

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

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

Last approved by the Faculty: 09/27/21

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 7/15/2022

## Table of Contents

I Preamble .....	4
II Department Mission .....	4
III Definitions.....	4
A Committee of the Eligible Faculty.....	4
1 Tenure-track Faculty .....	5
2 Teaching Faculty .....	5
3 Conflict of Interest .....	6
4 Minimum Composition .....	6
B Quorum .....	6
C Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty .....	6
1 Appointment.....	6
2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal.....	6
IV Appointments.....	7
A Criteria .....	7
1 Tenure-track Faculty .....	7
2 Teaching Faculty .....	8
3 Associated Faculty .....	9
4 Emeritus Faculty .....	10
5 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty .....	10
B Procedures.....	10
1 Tenure-track Faculty .....	11
2 Teaching Faculty .....	13
3 Transfer from the Tenure Track.....	13
4 Associated Faculty .....	13
5 Courtesy Faculty .....	14
V Annual Performance and Merit Review .....	14
A Documentation .....	14
B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty .....	15
1 Fourth-Year Review.....	15
2 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period .....	16
C Tenured Faculty .....	16
D Teaching Faculty.....	17

E Associated Faculty .....	17
F Salary Recommendations .....	17
VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews .....	18
A Criteria and Documentation.....	18
1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.....	18
2 Promotion to Professor.....	20
3 Teaching Faculty.....	21
B Procedures.....	21
1 Candidate Responsibilities .....	21
2 Committee of the Eligible Faculty Responsibilities.....	22
3 Department Chair Responsibilities .....	24
4 External Evaluations .....	25
5 Dossier.....	26
VII Appeals .....	29
VIII Seventh-Year Reviews .....	29
IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	29
A Student Evaluation of Teaching.....	29
B Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	29

## **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 Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#); and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the department and its faculty are subject.

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

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

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

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

## **II Department Mission**

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

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

## **III Definitions**

### **A Committee of the Eligible Faculty**

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

The department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president may not participate as eligible faculty members in reviews for appointment, reappointment, promotion, promotion and tenure, or contract renewal.

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

## **1 Tenure-track Faculty**

### **Initial Appointment Reviews**

- For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an assistant professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the department.
- For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review at senior rank (associate professor or professor), the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the department. A second vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank is then cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

### **Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews**

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

## **2 Teaching Faculty**

### **Initial Appointment Reviews**

- For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of an assistant teaching professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all teaching faculty in the department.
- For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review at senior rank (associate teaching professor or teaching professor), the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all teaching faculty in the department. A second vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank is then cast by all tenured faculty and all nonprobationary teaching faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

### **Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews**

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

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

### **3 Conflict of Interest**

A conflict of interest exists when an eligible faculty member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some way on the candidate's services, has a close professional relationship with the candidate (dissertation advisor), or has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an objective review of the candidate's work is not possible. Generally, faculty members who have collaborated with a candidate on at least 50% of the candidate's published work since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from an appointment or promotion review of that candidate; collaboration at this rate is not required for withdrawal on grounds of conflict of interest.

### **4 Minimum Composition**

In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the department chair, after consulting with the dean, will appoint a faculty member from another tenure-initiating unit within the college.

## **B Quorum**

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

## **C Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty**

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

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

### **1 Appointment**

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when a simple majority of the votes, cast by written, confidential ballot, are positive. Eligible faculty who are not able to attend the meeting in person must participate by conference call or video conference in order to cast a vote.

### **2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal**

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

## **IV Appointments**

### **A Criteria**

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

#### **1 Tenure-track Faculty**

Since the departmental mission, in similar fashion to the mission of the College and the University, focuses on the pursuit and attainment of international distinction in our discipline, appointment decisions for tenure-track faculty positions must be based on the assessment that the individual to be appointed exhibits strong potential to attain tenure and to advance through the faculty ranks. A minimum requirement for appointment at or promotion to the rank of assistant professor or a higher rank is an earned doctorate or possession of equivalent experience, and it is expected that an appointee will be in a position to achieve international recognition for her or his work in the field.

**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 only make such an appointment for an exceptional candidate. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year, or the appointment will not be renewed and the third year is the terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked once granted. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

**Assistant Professor.** An earned terminal degree is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the department and the profession is highly desirable. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the seventh year will be the final year of employment.

Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Committee of the Eligible Faculty determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted.

