awarded, the term of the award, and the role of the candidate on the grant/contract.
d. A list of scholarly presentations, including whether they were invited or peer-reviewed, and whether they were poster or podium presentations. Presentations should be organized by the venue in which they delivered (local, state, national, international).
e. Listing of awards granted for scholarship.

Service

The time period for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty, it is the date of last promotion or reappointment to present or the last five years, whichever time period is shorter. 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.

a. List of service activities across levels. This includes service to the Department, the College, University, Community, State, nation, and profession. Service outside the university includes the professional expertise of the faculty member to scholarly associations and groups as well as to the community. Internal to the University it includes service to students and formal and ad-hoc committees as defined in the Department and College Pattern of Administration, the University Senate, and other university offices.
b. Dossier narratives provide an opportunity for the candidate to document the nature of service provided and to provide context on the effort and prestige of the service activities (e.g. leadership in a professional society, service on a University Senate committee), since the significance of service contributions vary considerably and are often difficult to ascertain from only the listing of the activity.
c. List of any service awards or honors won.

The complete dossier is forwarded when the review moves beyond the department. The documentation of teaching (SEIs, peer reviews) is forwarded along with the dossier.

- **Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document**

Candidates must indicate the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. Candidates may be reviewed under the department's current APT document, in which case the APT document is not submitted. 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 clinical faculty, teaching faculty, and research 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.

- **External Evaluations** (see also External evaluations below)

When external evaluations are required, the candidate is responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed according to department guidelines. 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. See 'External Evaluations' below for more detail on the format and content for the external evaluations.

b. Committee of the Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

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, 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/dossier 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 that they request under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 only once. Faculty Rules 3335-7-08 and 3335-7-36 make the same provision for non-probationary clinical or teaching faculty and research faculty, respectively. 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.

- Clinical, teaching, or research faculty members will generally be considered for promotion review, upon request by the faculty member or recommendation by the chair or Committee of the Eligible Faculty during non-probationary contract periods (and not during the initial probationary period). A clinical, teaching, or research faculty member who is denied a review by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty may apply the following year.

- A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the Committee of Eligible Faculty, the 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 (POD) who will serve in this role for the following year. The POD cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The POD's responsibilities are described in a document from the Office of Academic Affairs. This role will default to the candidate's assigned faculty mentor, unless the mentor is on leave or the candidate or mentor request to the department chair that the role be assigned to a different faculty member on the committee.

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

  - **Early Autumn:** Review the candidate's dossier for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with the Office of Academic Affairs' requirements; and work with candidate to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.

  - Meet with the candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on their dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record. This meeting will default to a one-on-one meeting between the candidate and the POD, unless the candidate requests a meeting with the full Committee of Eligible Faculty.

  - Review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed and attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance, participate in discussion of every case, and vote.

  - Meet to discuss the candidate's record, including the dossier, teaching documentation, external evaluations, and any other supporting documentation.

  - During the meeting, 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.

  - At the conclusion of this meeting, a secret ballot vote is taken to provide a formal recommendation to the department chair regarding the promotion decision for the candidate. Prior to the meeting, the Committee chair will designate a Committee Reporter, who will document the discussion and vote. After the meeting, the Committee Reporter will draft a

letter to the chair that includes summaries of the Committee's analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship. The Reporter should seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, if needed.

- Revise the draft analysis of each case following the faculty meeting, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the chair. Prior to the letter's submission to the chair, the letter must be reviewed and approved by all faculty who participated in the meeting and voted.

- Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.

- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the chair in the case of joint appointees whose TIU is another department. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases.

c. 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 the criteria established within the APT document.

- 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. (The Department must ensure that such questions are asked of all applicants in a non-discriminatory manner.) For tenure-track assistant professors, to 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 chair, and the candidate. (Also see 'External Evaluations' below.)

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

- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.

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

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

- To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation to the college for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.

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

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

    - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair;
    - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and the department chair;
    - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the chair, indicating whether or not they expect 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 TIUs, and to forward this material, along with the chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the department chair of the other TIU by the date requested.

2. Associated Faculty

Adjunct faculty and associated faculty with tenure-track titles 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).

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 and all research faculty promotion reviews. As discussed above, external evaluations are sought for clinical/teaching faculty moving to the position of clinical/teaching professor. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for promotion to associate clinical/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 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 those with speech-language pathology or audiology programs ranked in the top 30. 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, former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate , or someone who has collaborated extensively with the candidate or is currently collaborating with 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. The department will only solicit evaluations from faculty at institutions with institutional affiliations predominantly in the programs listed above. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.

