

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE

Criteria and Procedures for the
**Department of Spanish and
Portuguese**

Revised March 2019; OAA Approved July 23,
2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	PREAMBLE.....	4
II.	DEPARTMENT MISSION.....	5
III.	DEFINITIONS.....	6
	<i>A. Committee of Eligible Faculty.....</i>	6
	<i>B. Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee.....</i>	6
	<i>C. Quorum.....</i>	7
	<i>D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.....</i>	7
IV.	APPOINTMENTS.....	7
	<i>A. Criteria.....</i>	7
	1. <i>Tenure Track Faculty.....</i>	7
	General Considerations.....	7
	Teaching.....	9
	Research.....	9
	Service.....	10
	2. <i>Regional Campus Faculty.....</i>	10
	3. <i>Associated Faculty.....</i>	10
	Lecturers.....	10
	Senior Lecturers.....	11
	Visiting Faculty.....	11
	Adjunct Faculty.....	11
	4. <i>Courtesy Appointments for Tenure-track Faculty.....</i>	11
	<i>B. Procedures:.....</i>	12
	1. <i>Tenure Track Faculty.....</i>	12
	2. <i>Regional Campus Faculty.....</i>	14
	3. <i>Associated faculty.....</i>	14
	Lecturers.....	14
	Senior Lecturers.....	14
	Visiting Faculty.....	15
	Adjunct Faculty.....	15
	4. <i>Courtesy Appointments for Tenure-track Faculty.....</i>	16
V.	ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES.....	16
	<i>A. Probationary Faculty.....</i>	16
	General.....	16
	Criteria and Standards for Research and Teaching.....	17
	Criteria and Standards for Service.....	17
	Procedures.....	17
	Assessment.....	18
	Regional Campus Reviews.....	19
	Fourth Year Review.....	20
	Exclusion of Time from Probationary Periods (cf. IV.A.2, above).....	20
	<i>B. Tenured Faculty.....</i>	20
	<i>C. Tenured Faculty at Regional Campuses.....</i>	21
	<i>D. Associated Faculty.....</i>	21

VI.	MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS	22
A.	<i>Criteria</i>	22
	General.....	22
	Categories of Evaluation	23
B.	<i>Procedures</i>	23
C.	<i>Documentation</i>	24
	Teaching.....	25
	Scholarship.....	26
	Service	26
VII.	REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE, AND FOR PROMOTION	26
A.	<i>Criteria</i>	26
1.	<i>Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor With Tenure</i>	26
	General Considerations	26
	Teaching.....	27
	Research.....	27
	Service	28
2.	<i>Promotion to Rank of Professor</i>	28
	General Considerations	29
	Teaching.....	29
	Research.....	29
	Service	29
3.	<i>Regional campus Faculty</i>	30
B.	<i>Procedures</i>	30
1.	Candidate Responsibilities	30
2.	Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities	30
3.	Eligible Faculty Responsibilities.....	32
4.	Department Chair Responsibilities.....	33
5.	Regional Campus Faculty	34
6.	External Evaluations	34
C.	<i>Documentation</i>	35
1.	Teaching.....	35
2.	Research	37
3.	Service.....	38
VIII.	APPEALS.....	39
IX.	SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS.....	39
X.	PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING.....	39
A.	<i>Student Evaluation of Instruction</i>	39
B.	<i>Peer Evaluation of Instruction</i>	40
XI.	REVISION AND AMENDMENT PROCEDURES	41

I. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapter 6 of the [Rules of the University Faculty](#) (Additional Rules Concerning Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure; the Office of Academic Affairs procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#); and any additional policies established by the college and the University. Should those rules and policies change, the department shall follow those new rules 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 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 its criteria and procedures for faculty promotion, tenure, and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document the dean and provost accept the mission and criteria of the department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating continuing faculty and candidates for positions in relation to its mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the following principles as articulated in Faculty Rule [3335-6-01](#):

Peer review provides the foundation for decisions regarding faculty appointment, reappointment and promotion and tenure (except when the provisions of rule [3335-6-03](#) (H) for fiscal or programmatic reasons are invoked). Peers are those faculty who can be expected to be most knowledgeable regarding an individual's qualifications and performance--normally tenure initiating unit colleagues. Because of the centrality of peer review to these review processes, faculty vested with the responsibility for providing peer review have an obligation to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes, to exercise the standards established in faculty rule [3335-6-02](#) and other standards specific to the academic unit and discipline, and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty. Recommendations by the faculty vested with the responsibility for providing peer review will be accepted unless they are not supported by the evidence presented regarding how the candidate meets the standards established in faculty rule [3335-6-02](#) and other standards specific to the academic unit and discipline. When, for the reasons just stated, a decision regarding faculty appointment, reappointment, or promotion and tenure differs from the recommendation of the faculty, the administrator or body making that decision will communicate in writing to the faculty body that made the recommendation the reasons that the recommendation was judged not to be supported by the evidence.

Decisions considering appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the university's policy on equal opportunity (<http://hr.osu.edu/policy/policy110.pdf>).

II. DEPARTMENT VISION AND MISSION

VISION

The Department of Spanish and Portuguese (SPPO) will be among the top undergraduate and graduate programs in the United States in the fields of Hispanic Linguistics, Iberian Studies, Latin American and Latinx Literary and Cultural Studies, and Portuguese.

MISSION

To teach, create and exchange knowledge about the languages, linguistics, literatures and cultures of Latin America, Portugal, Spain, the United States, and Portuguese- and Spanish-speaking Africa and Asia through teaching and learning, research and creative activity, and community engagement from local to global levels.

To realize this vision and mission, we will dedicate ourselves to the following goals that demonstrate our commitment to the productive interrelationships between research, teaching and community engagement:

Excellent Faculty and Academic Programs

- Support innovative and relevant research about language, language contact, linguistic phenomena, literature, film and visual studies, and overarching cultural dynamics in Latin America, Portugal, Spain, the United States, and Portuguese- and Spanish-speaking Africa and Asia
- Offer programs of distinction; and support innovative teaching
- Promote interdisciplinary research and collaboration

Diversity and Values

- Promote the understanding of and engagement with the rich diversity of the languages, literatures and cultures of Latin America, Portugal, Spain, the United States, and Portuguese- and Spanish-speaking Africa and Asia in the classroom and outside of it
- Foster an environment of productive exchange between diverse peoples and viewpoints

Citizenship and Advocacy

- Prepare a diverse student body to be leaders and engaged citizens on local, regional, national and global levels by promoting multilingual and cross-cultural competencies
- Affirm the vital importance of education in diverse languages, literatures and cultures to the preparation of student-citizens

Community Engagement

- Foster collaborations between faculty, students, and community partners (on local, regional, national, and global levels) through classes and extracurricular activities
- Support innovative efforts to integrate teaching, research/creative activity and community engagement with the Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking communities in central Ohio

Access, Affordability, and Student Success

- Expand access to teaching and learning opportunities through the use of new digital technologies
- Streamline undergraduate programs and provide cost-efficient study abroad opportunities to Latin America, Portugal and Spain.
- Enhance linkages between classroom and experiential learning and post-university opportunities

III. DEFINITIONS

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty (CEF)

1. **Tenure Track Faculty** In the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, the eligible faculty for appointment reviews of tenure track faculty consists of all tenure track faculty whose tenure resides in the Department. For an appointment at senior rank, a second vote is taken by the faculty members eligible to vote on the rank under consideration. The eligible faculty for senior rank new appointments and 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 SPPO excluding the Department Chair, 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 SPPO excluding the Department Chair, 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 (e.g., 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 SPPO does not have at least three (3) eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the Department Chair, after consulting with the executive dean, will appoint one or more faculty members from another unit within the College for the review so that the minimum number of three (3) can be reached.

B. Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee

1. The Department of Spanish and Portuguese utilizes a Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee consisting of a minimum of three tenured faculty members that assists the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in managing the personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The Promotion and Tenure subcommittee is appointed

by the Chair and consists of colleagues at a rank higher than the candidate within the candidate's primary field(s) of expertise.

C. Quorum

1. The Department of Spanish and Portuguese defines a quorum as 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.

D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

1. In all votes taken on personnel matters within the Department of Spanish and Portuguese 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.
2. **Appointment** The Department of Spanish and Portuguese requires a minimum of two-thirds of the votes cast by eligible faculty members be used for a positive recommendation for appointment.
3. **Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion** The Department of Spanish and Portuguese requires a minimum of two-thirds of the votes cast by eligible faculty members be used for a positive recommendation for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion.

IV. APPOINTMENTS

A. Criteria

1. Tenure Track Faculty

General Considerations

When judging a candidate's qualifications in teaching, research, and service for possible appointment, the primary concern always will be to determine whether or not the highest standards of professional performance have been met. In the department of Spanish and Portuguese some faculty members may primarily be engaged in language instruction, others, in the teaching of literature, linguistics, or culture. The nature of teaching, research and service among faculty members will thus vary. In addition, as The Ohio State University enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary investigation and education, and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances may arise in which the proper work of prospective faculty members may depart from established academic patterns. In all these cases, care and reasonable flexibility must be exercised in evaluating candidates with varied interests, commitments and responsibilities according to relevant criteria. At the same time, consideration should be given to the candidate's academic standing in relation

to others in his/her field. All appointment decisions are based on the faculty's judgment that the appointee possesses strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the faculty ranks (cf. VII.A, B, C).

No offer will be extended in the event that a 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.

Instructor

Appointments at the rank of instructor are only made by the Department of Spanish and Portuguese when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor but the appointee has not completed the required degree (Ph.D. or equivalent) at the onset of the appointment. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments.

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

To be recommended for appointment as an assistant professor, a candidate must have completed all requirements for the degree of Ph.D. (or equivalent) and begun a promising program of research. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the eligible faculty determine 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.

Recommendation for appointment of a candidate 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. Appointment 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 (see faculty rule [3335-6-02](#) (C)).

An initial appointment as professor or associate professor will generally entail tenure. In extraordinary circumstances a probationary period not to exceed four years may be granted by the Office of Academic Affairs upon petition of the department of Spanish and Portuguese and the College of Arts and Sciences. For the petition to be approved, a compelling rationale must be provided why appointment at a senior rank is appropriate but tenure is not. In such cases, review for tenure occurs 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.

Teaching

Effective teaching is an important criterion for all appointments. In judging teaching, considerations such as the following should be taken into account: the candidate's command of his/her subject; the candidate's ability to organize and communicate the subject matter effectively and to bring in new perspectives in consonance with state-of-the-art research; the candidate's ability to stimulate students' interest and curiosity; the candidate's ability to challenge the students intellectually and to inspire them to their best effort; and the candidate's willingness to help and guide students, whether it be inside or outside the classroom.

To be recommended for appointment as assistant professor a candidate should consistently have demonstrated effective teaching in previous positions, or show substantial promise for fulfilling the criteria of expectation. To be recommended for appointment at the senior ranks candidates must meet the criteria for promotion to those ranks within the department as described in Sections VII.A and VII.B, below. The ways in which those criteria may be documented are described in Section VII.E.

Research

Research is an essential activity of the department, and any candidate for appointment must demonstrate clear distinction in this area. Given the diverse interests and responsibilities of the members of the department, the type and results of this activity may vary. Some research may emphasize the generation or reinterpretation of knowledge; other research may introduce new approaches or apply existing approaches to a new body of material; still other research may emphasize pedagogical concerns that incorporate theoretical advances in instruction and/or language acquisition. Still other recognized work could consist of such activities as translation, editing scholarly publications, or compiling critical bibliographies. In all instances,

the basic criterion is the quality and significance of the scholarly activity as an innovating contribution of relevance to the candidate's and the department's fields.

To be recommended for appointment as an assistant professor, a candidate must have completed all requirements for the degree of Ph.D. (or equivalent), and begun a promising program of research. To be recommended for appointment at the senior ranks, candidates must meet the criteria concerning research for promotion to those ranks within the department as described in Sections VII.A. and VII.B, below. The ways in which those criteria may be documented are described in Section VII.E.

Service

Service at other institutions, which may often be distant from The Ohio State University, is difficult to evaluate, and thus candidates for initial appointment, especially at the junior level, may not always be judged on the basis of the service component of their record. Since more experienced candidates, especially for a senior appointment, do have a record of professional service, such service, as documented in appropriate ways, should be taken into account by the search committee for its quality and significance.

2. Regional Campus Faculty

As the mission of the regional campuses emphasizes undergraduate instruction, regional campus criteria for appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor are similar to those for Columbus campus faculty, but give relatively greater emphasis at each rank to teaching experience and quality.

3. Associated Faculty

Lecturers

To be recommended for appointment as a lecturer, a candidate will have completed, at minimum, all requirements for the degree of M.A. (or the equivalent) in the discipline or a closely related field. When judging a candidate's qualifications, effective teaching at the elementary and intermediate levels of language instruction will be the basic criterion. In making an evaluation, considerations such as the following should be taken into account: the candidate's command of his/her subject; the candidate's ability to organize and communicate the subject matter effectively; the candidate's ability to stimulate students' interest and curiosity; the candidate's ability to challenge the students intellectually and to inspire them to their best effort; the candidate's willingness to help and guide students, whether it be in the classroom or without. The means used to appraise quality of teaching are consistent with those used to evaluate candidates for appointment as assistant professor. Appointments as lecturer may be for one semester, one year, two, or three years. In each case, reappointment will be based on performance and departmental need.

Senior Lecturers

To be recommended for appointment as a senior lecturer a candidate must have completed all requirements for the degree of Ph.D. (or the equivalent). When judging a candidate's qualifications, effective teaching at the elementary and intermediate levels of language instruction will be the basic criterion, but the search committee will also consider the quality and quantity of scholarly achievement pertinent to his/her teaching assignment, as well as, when appropriate, professional service at other institutions. In making an evaluation of the candidate's teaching, the same considerations stipulated in the previous paragraph for lecturers should apply. The means used to appraise quality of teaching are consistent with those used to evaluate candidates for appointment as assistant professor. Appointments as senior lecturer are for one to three years, and reappointment will be based on a comprehensive review of performance in his/her assigned duties and departmental need.