**Associate Professor and Professor.** Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

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

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

Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a senior rank and approved for tenure, if appropriate, but the university will not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

## **2 Teaching Faculty**

The initial contract for teaching faculty must be for a period of five years. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for assistant and associate teaching professors must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for teaching professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. There is no presumption that subsequent appointments will be offered, regardless of performance. The terms of a contract may be re-negotiated at the time of reappointment. For faculty in their second and subsequent appointment terms, the teaching faculty member may be reappointed by the affirmative vote of the eligible faculty as defined in Section III.A.2. These extended appointments are not probationary, and the individual may only be terminated for cause (see rule [3335-5-04](#) of the Administrative Code) or financial exigency (see rule [3335-5-02.1](#) of the Administrative Code). Tenure is not granted to teaching faculty.

**Teaching Instructor.** Appointment at the rank of teaching instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant teaching professor, but requirements for the terminal degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. The department will only make such an appointment for an exceptional candidate. An appointment at the teaching instructor level is limited to three years. A teaching instructor must be approved for



promotion to assistant teaching professor by the beginning of the third year, or the appointment will not be renewed and the third year is the terminal year of employment.

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

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

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

### **3 Associated Faculty**

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a few weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. Associated faculty may be reappointed.

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

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

**Senior Lecturer.** Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a doctorate in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion.

**Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%.** Appointment at tenure-track titles is for individuals at 49% FTE or below, either compensated (1-49% FTE) or uncompensated (0% FTE). The rank of associated faculty with tenure-track titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty. Compensated tenure-track titled faculty appointed at 49% and below will have reduced expectations based on the terms of their appointment.

**Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor.** Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. They may not be reappointed for more than three years at 100% FTE.

#### **4 Emeritus Faculty**

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

The faculty member will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the department chair outlining academic performance and citizenship. The department chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the executive dean or designee. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule [3335-05-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered.

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

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

#### **5 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty**

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

### **B Procedures**

See the Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) for information on the following topics:

- recruitment of tenure-track 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 diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

Searches for tenure-track faculty proceed as follows:

In the normal course of departmental planning, after some discussion in a general department meeting with student representation, a decision will be made as to the area of linguistics in which to hire. The executive dean of the college or designee 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 (possibly including the department chair) and one appointed student representative. The faculty composition of the committee may be determined by self-selection (i.e., all faculty who want to may be permitted to serve on the committee).

Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo inclusive hiring practices training available through the college with resources from the [Office of Diversity and Inclusion](#). Implicit bias training, also strongly encouraged, is available through the [Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity](#).

The search committee:

- Appoints a Diversity Advocate whose responsibility is to ensure as broad an applicant pool as possible, consistent with department needs and standards, and to review procedures to ensure that they are fair. If there are qualified candidates in the pool who would contribute to the diversity of the department (understood in terms of the number of members of officially underrepresented groups on the faculty) then at least one such candidate should be in the group of finalists. If the search committee judges that in the pool of candidates there is no qualified person who can contribute to the diversity of the department, the Diversity Advocate will explain to the department the committee's efforts to attract a diverse pool of applicants, describing the pool of applicants and the pool of finalists.
- Develops a search announcement for internal posting in the university Job Postings through the [Office of Human Resources](#) and external advertising, subject to the department chair's approval. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the

goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.

- Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must advertise using at least one 30-day online ad in a national professional journal. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency ("green card"), and strict U. S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their appointment to a tenure-track position included an advertisement in a field-specific nationally prominent professional journal.
- Screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents to the full faculty a summary of those applicants judged worthy of interview. If the faculty agrees with this judgment, on-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the department office. If the faculty does not agree, the department chair in consultation with the faculty determines the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, cancel the search for the time being).

After presentation of those candidates judged worthy of interview to the faculty, the committee will invite one or more of the most promising candidates to campus for an interview. On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee; graduate students; the department chair; and the dean or designee. In addition, all candidates make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their scholarship, and may teach a class. The latter could be an actual class or a mock instructional situation. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format.

After the interviews, the committee will present a recommendation, including designation of a favored candidate should there be one, to the eligible faculty who will vote to determine which candidate shall be presented by the department chair to the dean of the college. This vote will be by written, secret ballot, and faculty not in attendance may vote by absentee ballot or conference call or video conference. A simple majority of those voting will be necessary for a positive recommendation. In order for the vote to be valid, at least two-thirds of all faculty eligible to vote must vote either yes or no. Abstentions are not votes. In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the eligible faculty decides by simple majority the order in which the candidates will be approached. The eligible faculty reports its findings to the department chair. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the department chair.

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote also on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

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

## **2 Teaching Faculty**

Searches for teaching faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate will give a presentation during the on-campus interview that addresses issues in teaching or professional teaching practice, and exceptions to a national search require approval only by the executive dean of the college.

