

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE
Criteria and Procedures for the School of Music

Updated Autumn 2019; OAA Approved 8/12/2019

Table of Contents

I.	Preamble	3
II.	School of Music Mission	3
III.	Definitions	4
	A. Committee of Eligible Faculty	4
	1. Tenure-track Faculty	4
	2. Conflict of Interest	4
	3. Minimum Composition	4
	B. Committee of Eligible Faculty	4
	C. Quorum	5
	D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty	5
	E. Appointment	5
	F. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion, and Contract Renewal	5
IV.	Appointments	5
	A. Criteria	5
	1. Tenure-track Faculty	5
	2. Instructor	5
	3. Assistant Professor	6
	4. Associate Professor	6
	5. Professor	6
	6. Regional Faculty	6
	7. Associated Faculty	6
	8. Visiting Faculty at Assistant, Associate and Professor Ranks	7
	9. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	7
	B. Procedures	7
	1. Tenure-track Faculty	7
	2. Tenure-track Faculty, Regional Campus	9
	3. Associated Faculty	9
	4. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	9
	5. Transfer from the Tenure-track	9
V.	Annual Review Procedures	10
	A. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty	10
	1. Regional Campus Faculty	10
	2. Fourth-Year Review	10
	3. Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period	11
	B. Tenured Faculty	11

C.	Tenured Faculty, Regional Campus	11
D.	Associated Faculty	11
VI.	Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards	11
A.	Criteria	12
B.	Procedures	12
C.	Documentation	12
VII.	Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	12
A.	Criteria	12
1.	Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	12
a.	Music Education	14
b.	Musicology and Music Theory	14
c.	Composition	14
d.	Performance	14
2.	Promotion to Professor	16
3.	Regional Campus Faculty	16
4.	Preliminary Screening of Candidates for Non-mandatory Reviews	17
B.	Procedures	17
1.	Candidate Responsibilities	17
2.	Committee of Eligible Faculty Responsibilities	17
C.	Primary Evaluation Committee (PEC) and Formal Evaluation Committee (FEC)	18
1.	Primary Evaluation Committee (PEC)	18
2.	Formal Evaluation Committee (FEC)	19
a.	FEC Examination of Evidence	19
b.	FEC Conduct of the Review	20
3.	Eligible Faculty Responsibilities	20
4.	Area Head Responsibilities	20
5.	Director Responsibilities	21
6.	Regional Campus Deans' Responsibilities	22
7.	Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) Responsibilities	22
D.	External Evaluations	23
E.	Documentation	24
1.	Teaching	24
2.	Scholarly and Creative Activity	24
3.	Service	24
VIII.	Appeals	24
IX.	Seventh Year Reviews	25
X.	Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching	25
A.	Student Evaluation of Instruction	25
B.	Peer Evaluation of Teaching	25
XI.	Appendices	27
	Appendix A: Statement of Diversity	27

I. Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty <https://trustees.osu.edu/bylaws-and-rules/faculty-rules>; the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook, <https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook> and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the School of Music and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the School of Music 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 SOM Director.

The Executive Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs must approve this document before it may be implemented. It sets forth the school's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the university, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the Executive Dean and the Office of Academic Affairs accept the mission and criteria of the school and delegates to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to school mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335- 6-01, <https://trustees.osu.edu/university-faculty-rules/3335-6> 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, <https://trustees.osu.edu/university-faculty-rules/3335-6> and other standards specific to this college and its units; 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: <https://hr.osu.edu/wp-content/uploads/policy110.pdf>.

II. School of Music Mission

The Ohio State University School of Music educates students for professional careers in composition, performance, scholarship, and teaching. As an integral part of a major public university with a strong commitment to teaching, research, and service, the school recognizes the relationship that binds music to other academic and artistic disciplines. The school aims to provide, at the highest level, instruction in the study and practice of music and, in so doing, to promote an awareness of music as a humanistic study. The school encourages musical research in all its dimensions by providing students and faculty opportunities for performance, creative activity, and scholarly inquiry. The school is dedicated to sustaining and advancing musical culture in the academy and in society at large, and it endeavors to meet service obligations to various communities within and beyond the university. Recognizing the dynamic and evolving character of music in contemporary life, the school acknowledges an ongoing responsibility to evaluate its programs and procedures, and to investigate fresh approaches to the realization of its mission. In keeping with the university's broader mission, the school is committed to nurturing the best of Ohio's students, while maintaining excellence and diversity by recruiting nationally and internationally.

III. Definitions

A. Committee of Eligible Faculty

1. Tenure-track Faculty

The eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion reviews of tenure-track faculty consists of all tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in the school excluding the school director, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

For tenure reviews of probationary professors, eligible faculty are tenured professors whose tenure resides in the school excluding the school director, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

2. Conflict of Interest

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

3. Minimum Composition

In the event that the school does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the school director, after consulting with the divisional dean, will appoint a faculty member from another school within the college.

B. Committee of 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 School of Music.

The School director, 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.

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 SOM.
- For appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) at senior rank (associate professor or professor), a review is performed and a second vote 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.

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. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the school director has approved an off-campus assignment.

Faculty members who recuse themselves 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 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. A member of the eligible faculty may vote by telephone or teleconference only in the case where that member was present for the entire discussion of the candidate’s case.

E. Appointment

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

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

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

IV. Appointments

Types of faculty appointments in the School of Music include tenure-track faculty and associated faculty, which can include visiting faculty, artists-in-residence, lecturers, and adjunct faculty.

A. Criteria

1. Tenure-track Faculty

The School of Music (hereafter SOM) will support the hiring of only the best available tenure-track faculty members consistent with the strategic needs of the SOM and the college, and with the goal of having as diverse a faculty body as possible. The SOM recruits and appoints to its faculty only individuals who enhance or have the strong potential to enhance the quality of research, teaching, and service that is characteristic of a world-class school of music. Regardless of the level of appointment, an important consideration is the individual’s record to date in research, teaching and service; potential for further growth in these three areas; and, potential for collaboration and cooperation with other faculty and students across the College of Arts and Sciences as well as outside the college.

2. 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 SOM will make every effort to avoid such appointments and an appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. When an instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment, 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 SOM eligible faculty, the director, the executive 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.

3. Assistant Professor

It is expected that any individual who is appointed as an assistant professor without tenure will have earned a terminal degree or commensurate experience in an appropriate field of study. S/he will show potential to develop into a nationally recognized scholar, researcher, or performer, as an effective teacher at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and demonstrate willingness to provide high-quality service to her or his field and institution. At the time of appointment to the rank of assistant professor, the individual must have a strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the ranks in a timely fashion. An appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary and may not exceed six years, including prior service credit. An assistant professor is reviewed for promotion and tenure no later than the sixth year of appointment as an assistant professor and informed by the end of the sixth year as to whether or not promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the seventh year. Promotion and tenure may be granted at any time during the probationary period when the faculty member's record of achievement merits tenure and promotion. Similarly a probationary appointment may be terminated at any time subject to the notice provisions of Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) and the provisions of paragraphs (G), (H), and (I) of Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#).

4. Associate Professor

It is expected that an individual appointed as an associate professor with tenure is a nationally and/or internationally recognized scholar or performer with a high-quality portfolio of research or creative activity, has demonstrated excellence in teaching undergraduate and graduate students, and demonstrated excellence in service/outreach to the profession and field as well as locally to the university. It is expected at the time of appointment to the rank of associate professor that the individual has strong potential to advance to the rank of professor in a timely fashion. On rare occasions individuals may be appointed as associate professor without tenure when joining the faculty.

5. Professor

It is expected that an individual appointed to the SOM faculty as a professor with tenure has established a national or international reputation as a leading scholar or performer in his or her field with an outstanding body of scholarship or other creative activity, has demonstrated excellence in teaching at graduate and undergraduate levels and has demonstrated a record of high-quality service to his or her field and institution.

6. Regional Faculty

As the missions of the regional campuses emphasize undergraduate instruction, regional campus criteria for appointment at the rank of tenure-track assistant professor, associate professor, or professor are similar to those of the Columbus campus faculty, but give relatively greater emphasis at each rank to teaching experience and quality.

7. Associated Faculty

Unless otherwise indicated, associated faculty appointments are made for no more than one year. In accordance with University Rule [3335-6-08](#) (D), decisions regarding the appointment and renewal of associated faculty on year-to-year contracts must be made in accordance with criteria and procedures of the School of Music and in accordance with University policies concerning associated faculty positions. Appointments of all auxiliary faculty, with the exception of courtesy appointments, must be reviewed and approved by the College of Arts and Sciences.

8. Visiting Faculty at Assistant, Associate, and Professor Ranks

Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from a regular academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank they hold at their home institution. The rank at which other (non-tenure-track 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.

9. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

The active academic involvement in the School of Music by a regular faculty member from another unit at Ohio State sometimes warrants the offer of a courtesy (0% FTE) appointment. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course, or a combination of these. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized. In contrast with other associated appointments, these can be for multiple years, typically with a review for continuation after three to five years.

B. Procedures

The School of Music's procedures for appointing new faculty are consistent with the OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook. <https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook>.

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](#).

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

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

1. Tenure-track Faculty

The divisional dean of the College provides approval for the SOM 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 director appoints a search committee consisting of five or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search and at least one other field within the SOM. Search committee recommendations are forwarded to the Director and shall be inclusive of all committee member opinions, both positive and negative. In some cases, where the position is interdisciplinary in nature, it is expected that members of the search committee will be drawn from other departments as well.

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 shall:

Appoint a Diversity Advocate whose responsibility is to ensure as broad an applicant pool as possible consistent with SOM needs, standards, and the SOM Statement of Diversity (see Appendix A) and to review procedures to ensure that they are fair.

Develop a search announcement for internal posting in the university Personnel Postings through the Office of Human Resources Employment Services (www.hr.osu.edu/) and external advertising, subject to the director's and divisional dean's approvals.

Develop and implement 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 assure that at least one print (as opposed to on-line) advertisement appears in a location likely to be read by qualified potential applicants. 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 circulated professional journal.

Screen applications and letters of recommendation and present to the director a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. The search committee may, with the consent of the director, invite top candidates to an on-campus interview.

The search committee will give the full faculty notice of interview events, a summary of each candidate's qualifications, and an opportunity to give input to the search committee. If suitable candidates are not available or the search committee members cannot agree on who should be invited to campus, the director will consult the divisional dean to determine the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, delay or cancel the search).

On-campus interviews with candidates must include opportunities for interaction with faculty groups, including the search committee, students, and the director. In addition, all candidates make a presentation to the faculty and graduate students on their research and provide evidence of their ability to teach. The latter could be an actual class, a mock instructional situation, or some other opportunity that allows an assessment of the candidate's teaching abilities. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format. While on campus, candidates for tenure-track faculty positions must be interviewed by the executive dean, a divisional dean, or their designee.

After the on-campus interviews, the faculty of the SOM have an opportunity through email and direct discussion to express their perceptions and preferences to the search committee members. The search committee reports a recommendation on each candidate to the director. In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the director decides which candidate to approach first. At that time, terms of the hire, including salary, teaching load, and other features of the position will be discussed with the divisional dean. All offers at the associate professor and professor ranks and all offers of prior service credit require the prior approval of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of Academic Affairs. After deliberations have been concluded within the SOM, the director will then contact the divisional dean to provide a summary of the interviews and recommendation for hiring.

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 SOM will therefore be cautious in making such appointments and vigilant in assuring that the appointee seeks residency status promptly and diligently.

2. Tenure-track Faculty, Regional Campus

For the hiring of regional campus-based faculty, the dean/director of the regional campus, in consultation with the College of Arts and Sciences executive dean and the Divisional Dean of Arts and Humanities and the SOM director, will authorize a search. The regional campus has primary responsibility for determining the position description for a tenure-track faculty search, but the dean/director or designee consults with the SOM director to reach agreement on the description before the search begins. The regional campus search committee must include at least one representative from the SOM. Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, the executive dean, divisional dean or their designee, the SOM director, SOM eligible faculty, and regional campus search committee. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. A decision to make an offer requires agreement by the SOM director and regional campus dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin. Letters of offer must be signed by the SOM director and the regional campus dean.

3. Associated Faculty

The appointment, review, and reappointment of all compensated associated faculty are decided by the school director in consultation with the Executive and Administrative Committees. Appointment and reappointment of visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the SOM and are decided by the school director in consultation with the Executive and Administrative Committees.

Associated faculty appointments are generally made for a period of one to three years, unless a shorter period is appropriate to the circumstances. All associated faculty appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Associated faculty appointments may be renewed only when the academic service for which the appointment was made continues. Visiting appointments are limited to three years at 100% FTE. Lecturer appointments are usually made on a semester-by-semester basis, although renewable annual contracts are common.

4. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

5. Transfer from the Tenure-track

Tenure is lost upon transfer to another appointment, such as to associated faculty. Transfers must be approved by the SOM director, the divisional 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.

Associated faculty members may apply for tenure-track positions and compete in regular national searches for such positions.

V. Annual Review Procedures

The School of Music follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the [Policy on Faculty Annual Review](#).

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

The documentation required for the annual performance review of every faculty member is described under Merit Salary Increases below. This material must be submitted to the school director in mid-January.

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

A. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty

Based on the annual reports submitted by the faculty and the area head's review letter, the director writes an evaluation to be shared with the candidate. If the SOM director recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The SOM director's letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The SOM director chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the divisional dean. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments, if he or she chooses).

If the SOM director recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the divisional dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

1. Regional Campus Faculty

Annual review of the probationary faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then moves to the SOM and proceeds as described above. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the SOM, the SOM director discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

2. 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 divisional dean (not the school director) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

External evaluations are solicited only when either the SOM director 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 emerging 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 as described above. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

The Formal Evaluation Committee (FEC) (see Section VII) Chair forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the SOM director. The SOM director 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 SOM 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 SOM director recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

3. 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](#).

B. Tenured Faculty

Associate professors are reviewed annually by their area heads, who submit a written performance review to the SOM director along with comments on the faculty member's progress toward promotion. The SOM director conducts an independent assessment; meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written performance evaluation on these topics. The faculty member, in response, may provide written comments on the review. These comments will be included in the faculty member's SOM personnel file.

Professors are reviewed annually by the SOM director, who meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals. 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 SOM, 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 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 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.

C. Tenured Faculty—Regional Campus

Annual review of the tenured faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then moves to the SOM and proceeds as described above. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the SOM, the SOM director discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

D. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty must be reviewed before reappointment. The SOM director, or designee, prepares a written performance evaluation. The SOM director's recommendation on renewal of the appointment is final.

VI. Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards

A. Criteria

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

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

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

B. Procedures

The SOM director recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the dean, who may modify these recommendations. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the SOM director divides faculty into groups based on continuing productivity and considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate.

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

C. Documentation

The annual performance review of every faculty member requires that an updated CV and Faculty Activity Report be submitted to the SOM director by the posted deadline date in mid-January. Probationary faculty members must also provide an updated dossier. The time period covered by the documentation is the previous calendar year (January to December).

VII. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

A. Criteria

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

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 School of Music.

1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

The essential basis for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure is convincing evidence that the candidate has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a performing artist, composer, and/or scholar, and as a provider of effective academic and professional service. Decisions will compare the

entire body of work across the candidate's career to the standards of excellence enumerated in the criteria. Moreover, this evidence should justify the expectation that the candidate will continue to make valuable contributions relevant to the mission of the SOM in all of these categories.

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.

In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, 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 develops new emphases among 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.

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 SOM's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university.

The SOM considers music performance, music composition and their allied fields of study and activity as research and scholarship, equivalent in stature to research- and scholarly activities in the academic areas of the SOM.

Superior attainment in scholarship is evidenced by national or international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of production of research and/or other creative/artistic endeavors. A successful candidate will have an emerging national or international reputation in his/her field. Work that is peer reviewed is given the greatest significance.

Superior attainment in teaching entails successfully conveying knowledge and skills to students. It can be measured by student evaluation of teaching (SEI), teaching observation or portfolio review by peers, recognition and awards, and successes of current and former students.

Superior attainment in service entails participation and leadership in national and international professional organizations, in university and SOM faculty governance and committees, and in other service activities at the national, state, and local level. The service contribution during the probationary period of assistant professors is limited by design. The candidate's dossier should contain indicators of commitment to future service.

Teaching, research, and service in all areas of study should be conducted according to high standards of professional ethical conduct, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics.

Criteria for promotion to the rank of associate professor specific to each discipline are as follows:

a. Music Education

Creative and scholarly contributions in music education take various forms. Accomplishment may be evidenced through published books, articles in journals, scholarly presentations, musical performances, and published compositions and arrangements. Products which receive dissemination nationally or internationally are expected, and products that are peer reviewed are given the most credit. Quality is valued more than quantity, though a record of steady productivity is important. Consideration is given to work in progress.

A significant record of service, including outreach, to the profession at the local, state, and national level is important, as is service to the music education area, SOM, college, and university. Leadership at the national level is preferred. Conducting professional development workshops and clinics, consulting, and adjudicating events are considered service activities.

b. Musicology and Music Theory

Research is an essential purpose of these disciplines. Research leads to better teaching, to innovation in curricula, and to professional growth of the faculty, in addition to the development and application of scholarly knowledge. In the evaluation of research, special emphasis is placed on quality and originality. Consideration is given to work in progress. Evidence must indicate that the research accomplishments of the candidate are significant contributions to scholarship, recognized nationally or internationally.

Such evidence may include:

Publications: The kind, scope, and quality of publications are considered. Publications based on original research have primary importance as evidence of scholarly achievement. These typically consist of books, monographs, critical editions, articles, distributed digital resources and in some cases, reviews. Articles and reviews appearing in refereed publications receive greater weight than those appearing elsewhere. Textbooks and other instructional tools are judged as scholarly works to the extent that they present new ideas or incorporate the results of scholarly research.

Presentations and performance activities: presentation of papers and participation in sections, panels, and symposia at professional meetings are considered in the evaluation of the candidate's scholarly achievement, as are musical performance activities informed by the candidate's scholarly research. Invited presentations to academic or professional organizations receive special consideration.

Consideration is given to the candidate's role in group-research projects at the local, national, and international level.

c. Composition

Candidates' work in composition is evaluated with respect to its originality, quality, and quantity. Quality indicators include commissions and performances from noted artists and ensembles; public performances in important venues; radio and television broadcasts; performances at juried conferences and festivals; artist residencies; election to national office in important professional organizations; grants from state, national and international arts organizations; and publication of books and articles about the candidate's works.

d. Performance

Music performance and its allied fields of study and activity are considered as research and scholarship by the School of Music, equivalent in stature to research and scholarly activities in the academic areas of the school.

Members of the performance faculty are expected to maintain an active creative/scholarly profile. Most of this activity will take the form of public performance, both at Ohio State and in other significant venues. Faculty members are expected to present a range of repertoire that highlights their personal musical strengths while enhancing exposure to diverse musical works.

Examples of creative activity and scholarship in the Performance Area might involve various combinations of the following, listed without hierarchy:

- Performances in solo recital and/or chamber music
- Professional engagements with orchestras, wind bands, opera companies, choral and/or vocal ensembles, or jazz ensembles
- Professional engagements as an ensemble performer with orchestras, wind bands, opera companies, choral and/or vocal ensembles, or jazz ensembles
- Solo performances that are recorded, reviewed, and/or broadcast
- Scholarly writing that leads to publication of books and/or articles related to pedagogy, literature, history, theory, performance practice, acoustics, anatomy and physiology, performer wellness, etc.
- Lecture/demonstrations, adjudications, master classes
- Engagements as conductor, opera director, or other musical preparation staff

The quality of work accomplished, the stature of venues, and the significance of collaborating artists and professional music organizations are essential factors in evaluating a candidate's creative activity and scholarship.

Faculty members in conducting are expected to engage in sustained creative activity and/or scholarship that may include, but is not limited to, various combinations of the following (listed without hierarchy):

- Invited performance by an Ohio State ensemble at a regional, national, or international venue
- Performance or recording with a regional, national or international organization
- Conducting, guest-conducting, or performance in collaboration with a national large ensemble or chamber group
- Presentation or performance at a significant national or international conference
- Conducting an ensemble or collaborative performance for a recording on a label with high visibility and reviews
- Administration and/or artistic direction of a symposium, music festival, or other significant event
- Invited clinics, master classes, adjudications, or workshops at a significant regional, national or international venue

- Publication of a book
- Publication of an article in a journal
- A college or university or professional award for scholarship, creative research, or performance excellence
- A regional, national, or international competition prize or award
- Receipt of a School of Music or University award
- Well documented evidence of the continuing impact of creative and scholarly works, e.g., reviews, citations, reports etc.

Criteria for the evaluation of teaching in performance may include: student performance in juries, solo, and ensemble performances; notable achievements of current and former students in performance and employment; the candidate's accomplishments in recruiting, retention, and career development of outstanding students; teaching observation by peers, and student evaluation of teaching (SEI).

The SOM recognizes that the evaluation of teaching should take into account both the variability of teaching loads in the studio and classroom, as well as the distribution of graduate and undergraduate students in the candidate's teaching load.

2. Promotion to Professor

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) establishes 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 artistic achievement in performance, composition, and/or scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated high quality service such as holding elected or appointed office in national professional organizations.

Specific criteria in teaching, artistic achievement and/or scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with added emphasis on sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, before and after tenure, and evidence of an established national and/or international reputation as a leader in the field.

External hires at the associate professor or professor level with tenure will demonstrate the same accomplishments in scholarship, teaching and service as persons promoted within the university.

3. Regional Campus Faculty

The criteria for promotion and tenure of regional campus faculty adhere as closely as is feasible to the spirit of the mission statements of both the regional campus and of the SOM. The essential basis for promotion and tenure for regional campus faculty is convincing evidence that the candidate has achieved excellence as a teacher, as an artist and/or scholar, and as a provider of effective academic and professional service. Moreover, this evidence should make it reasonable to anticipate that valuable contributions will continue to be made in all these areas relevant to the missions of the SOM and the university. This expectation is balanced by the understanding that the relative weight of teaching and service is ordinarily greater on regional campuses because the mission of the regional campuses is to provide quality instruction and serve the academic needs of their communities. For that reason, the SOM recognizes that the greater

teaching and service commitments of regional campus faculty require different expectations for scholarly and creative output. Nevertheless, the School of Music expects regional campus faculty members to establish a program of quality scholarship and creative activity. The judgment of whether a particular level of productivity meets the SOM's standards for tenure and/or promotion will take into consideration the regional campuses' different mission, higher teaching and service expectations, and more limited access to research resources.

4. Preliminary Screening of Candidates for Non-mandatory reviews

Every spring semester, at the promotion and tenure meeting, the eligible faculty considers faculty requests for non-mandatory reviews to be considered at the next academic year's promotion and tenure meeting.

A faculty member seeking a non-mandatory promotion or promotion-and-tenure review will submit by January 15 a complete curriculum vitae to the director's office, which then distributes it to the eligible faculty prior to the spring promotion-and-tenure meeting. At that meeting, the Committee of Eligible Faculty will review the case and vote on whether to permit the review to take place at the committee's fall meeting. A two-thirds affirmative vote is necessary for the review to proceed.

The director will communicate the decision to the candidate following the committee meeting.

B. Procedures

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

1. 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 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. The candidate should consult the area head, members of the FEC, and the area colleagues during dossier preparation.
- To submit a copy of the SOM's APT Document that was in effect at the time of the candidate's hire or when the candidate was last promoted, whichever is more recent, if s/he wishes to be reviewed under that document's criteria and procedures. This must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the SOM.
- To review the list of potential external evaluators developed by the SOM director and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The SOM director decides whether removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

2. Committee of Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

The eligible faculty shall maintain three Procedures Oversight Designees (POD) from among the eligible faculty. (see C.7 below)

The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's 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 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. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by the SOM.

A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the SOM director, or any other party to the review to make a positive recommendation during the review itself.

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

Late Spring: Suggest names of external evaluators to the SOM director.

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

Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.

C. Primary Evaluation Committee (PEC) and Formal Evaluation Committee (FEC)

To assist the eligible faculty, the director appoints a Primary Evaluation Committee (PEC) and Formal Evaluation Committee (FEC) for each candidate. The Primary Evaluation Committee (PEC) (see C.1 below) of three shall function during the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 5th years. The Formal Evaluation Committee (FEC) (see C.2 below) will join with the candidate's PEC members during the 4th and 6th year reviews and action.

For untenured faculty, the PEC and FEC appointments are made at the beginning of the candidate's time of service. It is intended that the PEC will remain connected with the candidate throughout their tenure-track appointment, providing consistency and stability for the candidate and the committee. The director will appoint an appropriate replacement in the event of committee vacancy.

FEC members are also appointed at the beginning of the candidate's time of service. These committee members are formally called into action during the 4th and 6th year formal reviews. It is expected that all FEC members will continue to follow closely the activities and progress of their assigned candidate. For candidates applying for promotion to the rank of professor, a formal evaluation committee consisting of five professors shall be appointed.

1. Primary Evaluation Committee (PEC)

Whenever possible, PEC appointments shall comprise two tenured faculty from the candidate's area, and one tenured faculty member from a different area in the School of Music. The committee shall include at least one professor, and a mix of gender representation.

A Chair of the PEC/FEC committee is appointed by the director and will guide committee work and serve as

the lead writer. The letter prepared by the PEC/FEC chair should summarize the Committee of the Eligible Faculty review and discussion of the case, including any formal votes taken during the meeting. It should state the SOM's expectations as described in the this APT document, and provide details about the candidate's documented record in the areas of teaching, service, and research, and articulate the committee's evaluation of that record. This letter should detail both the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's record, and must accurately and fully reflect the general assessment of the case by the eligible faculty at the review meeting.

Duties of the Primary Evaluation Committee (PEC):

Solicit faculty and external letters concerning promotion and tenure cases and probationary reviews.

Assist the candidate with dossier preparation during 4th and 6th year reviews, offering comment and suggestions regarding format and content.

Document SOM faculty comments and recommendations and submit to director so letter may be drafted to advise probationary faculty in first, second, third, and fifth year reviews.

2. Formal Evaluation Committee (FEC)

Two appointments are made in order to complete the Formal Evaluation Committee. The FEC committee of five is made up of the PEC and FEC appointments.

The two FEC appointments shall comprise at least one professor, and at least one appointment shall be outside the candidate's area.

When appointing the five PEC and FEC appointments, representation of the School's faculty, including gender, is expected.

Candidates applying for promotion to the rank of Professor will have a special Formal Evaluation Committee appointed by the director, employing the same criteria for FEC structure outlined below. The committee will be appointed in the spring semester, shortly after the candidate makes formal application for promotion consideration.

The candidate may consult with the assigned FEC to determine what materials are appropriate to be sent to external evaluators.

The FEC studies all documents, reviews the merits of the candidate, and prepares a summary of this review which, together with the candidate's dossier, including the area head's evaluation, is presented to the eligible faculty for their consideration at a meeting specially convened for this purpose. The FEC does not offer a specific recommendation to the faculty for action. Prior to the meeting date, copies of the dossier are made available to the eligible faculty for study.

During the promotion and tenure meeting, the area head provides a verbal summary of the candidate to be discussed. The PEC/FEC Chair (who serves as Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty) then conducts the discussion, eventually calling for a vote on the case. A positive vote is 67% (two thirds). Only those in attendance may participate in the discussion or the vote; abstentions are removed from the total voting contingent.

After the meeting, the chair of the PEC/FEC sends to the director a letter summarizing the discussion and the vote of the eligible faculty. A faculty member with duties in more than one area must be reviewed by an appropriately constituted subcommittee selected by the director.

a. FEC Examination of Evidence

The committee should recognize that one of the strengths of the school is the diversity of interests and accomplishments of its faculty. This recognition includes the awareness that, among other things, 1) some areas of creative and scholarly research enjoy more support from extramural funding agencies than do others, 2) collaborative work, including that which crosses disciplinary boundaries, is acceptable and, in some research areas, to be commended, and 3) there may be different expectations of the relative proportions of teaching, research, and service from one candidate to another.

b. FEC Conduct of the Review

Although the essential role of the Formal Evaluation Committee lies in synthesis and evaluation, the tenor of the relationship of FEC to candidate should be collegial rather than adversarial.

The FEC should take an active role in advising and guiding the candidate in the compilation, organization, and presentation of materials. The ultimate responsibility for the dossier nonetheless remains with the candidate.

It is incumbent upon the FEC to solicit and consider evaluations from the candidate's peers in the field from outside the university. A "peer" is understood to be someone in the area of specialty and in a position to judge the candidate's work. It is appropriate for evaluators to consider the standing of the candidate relative to others in the field.

Meaningful evaluation requires a balanced review. The provost expects that both strengths and weaknesses of a candidate be presented in external letters of evaluation and in letters prepared by administrators and promotion and tenure committees. It should be understood that any mention of weaknesses will not inevitably lead to a negative recommendation. Rather, lack of comment on weaknesses that are nonetheless evident in the core dossier may raise questions regarding the credibility of evaluators.

It is the FEC's obligation to convey to the college and university review committees the value of the candidate's teaching and scholarship, especially when, as so often happens in music, the most significant activities are unknown to the experience of reviewers outside the field.

3. Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

Faculty colleagues have the basic responsibility for evaluation of academic accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service for candidates for promotion or promotion and tenure. This evaluation is to be based on the core dossier and supporting material, as well as on direct knowledge of the candidate's teaching, service, and research or performance. Eligible faculty meet to review each candidate's case in open discussion and, by vote, render a favorable or unfavorable recommendation.

It is recognized that the meeting of eligible faculty is a critical component of the review process. Attendance at this meeting is, therefore, considered a major responsibility of the eligible faculty and proxy votes are not admissible. Eligible faculty members who cannot attend the meeting are expected to notify the director as soon as possible after receiving announcement of the meeting date. In cases where a significant number of faculty members cannot attend, the director will, if practical, reschedule the meeting to a more favorable time.

4. Area Head Responsibilities

For probationary faculty, the area head shall review the candidate's dossier, including faculty activity reports, statements of goals, updated curriculum vitae, peer reviews, and previous letters of evaluation. During the promotion and tenure meeting, the area head provides a verbal summary of the candidate to be discussed.

The candidate should consult the area head, members of the FEC, and area colleagues during dossier

preparation.

5. Director Responsibilities

At the time of appointment, the director furnishes faculty with a copy of the POA and APT. If these documents are revised, faculty will be furnished with copies of the revisions.

In the spring semester, the director will notify candidates for mandatory tenure review, and faculty who wish to apply for promotion to the rank of Professor of the timetable for review, including target dates for preparation and submission of materials, and all formal meeting dates and institutional deadlines related to the review process.

The Director and director's office staff solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the SOM director and the candidate. Communication with external evaluators is conducted by the director and director's office staff.

The director will 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.

The director's office staff makes 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.

Early in the spring semester prior to the year of review, the director compiles the list of individuals to be reviewed for tenure or promotion. This list includes three subsets: 1) tenured faculty members seeking promotion, 2) probationary faculty under mandatory 6th year review, and probationary faculty seeking early promotion, and 3) probationary faculty under 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th year reviews. Groups 1 and 2 will be reviewed in the autumn semester, and Group 3 will be reviewed in the spring semester. Upon the director's invitation to those seeking promotion or early promotion, individuals must indicate their intention in writing.

For Groups 1 and 2, the director receives the FEC's report and the vote of the eligible faculty, together with each candidate's dossier. The director then prepares a letter on each candidate to be forwarded to the divisional dean of the college, along with the dossier and vote of the faculty. The director's letter conveys his/her recommendation and the considerations leading thereto. When not in agreement with the judgment of the eligible faculty, the director meets with the five-member FEC to explain the basis of the disagreement before forwarding the letter.

For Group 3, a brief and informal summary statement is created by the PEC/FEC chair expressing the elements of the discussion by the eligible faculty. For Group 3, this summary is advisory. The summary statement is shared with the candidate and is placed in the candidates personnel file. Fourth year reviews are conducted in the spring semester (with group 3). Fourth year reviews are formal and therefore follow these procedures: The director receives the FEC's report and the vote of the eligible faculty, together with each candidate's dossier. The director then prepares a letter on each candidate to be forwarded to the divisional dean of the college, along with the dossier and vote of the faculty. The director's letter conveys his/her recommendation and the considerations leading thereto. When not in agreement with the judgment of the eligible faculty, the director meets with the five-member FEC to explain the basis of the disagreement before forwarding the letter.

The director's participation in the promotion and tenure review process should be limited to answering questions raised by the committee and to suggesting additional issues or questions for consideration as needed.

The director provides an independent assessment of the candidate's record in his/her letter. This letter should not repeat the detailed documentation provided in the chair of the committee of the eligible faculty's letter.

Rather, the director's letter should provide an overarching summary interpretation and assessment of the candidate's record, including a discussion of how that record relates to the mission of the unit. If the director's assessment and/or recommendation is contrary to that of the committee of eligible faculty, the bases for differing judgments must be addressed.

The director informs the candidate, in writing, when the report of the Committee of Eligible Faculty and the director's letter have been completed, and of the availability of these documents for consultation. The candidate is provided a copy of these documents, and will be given ten days after receiving notification of the review's completion in which to provide such written responses as he/she may wish to include in the dossier. The FEC and director may provide written responses to the candidate's comments, and these responses will also be included in the dossier. Only one set of written comments on the SOM level is permitted. The director informs the candidate of subsequent steps to be taken in the review process. When a final decision has been reached, the director informs the candidate of that decision. If the decision is negative, the director provides information on appeal procedures. If the negative decision also involves non-renewal of appointment, then the director specifies the appropriate termination date of appointment.

The director's office staff will forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline.

6. Regional Campus Deans' Responsibilities

The regional campus dean/director initiates a review by the regional campus faculty. The dean/director then forwards the report of this review, and a recommendation to the director of the School of Music, for inclusion in the candidate's dossier and for the use of the school's promotion and tenure committee. From this point, the review follows the same course as all promotion and tenure reviews, with two exceptions: 1) the SOM director sends to the regional campus dean copies of the peer evaluations, of the promotion and tenure committee's report (containing the eligible faculty's vote and assessment of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses), and of the director's recommendations; and 2) if the recommendations of the regional campus dean and the SOM director differ, the divisional dean on the Columbus campus consults with both before making a recommendation.

7. Procedures Oversight Designees (POD) Responsibilities

Term of Office for each POD is three years. POD's are elected/continued/renewed by the vote of the eligible faculty. It is intended that each of these appointments overlap in order to maintain a consistent level of experience regarding the contents of the SOM's POA and APT policies, and the College and University policies. If possible, open POD appointments shall be filled during the last autumn semester faculty meeting. A list of eligible faculty shall be circulated to the eligible faculty prior to the vote. Terms of appointment shall conclude the end of the following month of May in order to facilitate smooth transition. Area Heads and FEC committee chairs are not eligible to serve as POD.

Each Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) appointment has a specific area of responsibility. POD A shall focus on candidate reviews that take place in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 5th years. POD B shall focus on untenured candidates in the 4th and 6th year formal reviews. POD C shall focus on candidates applying for promotion to the rank of Professor.

Each POD shall become familiar with procedures and policies of the promotion and tenure process.

The appropriate POD shall serve as lead spokesperson for the relevant action should a question arise regarding procedure.

POD A, B, and C will serve as oversight observers for all meetings of the eligible faculty.

POD shall be available for consultation regarding procedures any time before and during a candidate's document preparation.

As part of the call to order for the autumn and spring meetings of the eligible faculty, one POD shall read the following statement: “The deliberations and actions of the eligible faculty are an essential component in shaping the future of this School of Music. To that end, faculty are reminded that it is the responsibility of the Formal Evaluation Committee to take careful notes of the upcoming proceedings. The FEC committee’s notes, drafts, and letters should not include specific faculty names, comments or individual votes. Unidentified comments, specific and general, may be included in the FEC documents and the final letter. Participation and discussions at Promotion and Tenure meetings should remain confidential. Any questions that arise regarding procedure shall be directed first to the POD representatives who are present for consideration and direction. “Any questions before we begin?”

D External Evaluations

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed.

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. The SOM will solicit evaluations only from professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.

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

Since the SOM 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 Promotion and Tenure Committee, the SOM director, 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 school requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The SOM 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

E. Documentation

Faculty members under review must follow the promotion and tenure dossier outline prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs to record their performance for annual reviews and for salary determination. It is the candidate's responsibility to submit all requested materials.

1. Teaching

Excellence in teaching is documented in part by formal peer-review and through the use of the SEI protocol required by the school. Valuable activities include the institution of new courses and the advising and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students. Because the recruitment and retention of outstanding students is essential for the overall excellence of the school, performance in this area is another criterion to be addressed in the teaching component.

2. Scholarly and Creative Activity

The spectrum of scholarship and creative activity across the school reflects the breadth and richness of the discipline of music. The definition and standards for superior attainment in scholarship and/or creative/artistic endeavor notwithstanding, the faculty member must demonstrate a record of sustained growth in her/his area of specialization.

3. Service

Excellence in faculty service involves contributions directed to both the institution and the profession. Such contributions are exemplified by, but not limited to:

Membership on school, college, and university committees.

Membership and offices held in professional organizations.

Service on editorial boards, committees of professional organizations, and as evaluator of performances, composition, and scholarship.

Service to university, student, and community organizations through musicianship or musical scholarship.

Service to university, student, and community organizations in extra-musical ways.

Service as an administrator at area, school, college, or university levels.

While the particular variety of service contributions will differ from one faculty member to the next, the effective governance of the school requires that all faculty members accept responsibility for an equitable share of the service load.

VIII. Appeals

The procedures for appeals are outlined in Faculty Rules 3335-5-05 and 3335-6-05. Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 <https://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning->

[faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html](#) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05 <https://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-5-faculty-governance-and-committees.html>. Disagreement with a negative decision is not grounds for appeal. In pursuing an appeal, the faculty member is required to document the failure of one or more parties to the review process to follow written policies and procedures.

IX. Seventh Year Reviews

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (<https://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html>) 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.

X. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A. Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI)

Annual evaluation of teaching for all faculty members in the School of Music is an important element of formal evaluative processes, including promotion and tenure and merit pay determinations. To this end, all areas of the School employ the university's online Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) instrument; however use of this standardized tool is not exclusive and the SOM does not rely solely on SEI responses to courses and instruction in their assessment of the quality of a faculty member's teaching. Formal student feedback represents only one among several categories of teaching evaluation in the School. Other evaluative tools and categories include:

Syllabi, web pages, and other course materials

Self-assessment and statement of plans and goals

Peer evaluation of classroom and studio teaching

Customized evaluation instruments such as *Feedback on Your Instruction*, offered by The Center for the Advancement of Teaching

The success of current and former graduate students and post-docs

Pedagogical materials adopted by other faculty

Demonstration of teaching expertise at other venues

Teaching awards or other recognitions

The SOM recognizes that all of these tools and modes of assessment may not apply to every faculty member in any given year. Inclusion of several evaluative criteria does indicate, however, that no single form of evaluation will take precedence over another. In addition, OAA recommends faculty members choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if s/he is 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

To facilitate the peer-review process, two-member teams conduct formal reviews of teaching by evaluating a broad range of evidence associated with the teaching assignment of the candidate. This evidence must include direct observation, and may involve juries, student recitals, studio or classroom visits, and the evaluation of syllabi and other teaching materials. These visits may be pre-arranged or spontaneous. The resulting written evaluation of teaching is addressed to the area head, copied to the candidate, and placed in the candidate's file in the director's office for use by the area head, promotion and tenure committee, and the director in drafting review letters. The two-member teams are chosen by the area head, in consultation with the director and may include the area head, and if need be, one member from another area. If an area head is a candidate, the director participates in the choice. The candidate may review his/her personnel file and may place in that file a response to the peer evaluation.

For probationary faculty, formal peer-review of teaching is required at least once per year, and more often if deemed necessary by the area head and director. For tenured faculty seeking promotion, at least two formal peer-evaluations of teaching are required before making application. These formal evaluations are to date from separate academic years, not including the year of the review for promotion. Tenured faculty requesting peer-evaluation of teaching must notify the director, in writing, by the announced deadline early in autumn semester.

XI. APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:

Statement of Diversity

The School of Music is committed to building a diverse faculty and staff for the highest quality workforce and to recruiting a student body that reflects human diversity, with ample opportunities for under-represented minorities and women. The SOM embraces human diversity and is committed to equal employment opportunity, affirmative action, and eliminating discrimination. This commitment is both a moral imperative consistent with an intellectual community that celebrates individual differences and diversity, as well as a matter of law.

Discrimination against any individual based upon protected status, which is defined as age, ancestry, color, disability, gender identity or expression, genetic information, military status, national origin, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, or veteran status, is prohibited.

Search Initiatives to Enhance Diversity

At least one of the candidates invited to campus for the interview or audition should contribute to increasing the diversity of the SOM faculty. If the search committee judges that in the pool of candidates there is no qualified person who can contribute to the diversity of the SOM, it will explain its efforts to attract a diverse pool of applicants and will describe the pool of applicants and the pool of finalists before asking the director and dean to invite the finalists to campus for an interview. Vigorous efforts to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates are required. The SOM should encourage collaboration with other hiring agencies, such as Centers and Institutes, and wherever appointments may be interdisciplinary to ensure a diversity action plan is in place to recruit new faculty.

APPENDIX B:

Mentoring of Assistant Professors

Mentoring in the School of Music has a single purpose: to provide a supportive, nurturing, and safe environment for discussion and informal advice.

Each tenure-track faculty member who begins employment at the rank of Assistant Professor will be assigned a mentor. The mentor relationship shall be formally maintained through the new faculty member's tenure decision. New faculty hired with tenure shall be assigned a mentor who will serve for a period of two years.

During the first month of the new faculty member's appointment, the director will assign one tenured colleague outside the new faculty member's home area to serve as mentor. This mentor will arrange for regular meetings with the new faculty member (the suggested minimum is one meeting per month during the academic year, and continuing through the tenure decision). The mentor's role will be to listen and advise regarding issues and concerns that arise. Mentors are reminded to maintain confidentiality with sensitive issues. The mentor must also keep in mind that faculty members are mandated reporters of sexual misconduct (Office of Human Resources, Sexual Misconduct Policy 1.15, <https://hr.osu.edu/public/documents/policy/policy115.pdf>) and encouraged to report other instances of misconduct (Office of Human Resources, Whistleblower Policy 1.40,).

The mentor will not serve on the faculty member's Formal Evaluation Committee (FEC), and no evaluative input will be formally requested from the mentor. At any point, either party may request that the director assign a new mentor.