Visiting Faculty

Based on programmatic needs the department may find it appropriate to appoint visiting faculty for a limited period of time. A visiting appointment at a junior rank will normally be for the purpose of filling a temporary vacancy on the faculty with a highly qualified candidate. At a senior rank, especially for a professor, the visiting appointment is intended to add the temporary instructional and scholarly services of a preeminent scholar to the departmental roster, thereby providing a significant stimulus to the intellectual atmosphere of the department in one or more of its programs. The ranks of Visiting Faculty are the same as the ranks of continuing faculty (assistant professor, associate professor, and professor) and the criteria of evaluation are the same as those for continuing faculty of the same rank. These criteria will also serve as the basis for evaluating a visiting faculty member under consideration for reappointment. Visiting appointments will be made for no more than one year at a time and require formal annual review if they are to be continued. The review procedures are the same as those for probationary continuing faculty of appropriate rank (see section V.A). No visiting appointment may exceed three continuous years. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion.

Adjunct Faculty

Based on programmatic needs, the department may find it appropriate to offer an adjunct appointment. Adjunct appointments are given to individuals who give academic service to the department such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees. The criteria and means used in evaluating candidates for these appointments will be the same as those employed in offering regular appointment to candidates of equivalent rank. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure). Adjunct appointments may be for no more than three years at a time.

4. Courtesy Appointments for Tenure-track Faculty

Based on programmatic needs, the department may find it appropriate to offer a no salary courtesy appointment to a faculty member employed by another tenure-initiating unit. Each appointment is based on the expectation of the appointee's substantial involvement in the department. The goal of extending a courtesy appointment is to enhance the scholarly and

instructional level of the department through the formal collaboration by faculty members of high academic standards in the activities of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese. Continuation of the appointment will depend on the faculty member's ongoing contributions to the mission of the department. The criteria and means used in evaluating candidates for courtesy appointments will be the same as those employed in offering regular appointment to candidates of equivalent rank.

B. Procedures:

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, clinical, 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

- a. Every appointment to the tenure track faculty in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese results from a nation-wide search. A vigorous effort will always be made to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates. 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](#).
- b. Once the need for an appointment in a certain area has been agreed upon by the departmental council and the chair, and approved by the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, the search begins with the constitution of a search committee.
- c. Search committees are appointed by the Department Chair, and consist of a representative group of no fewer than three faculty members of tenured-eligible rank, one of whom is designated the committee chair, plus one graduate student with full voting rights (see departmental Pattern of Administration, VI.B.2.c.1).

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](#).

All committees will have a Diversity Advocate, appointed by the Department Chair. The Diversity Advocate's responsibility is to be a strong voice on the committee for assuring that a diverse pool of qualified applicants is sought and to assure that consideration of applications does not include comments or assumptions that could bias consideration of applicants that bring diversity to the pool. The Diversity Advocate will vote on the merits of cases like other committee members.

- d. In close consultation with the Department Chair, search committees write an appropriate job description for the opening, which will be posted in the university Job Postings through the [Office of Human Resources](#) and externally, subject to the department chair's approval. The description 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. With the participation and advice of the departmental council, search committees seek out and identify strong candidates for the position.
- e. Centers or other interested units in the college are expected to participate in the hiring of faculty who might be affiliated with those units. When new faculty positions in areas of special interest to a particular unit are announced by the department that unit will be invited to become actively involved in the hiring process. If and when the search progresses to the stage of on-campus visits (see below), all candidates will meet with the unit chair or director and other relevant faculty.
- f. Once a short list of candidates has been agreed upon by the search committee, and approved by the Department Chair, the search committee may, if deemed appropriate, proceed to a preliminary interview of those candidates, either at a relevant professional meeting or over the phone.
- g. Those candidates agreed upon by the search committee to be the best of those under consideration are invited to the Columbus campus by the chair of the search committee for an on-campus interview with the approval of the Department Chair. At least one of the candidates invited for an on-campus interview should contribute to the diversity profile of the department. If the search committee judges that in the pool of candidates there is no qualified person specifically contributing to the diversity of the unit, it will explain to the departmental council its efforts to attract a diverse pool of applicants and will describe the pool of applicants and of finalists before the Committee of the Eligible Faculty's vote on inviting the finalists to campus.
- h. The interview will usually consist of some kind of public presentation, interviews with the Department Chair and all those faculty and students who are able to meet with the candidate, and interviews with interested colleagues in other units and relevant members of the college and University administration. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format.
- i. Following the on-campus visits of all the candidates for the open position, the members of the search committee will canvas the members of the department for their views, deliberate, and then make a recommendation to the CEF.
- j. The CEF may either accept, modify, or reject the recommendation of the search committee. If the offer involves senior rank and/or prior service credit, the CEF also votes on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or prior service credit. In

turn, the CEF makes a recommendation to the Department Chair who then makes his or her recommendation in a report to the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the Department Chair decides which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the Department Chair.

- k. All offers at the associate professor and professor ranks, with or without tenure, and all offers entailing prior service credit require the prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

2. Regional Campus Faculty

The regional campus has the primary responsibility for determining the position description for a tenure track faculty search, but the dean/director or designee consults with Department Chair to reach agreement on the description before the search begins. The regional campus search committee must include at least one representative from the department.

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, Department Chair, departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee, 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 Department Chair and regional campus dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the Department Chair and the regional campus dean.

3. Associated faculty

Lecturers

- a. Once the need for an appointment of a lecturer has been agreed upon by the chair, language program director, academic program director, and/or supervisory staff, the candidates will be asked to supply letters of reference and evaluations made by other faculty members, former employers, and/or students. The language program directors will then proceed to a preliminary interview of those candidates over the phone. Whenever possible, the local candidates will be invited for an on-campus interview. Offers will be made after careful examination of the candidates' credentials and interview reports.
- b. Responsibility for hiring lecturers rests with the chair who acts on recommendations made by the program directors and/or supervisory staff.

Senior Lecturers

- a. Every initial appointment to the associated faculty as a senior lecturer in the department of Spanish and Portuguese may involve a focused or a nationwide search. A vigorous effort will always be made to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates.

- b. Once the need for an appointment as a senior lecturer has been established by the chair in consultation with the departmental council, the chair will appoint a search committee which will normally be chaired by the vice chair. The search committee will write an appropriate job description for the opening and will seek out and identify strong candidates for the position.
- c. Once a short list of candidates has been agreed upon by the search committee, and approved by the Department Chair, the search committee may, if deemed appropriate, proceed to a preliminary interview of those candidates over the phone. Following the preliminary interview of all of the candidates for the open position, the members of the search committee will make a recommendation to the Department Chair who will decide on the matter after consultation with the faculty. All offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

Visiting Faculty

- a. The procedures followed in the appointment of visiting junior faculty are consonant with the procedures followed in the appointment of tenure-track faculty (see section D, above), with the exception that the candidates may, or may not, be asked for an on-campus visit. In the absence of an on-campus visit, the evaluation of the candidates will be based on the materials gathered by the search committee and on phone interviews.

The procedures followed in the appointment of visiting senior faculty may or may not be same as those followed in the appointment of visiting junior faculty. On occasion, the appointment of a distinguished visiting senior professor will proceed from a nomination made from within the department, especially if the term of the appointment is for a shorter period of time than one year. In the latter event, the faculty member making the nomination is responsible for gathering appropriate materials for a dossier that is then made available for consideration by the members of the CEF. Once the members of the CEF have had the opportunity to examine the dossier, they meet to discuss the nomination, vote, and make a recommendation to the chair who, in turn, makes a recommendation to the dean.