## **3 Transfer from the Tenure Track**

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

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

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

## **4 Associated Faculty**

The appointment, review, and reappointment of all compensated associated faculty are decided by the department chair in consultation with as wide a range of faculty as possible. Since, however, it is often the case that the need to hire lecturers arises only at the last minute, the department chair may, when necessary, act unilaterally to find a suitable candidate to fill the need. Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department and are decided by the department chair in consultation with as wide a range of faculty as possible. The department chair will consult with the faculty as appropriate when making decisions for the renewal of associated faculty appointments.

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

Associated faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for tenure-track faculty (see Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews below), with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is negative, and does not proceed to the university level if the dean's recommendation is negative.

## 5 Courtesy Faculty

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

## V Annual Performance and Merit Review

The department follows the requirements for the annual performance and merit review as set forth in the [Policy on Faculty Annual Review](#), which stipulates that such reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting as well as a written assessment. According to the policy, the purposes of the review are to:

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

The annual performance and merit review of every faculty member is based on expected performance in the previous calendar year in teaching, scholarship, and service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties and responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.

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

### A Documentation

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

- Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), Volume 3 (*assistant and associate professors*)
- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)
- cover letter summarizing contributions in the previous calendar year in teaching, research, service, and any other areas requested by the department chair (*all faculty*)

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

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

## **B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty**

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

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

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 department chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the executive dean of the college or designee. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments).

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 executive dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

### **1 Fourth-Year Review**

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

External evaluations will be solicited when the department chair or the eligible faculty determines that they are necessary to conduct the fourth-year review, such as in cases when the candidate's scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or there is a need for outside expertise in order to evaluate the scholarship. In this case, in the faculty member's fourth year, the eligible faculty will solicit external letters of evaluation from senior scholars at peer institutions who are acknowledged experts in the candidate's area(s) of scholarship, with this group not normally

including the candidate's former dissertation advisor. The committee will work from a list that it develops, checked against a list submitted by the faculty member. The faculty member under review may suggest persons from whom external letters are to be solicited, and may provide a list of persons from whom letters are not to be solicited for reasons of bias or conflict of interest. No more than half of the external evaluation letters in the dossier to be evaluated by the department's eligible faculty may be from individuals suggested as reviewers by the candidate. If necessary, additional letters will be solicited by the committee in order to ensure that this requirement is satisfied.

The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department chair, who conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

## **2 Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period**

Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#) (D) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure-track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period. Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#) (D) provides for time to be excluded from the probationary period in increments of one year to reflect the caregiving responsibilities associated with the birth of a child or adoption of a child under age six, with such exclusion guaranteed so long as notice requirements are met, and for personal illness, care of a seriously ill or injured person or other factors beyond a faculty member's control that significantly interfere with productivity. While individuals may apply for consideration of an exclusion at any time within the limits of the rule, the eligible faculty may wish to consider during the annual review process whether to recommend application for an exclusion. The eligible faculty may not, however, require a faculty member to apply for excluded time.

## **C Tenured Faculty**

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the department chair in consultation with the eligible faculty. The department chair meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals; and prepares a written evaluation. The department chair may consult with the Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty for review of the wording of the letter, and an indication is given of the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member, areas in which the faculty member can improve her/his performance, and substantive suggestions for achieving improvement. These annual reviews are intended to be constructive and candid, a means of helping tenured faculty to arrive at appropriate goals for the coming year. Faculty have the right to reply to annual reviews and for that reply to be placed in their personnel file.

Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals; and prepares a written evaluation. Professors may communicate in writing to waive the right to a face-to-face meeting with the chair. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the tenure initiating unit, as demonstrated



by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the college, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty.

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

#### **D Teaching Faculty**

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

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

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

#### **E Associated Faculty**

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

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

#### **F Salary Recommendations**

The department chair makes annual salary recommendations to the executive dean or designee, who may modify them. The recommendations are based on the current annual performance and merit review. The criteria for merit salary increases are essentially the same as those for tenure and promotion. Faculty who are on leave, working on grants, or serving as visiting professors elsewhere will not be penalized in regard to merit salary increases for such activities.

In formulating recommendations, the department chair may consult with colleagues, as necessary, in order to assess the quality of the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service during the previous calendar year.

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

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

## **VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews**

For promotion and tenure and promotion reviews, a two-thirds affirmative vote by the eligible faculty is required for a positive recommendation; less than a two-thirds affirmative vote will be recorded as a negative recommendation. In order for the vote to be valid, at least two-thirds of all faculty eligible to vote must vote either yes or no. Abstentions are not votes. Voting will be by written, confidential ballot. Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted. Faculty members who are not able to attend the meeting in person must participate by conference call or video conference in order to cast a vote.