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

- 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 chair, and the candidate. All potential evaluators must be approved by the College of Arts and Sciences through the Associate Dean for Faculty 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 the department, 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 the 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 and research faculty can be found here. A sample letter for clinical/teaching/practice 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

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 clinical/teaching/professional practice or research 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 course offered in the department. Faculty members should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if they are going to provide in-class time for students to complete the evaluation using a mobile application. The faculty member must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation. The faculty member should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and to provide feedback that can be taken into account in future teaching.

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 chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching processes. It is the chair's responsibility to ensure that the quality of instruction is monitored at all levels.

- Prior to the start of each semester, the department chair appoints individual faculty members to serve as peer reviewers for specific courses and instructors for that year. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage the entire faculty's attention to the quality of teaching in the department. Although there is no 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.

- Peer review focuses particularly on aspects of teaching that most students are not qualified to evaluate, such as: appropriateness of curricular choices given the goals of the course (survey as opposed to required major course), implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and appropriateness of approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge.

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

1. Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the chair are as follows:

- To ensure the peer review of the teaching by probationary tenure-track faculty members at least three times during the first three years of service and at least five times before the faculty member comes up for promotion and tenure review with the goal of adequately assessing teaching at all levels of instruction (e.g., graduate and undergraduate) to which the faculty member is assigned.

- To ensure the peer review of the teaching by probationary clinical/teaching faculty members at least three times during the first three years of service. Faculty on five-year contracts will be reviewed at least four times before the faculty member comes up for the initial reappointment review with the goal of adequately assessing teaching at all levels of instruction (e.g., graduate and undergraduate) to which the faculty member is assigned. Faculty on three- or four-year terms will be reviewed at least two or three times, respectively.

- To ensure the peer review of the teaching of tenured associate professors and non-probationary clinical/teaching faculty members at least once every two years, with the goal of assessing teaching at all levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.

- To ensure that all faculty members in the department have the required number of peer evaluations of instruction completed necessary for the departmental, college, and the Office of Academic Affairs reviews for their re-appointment or promotion. The requirements are as follows:

    - Assistant clinical/teaching professors beyond their probationary appointment being considered for promotion must include a minimum of two new peer reviews in their dossiers, and this requirement may mean that evaluations will occur more frequently as candidates prepare for a review.

    - Tenure-track associate professors being considered for promotion must include a minimum of three new peer reviews in their dossiers, and this requirement may mean that evaluations will occur more frequently as candidates prepare for a review.

    - Associate clinical/teaching professors beyond their probationary appointment being considered for promotion must include a minimum of three new peer reviews in their dossiers, and this requirement may mean that evaluations will occur more frequently as candidates prepare for a review.

- To ensure the peer review of the teaching of associated faculty with multiple year appointments at least once per year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.

- When the need for a peer review is triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching, to schedule a peer review for a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, including professors.

- The chair will maintain a schedule of required peer evaluations of teaching for each faculty member. At the beginning of Autumn, Spring, and Summer terms, the chair will identify the course that needs to be reviewed and make requests of the associate professors and professors to complete the peer evaluation during that term.

- If the faculty member assents to completing the review, they will reach out to the faculty member being reviewed in order to acquire the needed materials and schedule a date. The reviewer will request from the faculty member a list of dates on which visitation would be inappropriate because a quiz or exam is being given, a guest speaker is scheduled, etc.

- Regularly-scheduled teaching evaluations by peers are comprehensive and include, in addition to classroom visitation, review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and exams. The department chair will make sure that evaluations of a faculty member's teaching over time are conducted by more than one peer. Faculty under review should provide peer reviewers with the course syllabus and other materials well in advance of the classroom visit or visits. They should also provide reviewers with a list of preferred visitation dates. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, the peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to discuss the candidate's goals and expected outcomes for the course, teaching philosophy, and any challenges related to instruction including feedback from previous evaluations of teaching.

- 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 visits, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give informal feedback and also submits a written report to the department chair, copied to the candidate by the end of the semester of review. 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. For probationary faculty, the reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if desired. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier. The 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 chair or their administrative designee will add the peer evaluation to the faculty member's packet for future re-appointment or promotion reviews.

- A faculty member may request a peer review of their teaching. That request can be made to the department chair or directly to another faculty member. The department will make every effort to accommodate these requests to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. It does not become part of the dossier for re-appointment or promotion. Reviews conducted upon the request of the

department chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the chair or faculty member. Faculty seeking formative reviews may also seek the services of the Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning.