



THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

**Appointments, Promotion & Tenure
Criteria and Procedures**

School of Communication

OAA approved: November 20, 2020

Table of Contents

School of Communication	3
Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Document	3
I. Preamble	3
II. School Mission	4
III. Definitions	4
A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty	4
B. Promotion and Tenure Committee	6
C. Quorum	7
D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty	7
IV. Appointments	8
A. Criteria	8
B. Procedures	12
V. Annual Review Procedures	18
A. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty	18
B. Tenured Faculty	22
C. Tenured Faculty – Regional Campus	23
D. Clinical Faculty	23
E. Lecturers	25
A. Criteria	Error! Bookmark not defined.
B. Procedures	Error! Bookmark not defined.
C. Documentation	Error! Bookmark not defined.
VII. Promotion and Promotion and Tenure Reviews	27
A. Criteria	27
B. Procedures	32
C. Documentation	39
VIII. Appeals	41
IX. Seventh Year Reviews	41
X. Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching	42
APPENDIX A	48
APPENDIX B	59

APPENDIX C 66
APPENDIX D 68



THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

**School of Communication
Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Document**

I. Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the [Rules of the University Faculty](#), the Office of Academic Affairs procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), and any additional policies established by the college and the University. Should those rules and policies change, the School will follow those new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years on appointment or reappointment of the School Director.

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

The principles under which decisions on appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure are made are those articulated in **Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 – General Considerations**<https://trustees.osu.edu/bylaws-and-rules/university-faculty-rules>):

1 Peer review provides the foundation for decisions regarding faculty appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure (except when the provisions of paragraph (H) of rule 3335-6-03 of the Administrative Code are invoked).

2 In accordance with a policy of equality of opportunity, decisions concerning appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure shall be free of discrimination as to age, ancestry, color, disability, gender identity or expression, genetic information, military status, national

origin, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, or veteran status, and other categories covered in the university nondiscrimination policy.

In particular, all faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) and other standards specific to this School and College; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.

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

II. School Mission

The mission of the School of Communication is to achieve national and international distinction in research, teaching and service. To accomplish our mission, the School advances high quality social science scholarship and engages in innovative and excellent undergraduate and graduate education. We serve scholarly, professional and public constituencies by helping improve the understanding of communication processes and by working with professionals in communication, journalism, and other disciplines to improve the practice of communication.

The School of Communication at The Ohio State University embraces and maintains an environment that respects diverse traditions, heritages, experiences, and people. Our commitment to diversity moves beyond mere tolerance to recognizing, understanding, and welcoming the contributions of diverse groups and the value group members possess as individuals. In our School, the faculty, students, and staff are dedicated to building a tradition of diversity with principles of equal opportunity and multiculturalism.

III. Definitions

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

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

1 Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

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

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

2 Clinical Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

- For an initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a clinical assistant professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all clinical faculty in the School.
- For appointment (hiring) at senior rank (clinical associate professor or professor), a review is performed and a second vote cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all nonprobationary clinical faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews

- For the reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of clinical assistant professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured associate professors and professors, and all nonprobationary clinical associate professors and professors.
- For the reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of clinical associate professors, and the reappointment and contract renewal reviews of clinical professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors, and any clinical faculty senior in rank to the clinical associate professor being reviewed.

3. Conflict of Interest

A conflict of interest exists when an eligible faculty member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some way on the candidate's services, has a close professional relationship with the candidate (e.g., dissertation advisor), or has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an objective review of the candidate's work is not possible. Such a conflict may exist when the faculty member stands to gain or lose professionally from the outcome of the review of a candidate.

Generally, faculty members who have collaborated with a candidate on 50% or more of the candidate's published work since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of that candidate. The School also recognizes that there may be instances in the patterns of collaboration or the quality of collaborative work suggests a conflict of interest even though less than 50% of the total work is with a specific colleague. Additionally, there may be conflicts in instances in which the candidate may have collaborative work with multiple co-authors, and the sum of the collaborative effort is greater than 50% of the total work even though any specific individual's collaboration is less than 50%.

4. Minimum Composition

In the event that the School does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the School Director, after consulting with the Divisional Dean, will appoint a faculty member from another department or school within the college.

B. Promotion and Tenure Committee

The School has a Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee (or Committees) that assists the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in managing personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The committee's chair and membership are appointed by the School Director. Ordinarily, the Chair of the P&T Committee is also the Chair of the Committee of the Eligible Faculty. The term of service is two years, with reappointment possible. At least two of the four to five members of the P&T Committee(s) must hold the rank of professor. In consultation with the Chair of the Eligible Faculty, one of the members will be appointed by the Director as the Procedural Oversight Designee (POD), as required by university guidelines. When considering cases involving clinical faculty, the P&T Committee may be augmented by up to two non-probationary clinical faculty members. A faculty mentor for the candidate may serve on the Committee; sharing their insights

from their mentorship is welcome but mentors are not advocates for the candidate and should strive to be as objective as they can in their evaluation and comment.

The Director, in consultation with the Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty (also known as the “P&T Chair”), may appoint one or more P&T Committees for all assistant professors being reviewed for the fourth year review or for the promotion and tenure review during a particular year. The Chair and POD are the same for each committee (unless there is a conflict of interest or other issue requiring a replacement in these roles); other members may be selected who are best qualified to review the areas of research/teaching expertise of the candidate.

C. Quorum

The presence of 2/3 of the eligible faculty in the meeting constitutes a quorum. The Director as well as individuals who are on FPL, official medical leave, who are on their off-duty semester, or who have more than 50% of their appointment outside of the School are not counted in the number needed to reach a quorum. Faculty on approved leave of absences may not participate in personnel decisions including promotion and tenure reviews. A member of the eligible faculty on special assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the School Director has approved an off-campus assignment. Faculty members who recuse themselves or are recused by the Director because of a conflict of interest are not counted when determining quorum. Attendance via conference call or videoconferencing (e.g., Skype, Zoom, or Teams) is acceptable when it is impossible to otherwise participate; the Director and technical staff should be notified as far in advance as possible.