### **A Criteria and Documentation**

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

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.*

### **1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**

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

*The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a scholar, and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high-quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the university.*

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

The award of tenure is a commitment of lifetime employment. It is therefore essential to evaluate and judge the probability that faculty, once tenured, will continue to develop professionally and contribute to the department's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university.

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

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

**Teaching excellence.** Excellence in teaching means providing to all students the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning in linguistics and providing to the most capable and motivated students an enhanced learning experience. An effective teacher of linguistics is one who meets the formal obligations of course instruction in the Department of Linguistics, demonstrates an interest in students, stimulates students' interest in their subject, and succeeds in conveying knowledge of linguistics to students. Excellence in teaching is documented through student evaluations, peer reviews of teaching (these may include reviews of, e.g., syllabi, materials and assignments, and feedback to students on assignments and exams, as well as direct observation of lectures and other aspects of course conduct) and the importance of the courses taught to the department's graduate and undergraduate programs. Attention is also paid to supervision of high quality dissertations, masters and honors theses, and scholarly papers and presentations by students.

**Research excellence.** Excellence in research means attainment of measurable national or international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of high-quality scholarly research. This excellence typically will be demonstrated through significant contributions to the field. Significant contributions are those which offer new knowledge; information that aids colleagues in the field in carrying forward their own research; which tests new or traditional hypotheses in such a manner as to help evaluate their validity; which suggests applications of linguistics to other disciplines; which apply concepts from other disciplines to linguistics in ways which generally advance knowledge. In assessing various types of research activity, the committee will evaluate both the quality and quantity of contributions. The typical quantity of published work is approximately one major piece per year or the equivalent, but this should not be taken as either necessary or sufficient for promotion. Here and elsewhere, a major piece

consists of a monograph or an article in a peer-refereed journal or proceeding, or a chapter in an editor-refereed volume. The committee will consider, in addition to published work, presentation of scholarly papers at professional meetings, research grants, and recognition among other scholars in the field (as evidenced in citations and external evaluations). The committee will evaluate the candidate's achievements and the likelihood of further long term accomplishments on the basis of the widest possible range of evidence, including both evidence offered by the candidate and that solicited by the committee.

**Service excellence.** A member of the Department of Linguistics at Ohio State University has an obligation to use his/her talents for the betterment of the department, the college, the university, and the profession. Excellence in service consists of recognizing one's responsibilities to the organization and carrying out these responsibilities effectively and in a timely manner. Leadership consists of identifying the needs and problems of the organization and taking the initiative in addressing them. The amount of the service contribution during the probationary period of assistant professors is limited by design, but the quality of the service contribution must be evident.

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](#).

## **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 specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure (see Section VI.A.1), with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national or international reputation in the field. When assessing a candidate's national and international reputation in the field, a national and international reputation for the scholarship of teaching may be counted as either teaching or scholarship.

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

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

### **3 Teaching Faculty**

**Promotion to Assistant Teaching Professor.** For promotion to assistant teaching professor, a faculty member must have completed their doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field and be performing satisfactorily in teaching, professional practice, and service.

**Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor.** For promotion to associate teaching professor, a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service; have a documented high level of competence in professional practice; display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of this department; and produce and disseminate scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. The typical quantity of published work is approximately one major piece every two years or the equivalent, but this should not be taken as either necessary or sufficient for promotion. Here and elsewhere, a major piece consists of a monograph or an article in a peer-refereed journal or proceeding, or a chapter in an editor-refereed volume.

**Promotion to Teaching Professor.** For promotion to teaching professor, a faculty member must have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching and professional practice; leadership in service to the department and to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. The typical quantity of published work is approximately one major piece every two years or the equivalent, but this should not be taken as either necessary or sufficient for promotion.

## **B Procedures**

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty in the department.

The promotion review of teaching faculty generally proceeds in the same manner and on the same timeline as the Fourth-Year Review procedures for tenure track faculty, described in section V.B.1. Teaching faculty may request a promotion review at any time during their contract. Promotion of teaching faculty will be accompanied by a contract renewal for a new three to eight year appointment as described in section IV.A.2.