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

Adjunct Faculty

Appointments of adjunct faculty proceed in a manner similar to that of tenure-track faculty. Once the need for a particular adjunct faculty member has been identified by the department, and approved by the chair and the dean, a dossier is gathered and the candidate is invited to meet with the various members of the department and to make a public presentation. After the presentation, and in cognizance of the pertinent dossier, the members of the CEF meet to discuss the case, and to make a recommendation to the chair who, in turn, makes a recommendation to the dean.

4. Courtesy Appointments for Tenure-track Faculty

Courtesy appointments for members of the tenure-track faculty belonging to other tenure initiating units on campus proceed in a manner similar to that of adjunct faculty. Once the request has been made, or the opportunity has arisen, for making a courtesy faculty appointment by the department, a dossier is gathered and the candidate is invited to meet with the various members of the department and to make a public presentation. After the presentation, and after all members of the CEF have had the opportunity to examine the dossier, the latter meet to discuss the case, and to make a recommendation to the chair who, in turn, makes a recommendation to the dean.

V. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES

The department 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 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.

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 department chair no later than the final day of autumn semester classes.

The department chair 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 Faculty

General

At the time of appointment, probationary faculty members shall be provided with all pertinent documents detailing the promotion and tenure policies and criteria of the department, college, and University. If these documents are revised during the probationary period, probationary faculty shall be provided with copies of the revised documents.

During a probationary period a faculty member shall be reviewed annually in accordance with this rule and with the policies of the department, college, and university. The annual review shall encompass the faculty member's performance and continuing development in teaching, in scholarship, and in service. External evaluations of the faculty member's work, required for tenure and promotion reviews, may be obtained for any review if judged appropriate by the review committee (see Procedures, B, below) or the Department Chair.

Criteria and Standards for Research and Teaching

In the area of teaching and research, the criteria are basically the same as those that apply to new appointments, as described in section IV.A, above. For a positive annual review the standard in teaching is sustained quality of formal classroom instruction as documented in student (S.E.I.) and peer evaluation reports. In addition, a faculty member is expected to have contributed to curricular development and maintenance of a current teaching program, as well as being involved in graduate advising and examinations commensurate with the probationary faculty member's exposure to graduate teaching. In research, a positive annual review requires demonstrated growth of quality scholarly publication leading toward a cumulative record appropriate for the eventual consideration of promotion and/or tenure. The record will also include active conference participation and a beginning or expanding involvement in the professional field. The expectations in terms of quantity, quality and significance of instructional contributions and research outcomes are directly correlated with a probationary faculty member's progress through the rank. The different ways in which teaching and research may be documented are described in section VII.E, below.

Criteria and Standards for Service

A faculty member in the department of Spanish and Portuguese is expected to perform administrative service to the department, the college, the University, the academic world, and/or the community. To be recommended for a positive annual review, an assistant professor should have demonstrated willingness and ability to perform effective service on behalf of the department. Service shall be evaluated according to departmental standards of competence and effectiveness as applied to the service assignments he or she has been asked to perform.

Procedures

Annual reviews of probationary faculty will be conducted early in the Spring semester of each year. For special circumstances governing the fourth-year review of assistant professors, see paragraph 7, below. An annual review leading to a negative recommendation must also have followed the fourth-year review process. The Department Chair shall inform all candidates in timely fashion when the review will take place and provide them with a copy of the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline to be completed by the faculty member in reporting accomplishments to date, and any other documents needed, including an outline of their activities and accomplishments of the previous year as well as a statement of future plans and goals, and an updated curriculum vitae. Following the outline, candidates will then provide appropriate professional materials for review to the chair who will make them available to the appropriate review committee. All documentation should follow the models and standards established by the department. Following the annual review, copies of all current faculty CV's will be made available in an accessible location in the department where any faculty member may review them.

- a. The annual review of a faculty member affiliated with a center or another department will include, when relevant, consideration of that faculty member's teaching, research, and service that pertain to this unit. The unit director or chair (or representative) will be asked by the Department Chair to provide a written

evaluation of the candidate's contributions to the mission of this unit.

- b. The annual review committee for probationary assistant professors will consist of the tenured associate professors and professors of the department. At the discretion of the chair, a faculty member from the review committee may be charged with introducing the case to the assembled review committee, but without making a recommendation. Each review committee will be chaired by the Department Chair, who may participate in its deliberations but who may not vote. All committees will have a Procedures Oversight Designee, appointed by the Department Chair, whose responsibility is to see that the proceedings are carried out in a highly professional manner, and, in particular, that they are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions that could bias the review. The Procedures Oversight Designee should be a senior faculty member committed to diversity. Since the designee is not an advocate for particular faculty members, he or she is expected to vote on the merits of cases like other committee members.
- c. After each member of the committee has read and carefully considered the materials submitted by the candidate, the review committee will meet to deliberate, vote, and make a recommendation to the chair regarding the renewal or non-renewal of the probationary faculty member's appointment.
- d. After receiving the recommendation of the review committee, the Department Chair will inform the committee of the action he or she intends to take regarding the recommendation. If there is a discrepancy, the Department Chair will explain to the review committee in writing the reasons for his or her departure from the committee's recommendation.

Assessment

At the completion of the review, the Department Chair will provide the faculty member and the dean of the college with a written assessment of the faculty member's performance and professional development. It is expected that this assessment will be both constructive and candid and that it will include both strengths and weaknesses, since the review process is conceived as a means to be supportive and helpful to untenured faculty. When appropriate, it will honestly and clearly communicate aspects of performance that need improvement if the candidate is to make acceptable progress. Where the committee's assessment differs from the Department Chair's, the latter is responsible for formulating a coherent evaluation to provide the faculty member useful and constructive guidance reflecting the divergent points of view as far as possible. The assessment letter will always include a reminder that, according to faculty rule [3335-5-04](#), all faculty members have the right to review the contents of their personnel file. The contents of the chair's letter will subsequently be discussed with the candidate in a conference to be arranged at their mutual convenience. At least one other tenured faculty member, in particular the designated mentor of the probationary faculty member if feasible, shall be present at this conference.

- a. All annual review letters to date shall become a part of a faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure. Candidates shall have the right to respond in

writing to all letters of assessment, and their responses shall also become a part of the permanent dossier.

- b. If the department chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The department chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The department chair's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the dean of the college. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments, if he or she chooses).
- c. If the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#)) is invoked (see paragraph 2 below). Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.
- d. If both the department chair and the dean agree on non-renewal, the appointment of the faculty member will not be continued beyond the period specified in paragraph 10, below. Faculty members whose contracts have not been renewed may appeal this decision according to the procedures outlined in section VIII, below.