D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

Only those present at the entire review meeting or participating the entire review meeting by conference call or video link are eligible to vote. Those who are not present may not send a vote to be entered on their behalf, nor may they send a written statement to be read, nor have their opinions presented in the meeting, because such statements cannot be responsive to discussion at the meeting. Faculty members who have been recused cannot be represented in the discussion. Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted. Persons participating via conference call or videoconference may vote by sending their vote via email to the staff member present who will count votes; the staff member is responsible for maintaining the anonymity of the vote.

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

1. Appointment of recruited associate professors and professors

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment with tenure is secured when 60% or more of the votes cast are positive (or such a vote of professors for an appointment at the rank of professor).

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

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal is secured when 60% or more of the votes cast are positive. There will be a report of the actual vote in numbers.

Recommendation policies and procedures for initial appointment of assistant professors are described below.

IV. Appointments

A. Criteria

All appointments, reappointments and promotion and tenure decisions are made with the intent of fostering the mission of the School and are made in a non-discriminatory manner. The School, in keeping with its stated mission and with the criteria of the University for faculty appointments (as stated in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 \[A\]](#)), is committed to making faculty appointments that have the strong potential to enhance the quality of the School.

1. Tenure-track Faculty

Instructor: Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but requirements for the terminal degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. The School will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment to the rank of instructor is always probationary and may not exceed three years. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the end of the third year of appointment or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year. When an instructor is promoted to the rank of assistant professor, prior service credit may be granted for time spent as an instructor if the faculty member requests such credit in writing at the time of the promotion. This request must be approved by the School's eligible faculty, the School director, the Executive Dean or designee of the college, 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: The basic criteria for appointment as an assistant professor are ordinarily an earned doctorate, experience and training suggesting a high likelihood of success as a scholar, and evidence indicating the potential to become an excellent teacher.

University rules regarding probationary service and duration of appointments for faculty are found in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03](#). 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 Promotion and Tenure Committee determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted.

Associate Professor and Professor: Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Minimum criteria for tenured associate professors on the Columbus campus are an earned doctorate, a substantial record of scholarly achievement in an area relevant to one of the School's priority areas and/or relevant to the mission of the College, and an evident national reputation as a scholar with potential to attain, or evidence of, international visibility. A sufficiently strong such record may justify appointment as professor, as assessed by the search committee, eligible faculty, Director, and deans. Additionally, there must be evidence that the applicant has been an excellent teacher and has provided substantial service to the profession, the state, and/or the university. Appointment at senior rank normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at senior rank is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. Accordingly, a probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

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

2. Tenure-track Faculty—Regional Campus

Minimum criteria for regional campus faculty appointments are similar to those for Columbus campus appointments. In general, however, relatively lesser weight will be placed on the quantity of a candidate's research compared to Columbus appointments and more emphasis is placed on teaching potential and accomplishments, in recognition of the differing mission of the regional

campuses. The quality, though not the quantity, of research of regional campus appointments should be comparable to that of Columbus appointments.

3. Clinical Faculty

General: In keeping with [Faculty Rule 3335-5-19](#), the School's non-tenurable Clinical Faculty (CF) is designed to attract the most highly-qualified individuals to teach clinical and professional skills-oriented courses.

Minimum Requirements: The minimum basic criterion for appointment as Assistant Professor of Clinical Communication is a master's degree in communication or journalism or a related field and substantial industry/professional experience in the area of appointment.

The minimum criteria for Associate Professor of Clinical Communication or Professor of Clinical Communication include an earned doctorate and substantial industry/professional experience in the area of appointment.

Term: Clinical faculty initial appointments are ordinarily made for three years and require formal approval each year by the Director if they are to be renewed. After the first three years, a second appointment can be made for three years. A third appointment will ordinarily be for five years. There is no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the School wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see Faculty Rule [3335-7-33](#).

4. Associated Faculty

The School appreciates the opportunity to extend its faculty members' intellectual horizons and interactions with associated faculty whenever the opportunity provides a benefit for the School and the faculty member.

Associated faculty appointments carry no presumption of academic tenure. Unless otherwise indicated below, all appointments are for a one-year term which may or may not be renewed. As described below, these appointments may be uncompensated or compensated.

Lecturer: Appointment to the position of Lecturer is made primarily to assist in meeting the School's instructional obligations. As such, the primary criterion for those appointed to these titles is a demonstrated skill as an instructor, especially in undergraduate courses. Senior lecturer appointments require a PhD and relevant teaching experience.

Lecturer appointments are normally made on an annual basis and require formal approval each year by the Director if they are to be continued. The criteria for

appointment will be similar to those used for faculty as outlined in the previous sections of this document. Senior lecturers may be provided with up to 3-year appointments, contingent on available resources and continuing proof of teaching ability.

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

The minimum criteria for visiting faculty are in line with the School's general, tenure-track faculty. This type of appointment is typically unpaid and designated for individuals seeking to use their sabbatical leave to work on research with School faculty, though it may also be provided to capable doctoral level colleagues who are for other reasons in the Columbus area and qualified to teach courses and conduct research in the discipline. Normally the course load for such compensated visiting faculty will be three courses per semester, per negotiation with the Director. Individuals requesting a visiting faculty appointment must have a School faculty sponsor who will present their request at a faculty meeting where a vote will be taken whether or not to grant said request. These requests may also be handled by email if there is a deadline or scheduling issue making faculty meeting presentation impractical.

Proposals for visiting graduate students, or for postdoctoral researchers or fellows, are submitted by the sponsoring faculty member to the Director for approval.

In the event the visiting faculty appointment request includes a compensation component, the sponsor must first seek the Director's approval before proceeding. If the compensated or uncompensated appointment is approved by the Director, the sponsor will then present the request at a faculty meeting where a vote will be taken whether or not to grant a time-limited position. The vote is advisory to the Director.

Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct faculty, as described above, are uncompensated persons with credentials appropriate for appointment to tenure-track rank, performing significant teaching, research, or service roles for the School that require a formal appointment and title. School tenure-track faculty may propose to the Director such appointments, who will review the request and then forward it for approval to the eligible faculty at a rank recommended by the Director (but that must be reviewed by faculty).

The Director may also initiate such requests for review and approval by appropriate eligible faculty.

5. Emeritus Faculty

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

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the School director outlining academic performance and citizenship. The Committee of Eligible faculty (tenured and nonprobationary clinical associate professors and professors) will review the application and make a recommendation to the School director. The School director will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the Executive Dean or designee. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule [3335-05-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered.

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

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

6. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

No-salary/courtesy appointments are extended to Ohio State faculty from other tenure initiating units on the expectation of the appointee's substantial involvement in the School and its programs. Continuation of such courtesy appointments is contingent upon the continuation of the appointee's contributions to the School. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course from time to time, or a combination of these. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

B. Procedures

See the Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (<https://oaa.osu.edu/policies-and-procedures-handbook>) for additional information.

1. Tenure-track Faculty

All faculty searches must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#). A national search is required unless an exception is approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs (tenure-track faculty only).

All personnel appointments in the School are made upon the recommendation of the Director and the approval of the Executive Dean or designee of the College of Arts and Sciences. Appointments at the associate professor or professor ranks, with or without tenure, and offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency status.

The School Director has primary responsibility for recruiting new faculty in collaboration with the Chair of the Search Committee. All faculty appointments are competitive on the basis of excellence of qualifications. The Director is assisted in faculty recruiting by faculty Search Committees, the Executive Committee and Associate Director, and the faculty as a whole. All consultation with School personnel on faculty appointments, including discussion and votes taken in faculty meetings, is advisory to the Director.

All faculty vacancies are School vacancies; the entire faculty of the School has a vested interest in recruiting quality faculty, regardless of their particular area of specialization. The decision to focus a search or make a hire in a given program area is the responsibility of the Director, who will be advised in these matters by the Executive Committee and the School faculty.

All faculty members are encouraged to help in publicizing, recruiting, and evaluating applicants for faculty positions. The official mechanism for recruiting new faculty is the Search Committee. Search Committees will normally consist of four to five tenure-track faculty members plus the Director as an *ex-officio* member. One member of the committee will be designated as Search Committee Chair and another member as diversity advocate.

Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo inclusive hiring practices training available through the College of Arts and Sciences in consultation with the Office of Diversity and Inclusion. Implicit bias training, also strongly encouraged, is available through the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity.

The Search Committee Chair, working with the Search Committee and the Director, shall prepare and place notices of the position vacancies in appropriate professional outlets, such as professional organizations' mailing lists, websites, newsletters, etc., and internal publications according to university regulations. The committee shall make every effort to solicit applications from minority candidates for all positions. The Search Committee screens all application materials. Faculty who are not members of the Search Committee are invited to provide their input into this screening process.

If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must advertise using at least one 30-day online ad in a national professional journal. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency ("green card"), and strict U. S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their appointment to a tenure track position included an advertisement in a field-specific national professional journal.

Following the application deadline and consultation with the faculty, the committee then recommends to the Director any candidates they would like to bring in for an interview. The Director may select one or more of these candidates to interview, with the approval of the divisional dean. In giving this approval, the divisional dean will also consider the diversity of the pool, in line with the college policy that at least one of the candidates would bring diversity to the School. If the Director has substantial disagreement with the Search Committee recommendation regarding the selection of candidates, advice of the Executive Committee will be sought.

The Chair of the Search Committee, in consultation with the Director and the School's fiscal/HR officer and School staff, coordinates visits of all applicants. All faculty and graduate students are given an opportunity to meet with the candidates and express opinions as to the suitability of each candidate. Graduate student meetings with candidates should not be attended by faculty. All candidates for faculty positions are required to present a School colloquium. All candidates interviewing for a particular position must follow the same interview format. Following campus visits, the Search Committee systematically solicits the reactions of faculty and students about the applicants. In addition to open-ended comments that are sought after each visit, each faculty member will indicate with a "yes" or "no" whether the candidate would be an acceptable faculty member in the School.

The Search Committee collects all the comments from faculty and tabulates the acceptability of each candidate. After discussion among members of the search committee, the Search Committee Chair makes a rank-order hiring recommendation to the School Director. After the Search Committee discusses its

recommendation with the Director, the Search Committee will take the recommendation to the faculty as a whole for discussion and action.

The Chair of the Search Committee or assigned committee members will summarize the Search Committee's assessments of the candidate and faculty comments. A description of courses to be taught will be included in this summary. Then, the search committee first makes a recommendation to the faculty as to whether or not each candidate is acceptable as a potential hire. The Search Committee's recommendations for acceptability will stand unless someone on the eligible faculty disagrees and makes a motion for discussion of a given candidate. If this motion is seconded discussion ensues, and a vote for or against acceptability of that candidate will be taken by secret ballot.

Following the Search Committee summary and any discussion/vote re unacceptability, the members of the Search Committee and the eligible faculty will discuss all acceptable candidates. After discussion, faculty will indicate their first choice in a secret ballot. If there are multiple candidates, the candidate receiving the most first choice votes will be considered the faculty recommendation, and the one with the second most first choice votes the second choice recommendation, etc. If the number of votes is tied, the search committee recommendation for rank order of tied candidates will be taken as the faculty recommendation.

Ordinarily, such votes will be conducted by secret ballot, but in some instances other concerns (such as expediency) may require a discussion over e-mail or other form, and/or a ballot may be public or via various (non-anonymous) forms of communication; normally, we use a Qualtrics ballot under such circumstances to maintain anonymity to the extent possible.

All recommendations of the Search Committee and the faculty are advisory to the Director. The Director or a designee will receive the ballots and count them (in the presence of a Search Committee member), and will announce the vote to the faculty present.

The Director, in consultation with the divisional dean, will determine whether a formal offer will be extended to the top candidate, whether one of the lesser ranked candidates should be offered the position, or whether a new search should be conducted. The Director will keep the faculty apprised of negotiations and will inform the faculty of the success or failure of an offer. If an offer is refused or rescinded, the Director will decide whether to make an offer to the second ranked candidate if previously deemed acceptable, and then if need be, the third candidate if three have been deemed acceptable, and so on if there are more acceptable candidates. Likewise, more than one acceptable candidate may be made offers if positions are available and approved by the executive dean or designee. If the Director does not follow the faculty recommendation, an explanation of this decision will be provided to the faculty.

2. Tenure-track Faculty - Regional Campuses

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

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, School Director, School eligible faculty, regional campus search committee, and divisional dean or his/her designee. 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 School Director 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 School Director and the regional campus dean.

3. Clinical Faculty

Searches for clinical faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the on-campus interview is on clinical/professional practice rather than scholarship, and exceptions to a national search only require approval by the college Executive Dean or designee. Lecturers with a distinguished record of teaching and service to the School and/or profession may be appointed, upon recommendation of the Director and vote of eligible faculty, to clinical faculty appointment.

4. Transfer from the Tenure-track

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a clinical appointment if appropriate circumstances exist. Tenure is lost upon transfer, and transfers must be approved by the School Director, the college Executive Dean or designee, and the Executive Vice President and Provost. The request for transfer must be initiated by the faculty member in writing and must state clearly how the individual's career goals and activities have changed.

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

5. Associated Faculty

The appointment, review, and reappointment of all compensated associated faculty are decided by the School Director in consultation with the school's eligible faculty. Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or

visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the School and are decided by the School Director in consultation with the School's eligible faculty.

Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances up to a maximum of three years. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three consecutive years.

Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are usually made on an annual basis. After the initial appointment, and if the School's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment up to three years may be offered.

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

6. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

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

Nominations for courtesy appointments in the School for individuals holding faculty rank in other tenure initiating units of Ohio State are initiated by faculty of the School. Nominations are made to the faculty of the School and should include advance distribution of the nominee's vita. At the faculty meeting at which the nomination is considered, the nominator should review the highlights of the nominee's vita and discuss the contributions the nominee would make to the programs of the School.

Following discussion, a vote by secret ballot will be taken. The Director will make the final decision and will notify the nominee and the Chairperson of the nominee's unit of the courtesy appointment. Termination of an existing courtesy appointment may be initiated by any faculty member. The primary reason for

failing to renew an appointment is the lack of a substantive contribution to the School.

V. Annual Performance and Merit Review Procedures

Formal annual performance and merit review of the faculty will be conducted by the Director and may be based on input from and consultation with the tenured faculty (for probationary faculty) and the professors (for tenured associate professors).

The School follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the Faculty Annual Review Policy (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>). The annual reviews of every faculty member are based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and service as set forth in the School'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 School Director is required (per Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#)) to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#)) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

A. Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to the School Director no later than December 31st for the year under review:

- Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, *Policies and Procedures Handbook*, Volume 3 (*required for probationary faculty and recommended for associate professors*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (*non-probationary faculty*) organized per the School's documentation request;
- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)

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

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

B. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty

At the time of appointment, probationary tenure-track faculty members shall be provided with all pertinent documents detailing tenure initiating unit, college and university promotion and tenure policies and criteria. If these documents are revised during the probationary period, probationary faculty members shall be provided with copies of the revised documents. (see [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03](#))

Performance and merit reviews of probationary faculty take place annually. For untenured faculty, this review is a critical component of monitoring progress toward tenure and promotion. The annual review also serves as a basis for annual salary recommendations, for assisting faculty in developing and carrying out professional plans and for calling attention to performance problems where they may exist. It is expected that probationary faculty will exhibit substantial strength and continued progress in research, teaching and service within the context of the mission of the School, University rules pertaining to promotion and tenure, and years in service as an assistant professor. Performance in all three areas should show a trajectory toward demonstrating excellence, though strong confidence about excellence in research and teaching accomplishments are crucial as these are the chief dimensions of performance appraisal at the time of consideration for promotion and tenure.

Mentors The School has adopted a formal mentoring system. Detailed information on mentors and mentoring is in Appendix C.

Faculty Review Each year, the Director, in consultation with the Chair of the Eligible Faculty, will convene the Eligible Faculty of the School for the purpose of reviewing all probationary faculty members.

Committee members will be provided with access to full dossier and documentation to be reviewed by deadline dates provided by the Director. The dates may vary depending on College and University deadlines. Although the College requires that candidates submit a CV to the School Director, the dossier is the standard used for annual review considerations so candidates should assure that it is as up-to-date as possible. Any discrepancies between the dossier and the CV will be resolved through use of the dossier material, rather than the CV. The Chair of the Eligible Faculty will preside over the meeting and the Director and an assigned staff member will make note of comments and recommendations associated with each faculty member reviewed. These comments and recommendations will be used by the Director when writing annual review letters and will be used during individual conferences. Votes on renewal are not taken during annual review years (except the 4th year) unless there is a motion for nonrenewal from the faculty, or a request from the Director.

Feedback The Committee of Eligible Faculty (tenured faculty in the School) will meet annually to discuss the progress of assistant professors. The Eligible Faculty (in this case, professors) will meet annually to discuss the progress of associate professors. Comments from the Eligible Faculty will be used in the Director's annual review letters, and the Associate Director and Chair of the Promotion and Tenure committee will assist the Director in the drafting of these letters.

The Director will meet with every untenured faculty member annually to discuss the faculty member's performance and future goals and plans. In this meeting, the Director will convey to the faculty members feedback regarding their performance in the teaching, research and service categories.

This feedback is to include any evaluative assessments provided by the meeting of the tenured faculty during the deliberations of the eligible faculty, and any other pertinent assessment of the faculty member's progress toward tenure, including discussion of dimensions on which the assessment by the eligible faculty, and/or the Director differ. The letter provided to the faculty member is considered a draft in that any factual errors can be corrected by the faculty member (with appropriate documentation) before the letter becomes part of the personnel file.

Annual performance and merit reviews should be constructive and candid. Tenured faculty in the School and the Director should use the review process as a means to be supportive and helpful to untenured faculty as well as to candidly and clearly communicate aspects of performance that need improvement if the candidate is to make acceptable progress toward tenure. Any and all written comments submitted by the faculty member will be placed in his/her annual review materials.

Annual review information will help guide salary recommendations, although additional considerations may impact these recommendations. In a separate letter there will be a salary recommendation (for Columbus faculty).

If the School Director recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The School Director'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 School Director's letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the Executive Dean or designee. For tenure-track regional campus faculty, this written feedback is conveyed to the regional campus dean. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments).

If the School Director recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#)) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the executive dean or designee makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

As set forth in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03\(F\)](#), *Probationary appointments may be terminated during any probationary year because of inadequate performance or inadequate professional development. At any time other than the fourth year review or mandatory review for tenure, a nonrenewal decision must be based on the results of a formal performance review conducted in accord with fourth year review procedures as*

set forth in paragraph (C)(3) of this rule. Notification of nonrenewal must be consistent with the standards of notice set forth in [Rule 3335-6-08](#) of the Administrative Code.

1. Regional Campus Faculty

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

2. The Fourth Year Review

The fourth-year review of probationary faculty is conducted in the same time-frame as the annual reviews of other probationary faculty but requires a more elaborate report of activities from the faculty member. The fourth year review of probationary faculty shall follow the same process as the review for tenure and promotion at the School and College levels with one exception: External letters of evaluation are not solicited. Renewal of the appointment of a probationary assistant professor for the fifth year requires the approval of the Executive Dean or designee of the college, who makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

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

The eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the School Director, who conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the School 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 School Director recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

3. Exclusion of Time from probationary period

The School follows the provisions of **Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D)** (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules/chapter-3335-6-rules-of-the-university-faculty-concerning-faculty-appointments-reappointments-promotion-and-tenure.html>). Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

C. Tenured Faculty

Performance and merit reviews of all tenured faculty members take place annually. The annual review also serves as a basis for annual salary recommendations, for assisting faculty in developing and carrying out professional plans and for calling attention to performance problems where they may exist. It is expected that all tenured faculty will exhibit substantial strength and continued progress in research, teaching and service within the context of the mission of the School.

Faculty Review The committee of eligible faculty, consisting of professors, will review the documentation of associate professors. The comments and recommendations provided by the professors will be used by the Director when writing annual review letters for associate professors. Reviewed faculty members may respond in writing to the annual review summary and such response will be included in their personnel file along with the Director's letter.

The assessment of performance will include both strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate. This review should play a critical role in monitoring progress toward promotion to the rank of Professor.

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the School Director, who conducts an independent assessment; meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

A formal annual performance and merit review of the professors is conducted each year by the Director. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the School of Communication, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the School, the college, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty.

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

In addition to the annual review letter, there will be a separate letter concerning salary recommendations (for Columbus faculty). Annual reviews are intended to be constructive and candid, and to communicate aspects of performance that need

improvement as well as strengths. All annual review letters become a part of a faculty member's personnel file.

Response to evaluation and review of personnel file For all faculty members, the annual review letter includes a reminder that the faculty member may respond, in writing, to feedback about performance and that the faculty member may review his or her personnel file. [Faculty Rule 3335-5-04\(A\)\(6\)](#) states: *“At the time of their initial appointment and when they receive their annual review, faculty members shall be given notice of their right to review their personnel file maintained by their tenure initiating unit... A member of the faculty may place in his or her primary personnel file a response to any evaluation, comment or other material contained in the file.”*

D. Tenured Faculty – Regional Campus

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

E. Clinical Faculty

Performance and merit reviews of Clinical Faculty (CF) take place annually. For CF, this review is a critical component of monitoring progress and serves as a basis for annual salary recommendations. It is also a resource for CF in developing and carrying out professional plans and serves as an aide in calling attention to performance problems where they may exist.

It is expected that CF will exhibit substantial strength and continued progress in teaching and service within the context of the mission of the School, university rules and years in service as a CF member. Performance in the following areas should show a trajectory toward demonstrating excellence and are the chief components in considering promotion.

Review of assistant professors of clinical communication will be conducted by the Eligible Faculty consisting of all tenured faculty and associate professors and professors of clinical communication; review of associate professors of clinical communication will be conducted by the Eligible Faculty consisting of tenured professors and professors of clinical communication; and review of professors of clinical communication will be conducted by the Director (and, if the Director so chooses, by the Associate Director or chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee).

Performance areas include classroom teaching and service to the unit, college, university, and/or community. In addition to demonstrating excellence in teaching and service, we expect Clinical Faculty to:

- Embody the highest ethical and professional standards of the discipline
- Maintain current knowledge in the CF member's area of expertise
- Demonstrate understanding and commitment to the goals of the School

The School is committed to excellence and will not renew a probationary appointment following any annual review in which it is apparent that the candidate's likelihood of meeting performance expectations is poor.

Faculty review Each year, the Director, in consultation with the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, will convene the eligible faculty of the School for the purpose of reviewing all CF members. The dates may vary depending on College and University deadlines. The Chair of the committee of Eligible Faculty will preside over the meeting and the Director and an assigned staff member will make note of comments and recommendations associated with each faculty member reviewed. These comments and recommendations will be used when writing annual review letters and will be used during individual conferences. The Director will perform annual, written evaluations of CF at the same time that the tenure-track faculty are evaluated. The comments and recommendations of the review committee will be used by the Director when writing annual review letters and will be used during individual conferences. Annual review letters may be written in collaboration with the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee (aka Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty).

The Eligible Faculty will be provided with CVs and related materials by deadline dates provided by the Director.

Feedback The Director will annually meet with every CF member to discuss the faculty member's performance and future goals and plans. During their individual meetings, the Director will convey to the CF member feedback regarding their performance in the teaching, service, professional standards and other expectations.

All annual review letters become a part of a CF member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

Annual reviews should be constructive and candid. Tenured and tenure-track faculty in the School and the Director should use the review process as a means to be supportive and helpful to CF as well as to candidly and clearly communicate aspects of performance that need improvement. Any and all written comments submitted by the CF member will be placed in his/her annual review materials. In a separate letter there will be a salary recommendation.

As set forth in [Rule 3335-7-07](#), the Director will notify CF at the end of each year of the probationary period whether he or she will be reappointed for the following year. By the end of the second-to-last year of the contract, the School Director must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If the position will not

continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed.

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. This review proceeds identically to the review that follows fourth year review procedures for tenure track faculty, with the exception that external evaluations are not solicited. Following the review, the clinical faculty member shall be notified whether a new contract will be offered or not. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

After the completion of a probationary 3-year contract, CF may be reappointed for additional terms ranging from 3 to 5 years. These extended appointments are not probationary, and the individual can be terminated before the end of a contract only for a cause (as defined in [Rule 3335-5-04](#) of the Administrative Code) or financial exigency (as defined in [Rule 3335-5-02.1](#)).

F. Lecturers, Adjuncts in a Teaching Role, and Compensated Visiting Faculty

General Formal annual reappointment review of lecturers, and other associated faculty carrying out instruction, such as adjuncts in a teaching role and compensated visiting faculty, will be conducted by the Director of Communication Studies and the Director of Journalism Studies (as appropriate) and may be based on input from and consultation with the tenured faculty. The annual review serves as a basis for calling attention to outstanding performance and performance problems where they may exist.

Documentation During the Spring of each year, the Section Heads of Communication and Journalism Studies will be provided with all documents necessary for reviewing the full-time lecturers and other temporary instructors during the previous calendar year. These documents include SEI reports and open-ended comments from all of the sections that each lecturer has taught.

Review The time-frame for the review will be the previous calendar year. A review of each full-time lecturers' and other instructors' performance will be sent to the lecturers at the end of Spring.

Annual reviews should be constructive and candid. The Section Heads for Communication and Journalism Studies should use the review process as a means to be supportive and helpful to the lecturers or other instructors as well as to candidly and clearly communicate aspects of performance that need improvement. Following the annual review, the section heads make a recommendation to the School Director regarding renewal/nonrenewal. The School Director's recommendation on reappointment is final.

G. Salary Recommendations

The School Director recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the Executive Dean or designee of the College, who may modify these recommendations. The recommendations are based on the current annual performance and merit review as well as on the performance and merit reviews of the preceding 24 months. Equity can also be considered in accordance with college guidelines.

Raises for regional campus faculty are determined by the regional campus Deans/Directors after consultation with the Director of the School.

For tenured and tenure-track faculty, the greatest consideration for merit increase is given to the research component of the faculty assignment. Assessment of research accomplishments is centered on the amount and quality of scholarly research published in well-respected outlets and generation of significant grant support for research. A three-year rolling average is used in assessing research performance, so that the normal fluctuations in research productivity are not unduly rewarded or go unrewarded if they don't coincide with years in which raises are higher than usual. Submitted research proposals for significant grants, if reviewed positively but not funded, will also be considered in the salary exercise as research activity in the year submitted (but not as part of the three-year rolling average).

Quality teaching and service, while expected, are factored in especially if there are exceptional strengths (e.g., winning a university teaching award; winning a national award in a journalism/communication organization; elected to high office in a national organization) or weaknesses in these two components of the position.

For clinical and associated faculty, merit increases will be based on consideration of their teaching records and their service contributions (such contributions are optional for associated faculty).

For all faculty members, teaching contribution is assessed by a variety of criteria such as formal student evaluations (SEIs), peer reviews of instructional substance (e.g., quality of syllabi, materials and assignments, etc.) and process (e.g., enrollment figures, dropout rates, classroom visitation, engagement of students, etc.), importance of the course to the School's graduate and undergraduate programs and so forth. Substantial attention also is paid to mentorship activities: supervision of high quality dissertations, masters and honors theses, and scholarly papers and presentations authored or co-authored by students.

Assessment of service includes a judgment of the extent of effort, accomplishment and value to the School, and includes whether one's professional expertise is devoted to a task within the School, the college, the university, the state of Ohio, the nation and in professional organizations. Especially time-intensive service roles with a significant administrative component (e.g., Director of Graduate Studies, Section Heads for Communication and Journalism Studies) may be compensated with a course reduction

and/or summer support. Such reductions often need approval from the college administration.

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

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

VI. Promotion and Promotion and Tenure Reviews

A. Criteria

1. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure

According to [Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 \(D\)](#): *In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, when 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... 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 to criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.* According to [Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 \(C\)](#): *The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a scholar, and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the university.*

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

The School of Communication is a leading research and Ph.D. granting program in the field. Tenure reflects a level of achievement for early career scholars that provides a high degree of confidence that the candidates will develop and sustain over the course of their career a record of outstanding research accomplishment

and scholarly impact in their areas of expertise consistent with a strong national and international scholarly reputation. Tenure also reflects a high level of capability as classroom instructor and research mentor, and a demonstrated capacity to contribute as a citizen of the School, University, and profession, as well as to society as a whole.

Criteria for assessing the potential for an outstanding research career include quality, productivity, distinctive scholarly contributions to the understanding and study of theoretical, methodological, and/or substantive issues significant to the discipline of communication as a whole and/or one or more of the component subfields studied here at the School of Communication, as well as the research program's cohesiveness and potential for scholarly impact. Potential social impact of the research contribution is also considered. Assessment of quality is based on peer review success in appropriate Web of Science Core Collection (formerly known as ISI) journals and in grant proposals, if those are part of the record, and on expert assessment by external reviewers, the P&T committee, and the Eligible Faculty. Productivity is assessed primarily based on rate of publication in Web of Science indexed journals. If placement is primarily in relatively specialized journals, without a strong record of publication in leading disciplinary general interest (flagship) journals, a higher rate of publication is typically expected. Expert endorsement of research publication quality from faculty and external reviewers, indicating quality is commensurate with an emerging strong national and international scholarly reputation in the candidate's area of expertise, becomes particularly important. Publications in excellent journals from other social sciences and allied fields outside of Communication are also valued; their contribution to the study of communication issues should be readily discernible. The pattern of productivity and the research pipeline are also examined with respect to evidence for likely future productivity. Distinctive intellectual contributions and capacity to do quality work independent of guidance from senior faculty are assessed by looking at the intellectual cohesiveness of the research program, at work published without senior collaborators, and at documentation of the candidate's intellectual leadership and distinctive contributions in their collaborative research efforts in projects including senior co-authors. Potential for scholarly impact and social importance is primarily based on evidence from citation analyses and the expert assessment of School faculty and external reviewers.

Criteria used to assess a high level of capability as a classroom instructor include review of Student Evaluations of Instruction (SEI), review by School faculty of syllabi, assignments, and class materials, and classroom observations. Criteria for assessment of performance as a research mentor includes record as a graduate advisor, feedback from faculty regarding performance as a graduate committee member, and record of co-authorship of peer-reviewed articles with School students, particularly in quality communication journals that will increase the competitiveness of School graduate students on the academic job market.

While service expectations are reduced for assistant professors, all faculty members are expected to participate in service to the School and to the profession. Service is assessed through a review of the record of committee, professional organization, and peer review activities, and the personal experience of tenured faculty with the candidate in their service role.

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](#).

Candidates should review Appendix A for a more in-depth explanation of these criteria and for some relevant suggestions.

See *OAA Dossier Guidelines; Expectations for Assistant Professors Before Promotion to Associate Professor [Appendix A]*

2. Promotion to Rank of Professor

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 School expects an individual ready for promotion to professor to be a role model for less senior faculty, for students and for the profession. While the individual seeking promotion should be assessed in relation to assigned responsibilities, exceptional performance in these responsibilities is required. Internal cases for promotion and external hires at that rank should be comparable to the quality of external candidates who could be hired.

Promotion to professor in the College of Arts and Sciences requires excellence in scholarship, teaching and service beyond that achieved prior to tenure. The record in all three areas also must be such that it inspires strong confidence of continued professional growth and productivity in ways relevant to future directions of the School. Excellence in scholarship means attainment of measurable national and international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of high quality published research that contributes to the understanding and study of theoretical and/or substantive issues significant to the discipline of communication as a whole and/or one or more of the component subfields studied here at the School of Communication. A successful candidate will have achieved national distinction as a scholar based on high-quality productivity and have an established a strong national and international reputation. Citation records are important indicators of scholarly impact consistent with promotion to professor and are accordingly weighed relatively heavily. The substantial probability that a

high rate of quality scholarship will continue needs to be established; a strong record of publication in quality journals is needed subsequent to tenure and promotion. Efforts to obtain external support for research are normally expected of candidates for professor, though the School and College recognize that availability of support varies by specialization. Success in significant grant generation is also a marker of national recognition and potential for scholarly and substantive impact, and provides further evidence for readiness for promotion to rank of professor.

Excellence in teaching means providing to all students the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning in the social and behavioral sciences and providing to the most capable and motivated students an enhanced learning experience. A strong record of mentorship as a dissertation and thesis advisor and as a co-author with students, is another important criterion for promotion to professor. Excellence in service means providing a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more publics – including the college, the University, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, the nation and professional organizations. As professors are expected to take an active role in School leadership and governance, a strong record of service to the School is generally expected (though in some cases the record may focus more on service to the University and discipline). Some significant professional service roles, current or past, are also typically expected of candidates for professor.

See Appendix B for more details regarding promotion to professor.

See OAA Dossier Guidelines; Expectations for Associate Professors Before Promotion to Professor [Appendix B]

3. Regional Campus Faculty

Expectations for regional campus faculty differ somewhat from those for faculty on the Columbus campus. The primary mission of the regional campuses is to provide high quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities. The relative emphasis on teaching and service expected of regional campus faculty will, therefore, ordinarily be greater. While the School expects regional college faculty to establish a program of high-quality scholarship and publication, it recognizes that greater teaching and service commitments and less access to research resources for regional campus faculty require difference research expectations. In general, although regional faculty are not expected to have a research output that is as high as that for Columbus faculty for promotion purposes, the overall quality of this research is expected to be comparable.

See OAA Dossier Guidelines; Expectations for Assistant Professors Before Promotion to Associate Professor [Appendix A]; Expectations for Associate Professors Before Promotion to Professor [Appendix B]

4. Clinical Faculty

Promotion to Associate Professor of Clinical Communication in the School of Communication requires a doctoral degree in the area of expertise and a sustained record of excellence in clinical teaching and in service. Excellence in clinical teaching refers to providing to all students the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning in practice-oriented courses, and providing to the most capable and motivated students an enhanced learning experience. The record in these two areas also must be such that it inspires strong confidence of continued professional growth and productivity in ways relevant to future directions of the School. The claim that promotion of the candidate will improve the overall quality and standing of the School and program area needs to be supported. Internal cases for promotion and external hires at this rank should be equally strong.

Excellence in clinical teaching is demonstrated through student evaluations and peer reviews of instructional substance (e.g., syllabi, materials and assignments, feedback on assignments and exams) and process (e.g., enrollment figures, dropout rates).

Excellence in clinical service means making available a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more publics -- including the college, the university, the Columbus community, the State of Ohio, and professional organizations, as well as on the national level. Evidence of service excellence is provided not only through the individual's record of offices held and organizational involvement but also through peer evaluation, where peers may be faculty members, collaborators, or others who have first-hand knowledge of service contributions.

There is no mandatory time-frame for promoting assistant professors of clinical communication. Promotion to associate professor of clinical communication is neither automatic nor to be expected in all cases. The eligible faculty may recommend consideration for promotion in the following cycle when conducting annual reviews. The candidate submits a dossier, leaving blank those sections referring to scholarly research and citations (pedagogical publications can be discussed under service). No external letters are solicited. The dossier is reviewed by the P&T Committee, and a letter developed for the Eligible Faculty, who review the case, revise the letter, and vote upon the candidate.

Promotion to Professor of Clinical Communication in the School of Communication requires a doctoral degree in the field of expertise and a sustained record of exceptional performance in clinical teaching and service beyond that achieved at the clinical associate professor level. The record in these two areas also must be such that it inspires strong confidence of continued professional growth and productivity in ways relevant to future directions of the School. The School expects that individuals ready for promotion to professor of clinical

communication will be role models for less senior instructors, the students, and for the profession. Internal cases for promotion and external hires at this rank should be equally strong.

Outstanding clinical teaching includes an international reputation in the area of expertise which has been formed through teaching workshops, books and articles that demonstrate leadership in teaching in addition to university/industry/organizational awards. Student evaluations and peer reviews of instructional substance (e.g., syllabi, materials and assignments, feedback on assignments and exams) and process (e.g., enrollment figures, dropout rates) must indicate an outstanding teacher.