### **1 Candidate Responsibilities**

The responsibilities of the candidate are as follows:

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

- To submit a copy of the APT document under which the candidate wishes to be reviewed. Candidates may submit their department's current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion, whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, 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. The APT document must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the department.
- To review the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair and the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The department chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.) Under no circumstances should a candidate solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

## **2 Committee of the Eligible Faculty Responsibilities**

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

- To review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in spring semester for tenure-track faculty and in fall semester for teaching faculty, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
  - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
  - A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) for one year. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
  - Consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policy, only faculty members who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non-mandatory tenure review. The committee must confirm with the department chair that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident (has a "green card"). Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to

lack of citizenship or permanent residency are not considered for promotion by this department.

- A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
  - **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.
  - Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair.
  - **Early Autumn:** The Procedures Oversight Designee reviews each candidate's dossier for completeness, accuracy, and consistency with process requirements, and works with the candidate to assure that needed revisions are made before the formal review process begins, meeting with the candidate for clarification as necessary and providing the candidate an opportunity to comment on the dossier.
  - After the dossier is made available for review, the members of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty review thoroughly and objectively the candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
  - The eligible faculty meet to discuss the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service. They seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. Members of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty attend all meetings except when circumstances beyond their control prevent attendance; they participate in discussion of every case, and vote.
  - Following the meeting of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the committee chair drafts a report to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting, consulting with the faculty as necessary. The committee chair forwards the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
  - After the comment period, the chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty provides a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
  - The chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty provides a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit, consulting with the faculty as necessary. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

### 3 Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To charge each member of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- Where relevant, to verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty members who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure will not be awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are not considered for promotion by this department.
- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the department chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To solicit an evaluation from a department chair of any department in which the candidate has a joint appointment.
- 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 on.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
  - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair
  - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair
  - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten calendar days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The



letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.

- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline, except in the case of associated faculty for whom the department chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases.
- To receive the eligible faculty's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the TIU head of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

#### **4 External Evaluations**

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews, and all adjunct faculty promotion reviews. For promotion reviews of teaching faculty, external evaluations will be solicited when the department chair or the eligible faculty determines that they are necessary to conduct the review.

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

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

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

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Committee of the Eligible Faculty, the department chair, and the candidate. 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 the person(s) suggested by the

candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs [suggested format](#) for letters requesting external evaluations.

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

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

## **5 Dossier**

As noted above under Candidate Responsibilities, every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. All material the candidate deems relevant will be brought before the eligible faculty and department chair. While the Committee of the Eligible Faculty makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by him or her.

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

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

- Other information that the candidate, the committee, and the department chair believe to be pertinent.

The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less, to present.

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

- Candidates for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure will be evaluated on both the quality and quantity of scholarly output, but special emphasis will be placed on quality. In all cases, candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to have a research record that demonstrates clear distinction in linguistics, as is appropriate for faculty at a major research institution. The typical quantity of published work for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure is six high quality articles in reputable refereed journals, or the equivalent, including research monographs published by major presses in the field, rigorously refereed conference proceedings, and refereed chapters in edited books. The published work should provide evidence of an established and coherent research program.
- Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor will be evaluated according to the same criteria as those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with the criteria strengthened in the following ways:
  - The teaching, service, and scholarly work upon which the evaluation is based must be subsequent to that upon which promotion to associate professor was based.
  - The typical quantity of published work for promotion to the rank of professor is an additional six high quality articles in reputable journals, or the equivalent as just described. In this case, the published work should provide evidence of a deep and sustained research program, and the candidate is expected to have established a national and international reputation.

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

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

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

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

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

The time period for scholarship documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty must include the start date to present, but previous scholarship may also be included. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to present. All scholarship outcomes will be reviewed for increasing independence and scholarly leadership over time. There should also be an increasing trajectory of significant scholarly outcomes over time.

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

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

The time period for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to present.

The complete dossier is forwarded when the review moves beyond the department. The documentation of teaching is forwarded along with the dossier. The documentation of scholarship

and service is for use during the department review only, unless reviewers at the college and university levels specifically request it.

## **VII Appeals**

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**

### **A Student Evaluation of Teaching**

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

### **B Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

The department chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process.

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

The responsibilities of the Peer Review of Teaching Committee are as follows:

- To review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and teaching faculty at least once per year during the first three years of service, and at least twice more before the commencement of the mandatory tenure review, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.

- To review the teaching of tenured associate professors and associate teaching professors at least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned, having at least two peer reviews of teaching during the six-year period preceding a promotion review.
- To review the teaching of tenured and teaching professors at least once every four years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.
- To review, upon the department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review, to the extent that time and staffing permit. Such reviews might be triggered by a variety of circumstances, including low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.
- To review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time and staffing permit. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the [Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#).

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

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