Regional Campus Reviews

- a. Regional campus faculty shall first be reviewed by the faculty and dean and director on the appropriate campus using procedures established on each campus. This review shall focus primarily on the faculty member's contributions in teaching and service, which are the areas of greatest weight in the evaluation of regional campus faculty (cf. section VII.C, below). The dean and the director shall forward the report of the regional campus faculty containing his/her recommendation to the candidate and to the chair of the department. The Columbus campus review shall proceed as described above in section V.A.4.5. This review focuses primarily on the candidate's scholarly work, but considers all aspects of the record. At the completion of the Columbus campus review, the Department Chair will provide the faculty member, the dean of the college, and the regional campus dean with a written assessment of the faculty member's performance and professional development.
- b. It is important that the regional campuses and the department work cooperatively to time reviews so that the sequential interaction described above may take place. It is also important for the chair of the department and the dean of the regional campus to be alert to any developing discrepancy between the quality of teaching and service on the one hand and the quality and quantity of scholarly work on the other, in order to minimize the possibility that the regional campus and the department may disagree on a tenure recommendation. When such discrepancies

become apparent, the regional campus dean should explore means of addressing this problem with the faculty member and the chair of the department as appropriate.

Fourth Year Review

The fourth-year review of probationary faculty takes place early in the Spring semester of their fourth year of applicable probationary time. It shall follow the same process as the review for tenure and promotion (see section VII below) with two exceptions: external letters of evaluation may or may not be solicited by the department; and the dean, not the department chair, makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. External evaluations are only solicited when either the department chair or the eligible faculty determine that they are necessary to conduct the Fourth-Year Review. 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. Before reaching a negative decision or a decision contrary to the department's recommendation, the dean must consult with the college tenure and promotion committee.

Exclusion of Time from Probationary Periods (cf. IV.A.2, above)

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) 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

1. Like probationary faculty, tenured faculty are reviewed annually to assess their contributions to the department and the profession and their continuing professional development in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The standards and criteria for these reviews are basically the same as those that apply to probationary appointees of equivalent rank, as described in section V.A, above, with the appropriate upward adjustments in the expectation of the significance and distinction of overall contributions associated with the senior ranks.
2. Prior to the time of the annual review, which will normally take place during the Spring Semester, tenured faculty will be asked by the chair to submit an annual report containing a written record of accomplishments in instruction, research or other scholarly activity, and service for the year preceding the annual review, along with a statement of future goals and plans, an updated curriculum vitae, and all other relevant materials. All documentation should follow the models and standards established by the department. These materials will then be made available to the senior promotion committee consisting of all tenured professors in the department for conducting the review. Following the annual review, copies of all current faculty CV's will be made available in an accessible location in the department where any faculty member may review them.

3. The annual review of a faculty member affiliated with another department or center will include, when relevant, consideration of that faculty member's teaching, research, and service that pertain to this additional unit. The unit chair or director (or representative) will be asked by the Department Chair to provide a written evaluation of the candidate's contributions to the mission of the center.

The review of an individual associate professor is conducted by the tenured professors of the department who, as the senior promotion committee, make a recommendation to the chair on the candidate's accomplishments in the areas of teaching research, and service. The review of the tenured professors is conducted by the chair of the department.

4. Upon the conclusion of each review, the Department Chair shall prepare a report, summarizing the results of the review and containing whatever recommendations the review committee and/or chair may have to enable the faculty member to remain productive. The report should include a reminder that, according to faculty rule [3335-5-04](#), all faculty members have the right to review the contents of their personnel file. When completed, the report shall be forwarded promptly to the faculty member. The department chair meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals, and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. Following the meeting, the faculty member may, if he or she so desires, submit a written response for inclusion in the permanent file.

C. Tenured Faculty at Regional Campuses

The annual review of tenured faculty on the regional campuses should follow the process described in paragraph 6.a of section A, above. The departmental review should follow the process described in paragraphs 1-5 of the present section B.

D. 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. 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. No later than October 15 of the final year of the appointment, the chair will decide whether or not to reappoint. The department chair's recommendation on reappointment is final.

VI. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS

A. Criteria

1. General

The determination of salary increases or other rewards centers on the period under review but shall not be based on performance during the preceding year alone. The faculty member's entire record, esteem in the profession, importance to the department, University, and the like shall also be considered.

- a. Those faculty who are highly productive in significant research, consistent in high quality teaching and in effective service will merit the greatest reward. However, to fulfill its mission the department must, from time to time, impose a higher than average burden of teaching and/or service responsibilities on particular faculty. The salary criteria must be sufficiently flexible to permit a wide range of assignments and reward excellence when a faculty member's balance of activities in the three areas of research, teaching, and service supports the departmental mission. The effective enhancement of the college and University mission through quality interdisciplinary efforts, service on college and University committees and the like shall also be considered when evaluating a faculty member's performance for the purpose of salary and other rewards.
- b. In specific cases, special attainment goals may be set for an individual faculty member to benefit his or her professional development while enhancing the departmental mission and respecting budgetary and other departmental needs and constraints. Such goals can be set at the time of discussing the results of an annual review, for periods of one year or more. Such an agreement will then become part of the annual review letter, to be taken into consideration at the next annual review and merit increase determination. The specific deviations of an individual goal contract refer to the standard of the category of "regular" mentioned in paragraph 2 below.

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.

2. Categories of Evaluation

- a. The underlying principle guiding the determination of merit salary increases is to establish three categories of performance evaluation following the results of the individual faculty member's annual review and his or her overall standing in the field:
 - a) appropriate according to regular expectations,
 - b) superior performance compared to the norm, and
 - c) inferior performance compared to the norm.For exceptionally high merit a top tier within the superior category can be invoked, while a particularly disappointing performance may lead to a special zero level of

merit attribution.

- b. A “regular” performance in the year under review implies effective teaching results that demonstrate attention to, and improvement in, those areas, if any, that had previously been cited as needing betterment; effective service as assigned; and a body of qualitatively good research, showing progress, development, innovation of analysis, and having documentable impact on the field. A somewhat lower performance in one branch of scholarly activity, instruction, or service may be compensated by higher results in the other area(s). However, overall teaching quality should not significantly fall below the effective level; scholarly activities may not be absent or marginal; and service cannot have been absent or abandoned. A “superior” evaluation implies documentable excellence in at least one of the three areas, distinctly surpassing the “regular” level, while the other two remain at a “regular” level. An “exceptional” subcategory refers to truly outstanding performance in two or three of the component fields of activity (scholarly pursuits, instruction, and service).
- c. The category of “inferior” obtains for a performance where one of the areas is clearly lacking compared to the “regular” level, and where there is no effective compensation in the other areas. The rare evaluation of “deficient” shall apply in cases where the faculty member has not submitted appropriate information for evaluation, or where two or three areas of activity have been judged to be “inferior” for the year evaluated.

B. Procedures

1. Recommendations regarding salary increases for the following year are made by the chair of the department to the divisional dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The chair is advised in this matter by the Advisory Committee of the department which centrally includes in its deliberations the results of the appropriately constituted faculty annual review committees (see sections V.A and V.B, above). The Advisory Committee focuses its attention on the faculty member’s contributions during the period under review in the areas of actual publications and scholarly activities, teaching, and service provided, but also provides feedback to the chair on the broader criteria of excellence, contributions to the department, and equity considerations. As noted, there is a distinction between the scope of the annual review which focuses on the previous year’s work and that of the salary merit adjustment process which considers both the results of the annual review and the larger criteria in the section above. Both the annual review and, whenever possible, the opportunity for faculty response to the annual review (see above, paragraphs V.A.5.b and V.B.6) shall have occurred before the Advisory Committee begins its deliberations on salary merit adjustments.

The three basic categories of “superior”, “regular”, and “inferior”, as well as the two extreme categories of “exceptional” and “deficient” shall be differentiated in terms of merit increase in a gradation appropriate to produce clear differentiations in merit salary increases and a strong incentive to produce work worthy of superior or exceptional recognition. While the eventual attribution of dollar values

to these five categories is in part conditioned by a percentage value of the faculty member's current year salary, there will be a correction applied in the case of any salaries below or above a median band of all departmental salaries. The salaries falling below this band will receive a dollar amount revised upward from a pure percentage base if they fall in the evaluation category of "regular", "superior", or "exceptional". Those above the median band will receive a dollar amount revised downward from a pure percentage base if they fall in the evaluation categories of "regular", "inferior", or "deficient". The aim of this correction is the proactive avoidance of salary compression unrelated to individual merit, while maintaining full competitiveness for meritorious performance to gain the highest salary merit increases in relation to the current salary level. For purposes of assuring salary equity in relation to a faculty member's overall standing in the field, the Department Chair may reserve up to 10% of the annual merit increase funds for special recognition. All salary recommendations formulated in relative and absolute terms according to this plan are subject to the chair's revision and comprehensive adjustments for equity and excellence before being sent to the dean as departmental recommendations for the annual departmental merit salary adjustments.

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.

C. Documentation

As noted in paragraph V.A.4, above, probationary faculty record their previous year's performance for the purpose of annual review on documents that follow the promotion and tenure dossier outline prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs. As noted above in paragraph V.B.2, tenured faculty record their previous year's performance for the purpose of annual review on a form provided by the department and on an updated curriculum vitae. In addition, all faculty members will also submit a written report of accomplishments in instruction, research or other scholarly activity, and service for the year preceding the annual review, along with an indication of future goals and plans, as well as an updated complete CV. To ensure uniform evaluations, all faculty members will be required to document their contributions using the guidelines and standards established by the department. The Advisory Committee's evaluation for salary recommendation will be based on these annual review documents.

The annual performance review of every faculty member requires that all documentation described below, including the two summary documents, be submitted to the department chair no later than the first Friday of spring semester classes.

- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place
- updated Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, Volume 3 (<https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook>)

(assistant professors only)

Any published materials presented for consideration should be in the form of reprints, photocopies of journal articles, or other final form that documents actual publication. An author's manuscript does not document publication.

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

The time period covered by the documentation described below is the previous 12 months.

Teaching

Cumulative eSEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught.

Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details, including required number, included in section X below).

Copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed. An accepted but unpublished work submitted for consideration in a given annual review may not be resubmitted after publication for consideration in a future annual review.

Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.

Scholarship

Copies of all scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.

Documentation of grants and contracts received.

Other relevant documentation of scholarship as appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted).

Service

Any available documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier.

VII. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE, AND FOR PROMOTION

A. Criteria

1. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure

General Considerations

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

- a. According to faculty rule 3335-6-02, tenure at The Ohio State University will not be awarded below the rank of associate professor. The same faculty rule states that 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.
- b. Faculty rule 3335-6-02 further stipulates that 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. While it is recognized that some faculty are stronger in one area than another, there must always be a balance between the two core areas of teaching and research. Extraordinary teaching cannot compensate for a poor record in publication, and extraordinary scholarship cannot compensate for poor teaching. 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 the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.
- c. Thus, although criteria will vary according to the particular responsibilities of each faculty member, every candidate will be held to a standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Above all, candidates will be held to a very high standard

of performance in the areas that are central to their responsibilities. The pattern of performance across the probationary period shall yield a high degree of confidence that the candidate will continue to develop professionally in the areas that are central to his or her responsibilities and in ways relevant to the departmental mission in the University.

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

The accomplishments listed below in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service are expected of faculty for promotion to associate professor with tenure. In the evaluation of untenured associate 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.

Teaching

Excellence in teaching is a requisite for promotion within the department. In judging teaching, considerations such as the following will be taken into account: the faculty member's command of his/her subject; the faculty member's ability to organize and communicate the subject matter effectively and to bring in new perspectives in consonance with state-of-the-art research; the faculty member's ability to stimulate students' interest and curiosity; the faculty member's ability to challenge the students intellectually and to inspire them to their best effort; the faculty member's insistence in all appropriate circumstances on clear and effective writing; and the faculty member's willingness to help and guide students, whether it be in the classroom or without. As an example of the latter, special mention should be made of advising, which is an important function of all faculty members and which often, as when directing theses or dissertations, requires a notable commitment of time. Active collaboration in course and program development is also expected of each faculty member.

To be recommended for promotion to associate professor with tenure a faculty member should have shown continued growth as a teacher and consistently have demonstrated a high standard of quality in his/her areas of responsibility, both in direct teaching activities and in advising, mentoring and program development.

Research

No area of academic endeavor contributes as much as does research to the standing afforded the department both within the university and within the larger academic community. Thus, review committees at all levels of the university place great emphasis on scholarly achievement and productivity, and all candidates for promotion must demonstrate clear distinction in this area. Given the diverse interests and responsibilities of members of the department, the type and results of this activity may vary. Some research may emphasize the generation or reinterpretation of knowledge; other research may introduce new approaches or apply existing approaches to a new body of material; still other research may emphasize pedagogical concerns that

incorporate theoretical advances in instruction and/or language acquisition or apply technology in innovative and creative ways. Still other recognized work could consist of such activities as translation, editing scholarly publications, or compiling bibliographies. Just as there are varying forms of scholarly activity and varying results of research efforts, there must be varying criteria and patterns for the evaluation of such efforts. In certain areas of research within the department, the publication of a series of extensive articles may represent work and accomplishment comparable to the publication of a book in another. Specifically, for recommending an assistant professor for promotion and tenure, a book (either published or in press), is a standard expectation in the fields of literary and cultural studies, while in linguistics and pedagogy more weight may be attributed to a series of substantive articles. The research standard in addition comprises a series of refereed journal articles and book chapters in high-quality outlets as documentation, in combination with regular conference participation, of a developing program of original research presented to the profession at large. In all instances, the basic criterion is not quantity alone but the quality and significance of the scholarly activity as an innovative contribution of relevance to the faculty member's and the department's appointed fields.

Recommendation for appointment of a candidate to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a scholar, and can be expected to continue a program of high quality scholarship relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the University.

Service

In addition to teaching and research, a faculty member in the department of Spanish and Portuguese is expected to perform administrative service to the department, the college, the University, and/or the community. To be recommended for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor, or to be recommended for tenure in the case of a probationary associate professor, the faculty member should have rendered effective and significant department and/or college or University service in a cooperative way, have demonstrated success in rendering similar service to the profession at large and/or the community, and show promise of continuing to provide quality service and outreach of relevance to the mission of the department, the college, and the University.

2. Promotion to Rank of Professor

General Considerations

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

According to faculty rule 3335-6-02 (C), 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 department expects an individual ready for promotion to professor to be a role model for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession, which implies adherence to a high standard of contributions to departmental and university tasks. While an individual seeking promotion will be assessed in relation to assigned responsibilities, exceptional performance in these responsibilities is required.

Teaching

To be recommended for promotion to professor, a faculty member should have shown continued growth as a teacher and consistently have demonstrated true distinction at all levels at which he/she teaches, both in direct teaching activities and in advising, mentoring, and program development. See also paragraph A.2., above.

Research

To be recommended for promotion to professor, a faculty member should have made distinguished contributions to his/her field since appointment to the previous rank and should have achieved recognition from the community of scholars in that field. The need for flexible criteria according to the faculty member's area of specialization and its prevalent modes of publication and activity patterns established in paragraph A.3 above applies also here. Within this framework, a typical standard of achievement for promotion to professor, to be understood as additive to the research record established at the time of promotion to associate professor with tenure, will at a minimum imply the publication of an original monograph or equivalent research product having received favorable review in the profession. In addition the faculty member will have published a series of refereed journal articles and book chapters in high-quality outlets documenting a mature program of original scholarship with a documented impact on the field. He or she will also have continued to participate actively in scholarly meetings as well as giving invited lectures in prestigious venues. Other scholarly achievements may further enhance the professional stature of the faculty member.

Service

To be recommended for promotion from associate professor to professor, or to be recommended for tenure in the case of a probationary professor, the faculty member will have rendered exceptional service to the department, the college or University, and/or the profession at large, as well as pertinent outreach efforts for the community. Such service will be characterized by its effectiveness and cooperative nature.

3. Regional campus Faculty

The primary function of the regional campuses is to provide excellent undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities. Regional campus faculty are expected to establish a research program of high quality, but the character and particularly the quantity of that activity may differ from that of Columbus campus faculty because of the weight of other responsibilities and because of lack of access to comparable resources. (See also paragraph IV.A. 1, above.)

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 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) 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.

1 Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates are responsible for submitting 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.

Candidates are also responsible for submitting a copy of the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. Candidates may submit the department's current APT document; or, alternatively, they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion, 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.

If external evaluations are required candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair 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 department chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

2 Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are as follows:

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

- The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV 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 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) 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 moreover 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.
 - **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair.
 - **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.
 - Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship

and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.

- Revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of the full eligible faculty, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
- Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure-initiating unit is another department. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the 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 Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the members of the eligible faculty are as follows:

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

4 Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- 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 moreover not considered for promotion by this department.
- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the chair and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

- To make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting.
- **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 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 warrants 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 Promotion and Tenure Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the department chair of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

5. Regional Campus Faculty

- a. Regional campus faculty who are candidates for promotion and tenure, or promotion, shall first be reviewed by the faculty and dean and director on the appropriate campus using procedures established on each campus. This review shall focus primarily on the faculty member's contributions in teaching and service, which are the areas of greatest weight in the evaluation of regional campus faculty. The dean and the director shall forward the report of the regional campus faculty containing his or her recommendation to the candidate and to the chair of the department. The Columbus campus review focuses primarily on the candidate's scholarly work, but considers all aspects of the record. It is important that the regional campuses and the department work cooperatively to time the promotion and tenure, or promotion, reviews so that the sequential interaction described above may take place.
- b. From this point on, the review follows the same course as all promotion and tenure reviews, as described in the section on procedures above.

6 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.

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 can give an "arms' length" evaluation of the research record and is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will only solicit evaluations 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 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 May prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the 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 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) 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, provided at <http://oaa.osu.edu/sampledocuments.html>, 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.

C. Documentation

1. Teaching

Some of the means which may be used to appraise quality of teaching are the following:

- a. Evaluations made by faculty colleagues who have worked with the faculty member in team-teaching projects, or who can judge his or her teaching in courses prerequisite to their own. Testimony may be solicited from colleagues by the promotion and tenure committee. (See also Section V.A.2.)
- b. Departmental policy requires that all faculty, probationary and tenured, make use

of student opinion surveys through the use of the University-wide SEI forms for all formal classes taught during each semester of each year. The summary reports are received each semester as a complete set by the Department Chair and archived in the respective personnel files. Efforts should always be made to obtain such evaluations from the largest possible number of enrolled students in order to ensure an accurate assessment of student opinion. Faculty members may dedicate class time to do so, but should not be physically present as students fill out the evaluations. In addition, optional documentation of formal instruction may comprise department, college or university evaluation forms other than the S.E.I.

College practice posits the following schedule of peer evaluation. The teaching of probationary tenure-track faculty must be reviewed at least once per year during the probationary period, with the goal of adequately assessing teaching at all levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. When assistant professors are reviewed for tenure and promotion, they are required to have a minimum of five peer evaluations of teaching from the probationary period. The teaching of tenured associate professors should be reviewed at least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. When associate professors are reviewed for promotion to professor, they will be required to have a minimum of three peer evaluations of teaching. The teaching of tenured professors should be reviewed at least once every four years, with the goal of assessing teaching at all levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. Colleagues who are to visit classes will be appointed by the Department Chair in consultation with the respective promotion and tenure review bodies. Classes of assistant professors may be visited by associate professors or professors. Classes of associate professors may be visited by other associate professors or by **professors**. The Department Chair will ensure that an appropriate number of these visits will have been made by professors, especially in the three years predating formal consideration for promotion. Classes of professors will be visited by associate professors or professors; the latter may be selected from the faculty of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese or another department. The Department Chair will ensure that all peer evaluators understand the nature of their task.

Following the classroom visits, the colleague who has visited will write a report containing his or her observations on the classes visited, including such matters as interaction with students, resolutions of problems in the classroom, the level of intellectual stimulation, as well as an evaluation of any instructional materials perused. This report is submitted to the Department Chair, with a copy to the faculty member who has been visited. The latter will discuss the report with the colleague who has visited, and, if he or she so wishes, write a letter to the Department Chair that contains his or her reactions to the report. This letter, like the report on which it is based, will be kept in the faculty member's permanent file.

- c. Careful consideration and evaluation should also be applied to indirect teaching, including advising and mentoring of students, thesis and dissertation direction, development of new courses and curricula. Such teaching activities are considered

part of the normal duties of a faculty member. Quantitative and qualitative assessment of such instructional activities should be commensurate with a faculty member's rank. Appropriate instruments for assessment may be interviews conducted by the promotion and tenure committee, and/or letters solicited by the promotion and tenure committee from appropriate sources.

- d. Special accomplishments in teaching (such as nominations or selection for particular awards).
- e. Self-assessment by the faculty member.
- f. Professional success of former students.
- g. Any other information which the promotion and tenure committee may judge to be pertinent.

2. *Research*

In evaluating scholarly achievement, the promotion and tenure committee should consider both its quality and quantity, but place special emphasis on quality. Work in progress should be assessed whenever possible. An important aspect is the assessment of the value of specific publication outlets, the frequency and significance of citations of the faculty member's work, and published reviews of the candidate's work. Citations in relevant publications or other evidence that the work of the candidate has been recognized by authorities in the field should also be considered. Critical appraisals from distinguished scholars in the candidate's field are required. In arriving at the essential internal evaluation of the candidate's research, the type and scope of each publication shall be carefully considered in assessing its impact in the field. In all cases, the promotion and tenure committee shall also consider the internal and external evaluations it has solicited in attempting to ascertain whether the scholarly efforts of the candidate make an important contribution to the field and show promise of continuing development.

Primary examples of publications that are appropriate kinds of research activity are the following:

- a. Publications
 - 1) Monographic and comprehensive works (books, monographs, articles, etc.) based on original research. These shall be accorded special importance as evidence of scholarly achievement and development.
 - 2) Critical bibliographies as well as editions of conference proceedings and editions of a collection of research articles.
 - 3) Textbooks, source books, instructional software, readers, anthologies of texts, contributions in the area of foreign language teaching, and similar publications which are conceived primarily for undergraduate or graduate instruction. These shall be judged scholarly works to the extent that they utilize or present new methodologies or incorporate ideas derived from original research and that they are pertinent to the academic mission of the department.

- 4) Translations and creative work. These shall be evaluated in the light of such criteria as originality, significance, and pertinence to the academic mission of the department.
- 5) Reviews of scholarly works written for professional journals. In taking such reviews into account, consideration shall be given to the kind and size of the review (review essay, regular review, book notice), and to the type and quality of the scholarly journal in which they appear

b. Other Scholarly Activities

- 1) The quality and frequency of scholarly activity at significant international, national, and regional professional meetings shall be assessed, especially the presentation of papers, formal participation in symposia, official commentaries as discussant of the papers of others, and organization of scholarly meetings.
- 2) Consideration commensurate with the prestige of the citation shall be given to scholarly prizes, awards, grants or fellowships as well as to invitations to deliver public lectures or teach at other universities. The persistence in soliciting, and, wherever applicable, the success in obtaining, external funding for scholarly activities is a regular criterion of evaluation, since the University guidelines require all faculty members to develop consistent activities in this regard.
- 3) Any other evidence which the promotion and tenure committee believes relevant in judging the candidate's success and professional impact as a scholar shall also be considered fully.

3. *Service*

The form that service may take varies greatly among faculty members. The most usual kinds of service, and the ways in which they may be documented, are as follows:

Departmental Service: Work on departmental committees to which the faculty member has been assigned, fulfilling ad hoc assignments. The amount, and quality, of this service may be documented by reports from those who have worked with the faculty member as well as from those who have had occasion in other ways to evaluate that service. It must be recognized that all those with heavy administrative responsibilities, e.g., departmental officers, chairs of major committees, and directors of language programs perform service in which the time commitment is considerable; such service should be appropriately considered by the review committee. To the extent that such service resulted in a reduced course load, the corresponding weight of the assignment should be shifted from teaching to service for the purpose of assessing overall merit. In all cases, effectiveness of a faculty member's service contribution is the primary criterion of quality.

- a. College and University Service: Service to the college and University should be evaluated according to the same principles as service to the department.

- b. Service to the Profession at Large: Service to the profession at large may include service in state, regional, and national professional organizations in the individual's academic field, as office-holder, as member of committees, or in ad hoc assignments on behalf of an organization; work as an academic consultant; work on editorial boards and as referee for scholarly journals; service as referee for faculty members under review at other universities. Such service may be documented by letters of appointment and/or appreciation and shall also be taken into due consideration as an indication of the growing national and/or international stature of the faculty member in question.
- c. Outreach to the community: The criteria for outreach to the community must inevitably vary from individual to individual. It may be documented in the same way as service to the profession. The basic principle in weighing it should be that such service be in support of the academic mission of the department. It should be recognized that the University is becoming increasingly community-oriented, and since members of the faculty are called on more and more to make significant contributions to furthering such community relations by promoting the academic mission of the department, appropriate recognition should be given. The criteria for evaluation will concern effectiveness, continued demand, timeliness, and topicality.

VIII. APPEALS

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>).

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 (<http://trustees.osu.edu>) 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

The Department of Spanish and Portuguese values excellence in teaching across all sections and at all levels of instruction. Student and peer evaluations of teaching provide tools for assessing faculty teaching effectiveness and for providing faculty with regular opportunities for improvement.

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) form and/or an equivalent end-

of- course teaching assessment survey/tool is required in every course offered in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese. Faculty should encourage a high completion rate by explaining the significance of the evaluation.

Faculty are also encouraged to use in-class discursive evaluations of teaching. Such evaluations should be administered in accordance with SPPO policies and expectations. Someone other than the instructor should distribute and collect discursive evaluations while the instructor is out of the room, and completed evaluations should be held in the department office until the faculty member has turned in grades.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Peer evaluation of teaching is required for all faculty members in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese. Peer evaluation should fulfill two basic goals: 1) provide constructive feedback to faculty on both the content and the quality of their instruction, and 2) help faculty to continually improve the overall effectiveness of their teaching at all levels.

The Department of Spanish and Portuguese has established the following guidelines:

Probationary faculty

- The teaching of probationary tenure track faculty must be reviewed at least once per year during the probationary period with the goal of adequately assessing teaching at all levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. When assistant professors are reviewed for tenure and promotion, they are required to have a minimum of five (5) peer evaluations of teaching from the probationary period.
- Peer evaluations of teaching for probationary faculty are comprehensive and include, in addition to classroom visitation, review of course syllabi, instructional materials, assignments, and exams. Faculty under review should provide peer reviewers with the course syllabus and other materials well in advance of the classroom visit(s). They should also provide reviewers with a list of preferred visitation dates. In addition to preparing a written report for the faculty member's file, the reviewer should meet with the faculty member following the classroom visitation for a more informal consultation about his or her teaching effectiveness. To the extent possible, a peer reviewer should be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed.
- Written reports of peer evaluation of teaching should focus not only on classroom performance but also on curricular choices, implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and engagement with current disciplinary knowledge. Written reports should be completed by the end of the semester of review and submitted to the Fiscal/HR Manager who will furnish copies to the Department Chair and the faculty member. The faculty member may provide written comments on this report and the peer reviewer may respond in writing to those comments if he or she wishes. All such comments are appended to the report for inclusion in the faculty member's

promotion and tenure dossier, unless the faculty member requests the comments be excluded.

Tenured and non-probationary faculty

- The teaching of tenured associate professors should be reviewed at least once every other year with the goal of assessing teaching at all levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned. When associate professors are reviewed for promotion to professor, they will be required to have a minimum of three peer evaluations. Reviews should follow the format described above for probationary faculty.
- The teaching of tenured professors should be reviewed at least once every four years with the goal of assessing teaching at all levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.

Additional peer reviews of teaching

- The Department Chair may request peer review of the teaching of any faculty member whom the chair judges would benefit from review. Typically, such reviews are in response to low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance to improve teaching.
- Any faculty member may request additional peer review of teaching. 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 University Center for the Advancement of Teaching (www.ucat.osu.edu).

XI. Revision and Amendment Procedures

Revisions to this document must be consistent with the purpose of the document and with appropriate university rules and policies. With the first year of his or her appointment or reappointment, the Department Chair shall review the Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure document and, in consultation with the SPPO Advisory Committee, draft revisions as appropriate. At other times, the Department Chair or any member of the faculty may propose amendments. Revisions and amendments shall be adopted after consultations with the Advisory Committee. The Department Chair will then forward the revised document to the College of Arts and Sciences. It must be approved by the dean of the college and the Office of Academic Affairs before it may be implemented.