Outstanding performance in clinical service includes making available a high level of professional expertise and experience to one or more publics -- including the college, the university, the Columbus community, the state of Ohio, and professional organizations, as well as on the national and global level. Evidence of service excellence is provided not only through the individual's record of offices held and organizational involvement but also through peer evaluation, where peers may be faculty members, collaborators, or others who have first-hand knowledge of service contributions. In addition, individuals who are considered for clinical professor should have demonstrated exceptional strengths in service, as evidenced through high office in national organizations. Teaching loads for clinical faculty may be reduced on the basis of service activity.

Appointment to professor of clinical communication involves additional responsibility and privilege. Professors should be significantly engaged in charting the direction of the School. Evidence of willingness and ability to participate constructively in School administration is also a consideration in appointment to professor of clinical communication.

There is no mandatory time-frame for promoting associate professors of clinical communication. Promotion to professor of clinical communication is neither automatic nor to be expected in all cases.

The eligible faculty may recommend consideration for promotion in the following cycle when conducting annual reviews. The candidate submits a dossier, leaving blank those sections referring to scholarly research and citations (pedagogical publications can be discussed under service). No external letters are solicited. The dossier is reviewed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and a letter developed for the Eligible Faculty, who review the case, revise the letter, and vote upon the candidate.

B. Procedures

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

[procedures-handbook](#)). The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty in the School.

1. Candidate Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the candidate are as follows:

- To submit a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist.
- To submit a copy of the APT document under which the candidate wishes to be reviewed. Candidates may submit the School'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.
- This must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the School.
- To review the list of potential external evaluators developed by the School Director and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The School Director decides whether removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

2. Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

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

- To review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the Director and 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 60% majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.

- The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
- A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) for one year. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
- Consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policy, only faculty members who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non-mandatory tenure review. The committee must confirm with the School Director 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 School.
- A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the School Director, 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 a Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.
 - Suggest names of external evaluators to the School Director.
 - **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.

- Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
- 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 School Director.
- 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 School Director 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 School's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this School'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. School Director Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the School Director 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 School.

- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Director and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To solicit an evaluation from a TIU head of any TIU in which the candidate has a joint appointment.
- To make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- 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. The Director will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the School review process:
 - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and School Director
 - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and School Director
 - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the School Director, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the School Director, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.

- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline, except in the case of associated faculty for whom the School Director recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the School Director 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 School Director's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the Chair of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

5. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

Regional campus faculty are first reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus Dean/Director. The regional campus review focuses on teaching and service.

The regional campus Dean/Director forwards the written evaluation and recommendation of the regional campus review to the School Director, from which point the review follows the procedures described for the Columbus campus faculty.

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. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for clinical faculty. The decision to seek external evaluations relevant to teaching or service for a clinical faculty member will be made by the School Director after consulting with the candidate and the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee; these are not required for clinical promotion review, as such promotion does not carry tenure.

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 school will only solicit evaluations from professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State, unless there is a compelling reason otherwise and the evaluator is approved by the College. 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.

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

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the School Director, and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this School requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The School follows the College of Arts and Sciences’ suggested format, provided at <https://ascintranet.osu.edu/Promotion-Tenure>, 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 School Director, 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 School's written evaluations or brought to the attention of the Office of Academic Affairs for advice.

C. Dossier

As noted above under Candidate Responsibilities, every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline. While the Promotion and Tenure Committee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by the candidate.

The complete dossier, including the documentation, is forwarded when the review moves beyond the School. The documentation of scholarship and service noted below is for use during the School review only, unless reviewers at the college and university levels specifically request it.

- 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 review.

1. Teaching

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

- cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class
- peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the School's peer evaluation of teaching program (details, including number, provided in this document)
- 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.
- teaching activities as listed in the core dossier, including
 - involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research
 - mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers

- extension and continuing education instruction
- involvement in curriculum development
- awards and formal recognition of teaching presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences
- adoption of teaching materials at other colleges or universities
- other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate

2. Scholarship

The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to present. Examples of documentation include:

- Copies of all books, articles, and 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 research as appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted)
- scholarship activities as listed in the core dossier including documentation of creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus including artwork, choreography, collections, compositions, curated exhibits, moving images, multimedia, performances, radio, recitals, recordings, television, and websites
- documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options and commercial licenses
- list of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work
- Supplemental materials, such as letters from publication or grant proposal coauthors to clarify the contribution of the candidate to certain publications or proposals. The decision to seek letters from coauthors will be made by the School Director after consulting with the candidate and the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The requests to coauthors will be made by the School Director or the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

3. Service

The time period for material included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty it is the date of last promotion to present. Examples of documentation include:

- service activities as listed in the core dossier including
 - involvement with professional journals and professional societies
 - consultation activity with industry, education, or government
 - clinical services

- administrative service to School
 - administrative service to College
 - administrative service to university and Student Life
 - advising to student groups and organizations
 - awards and prizes for service to profession, university, or School
- any available documentation (e.g., letters from committee Chairs) of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier

VII. Appeals

It is the policy of The Ohio State University to make decisions regarding the renewal of probationary appointments and promotion and tenure in accordance with the standards, criteria, policies, and procedures stated in these rules, supplemented by additional written standards, criteria, policies, and procedures established by tenure initiating units and colleges. If a candidate believes that a non-renewal decision or negative promotion and tenure decision has been made in violation of this policy and therefore alleges that it was made improperly, the candidate may appeal that decision. Procedures for appealing a decision based on an allegation of improper evaluation are described in [Rule 3335-5-05](#) of the Administrative Code. ([Faculty Rule 3335-6-05\(A\)](#)).

VIII. Seventh Year Reviews

Every effort should be made to consider new information about a candidate's performance before a final decision is made if the new information becomes available before a decision is rendered. In rare instances, a tenure initiating unit may petition the Executive Dean or designee to conduct a seventh year review for an assistant professor who has been denied promotion and tenure. Both the eligible faculty of the unit and the (Director) must approve proceeding with a petition for a seventh year review. The petition must provide documentation of substantial new information regarding the candidate's performance that is germane to the reasons for the original negative decision. Petitions for seventh year reviews must be initiated before the beginning of the last year of employment because the seventh year review, if approved, would take place during the regular university review cycle of the assistant professor's seventh and last year of employment.

If the Executive Dean or designee concurs with the tenure initiating unit's petition, the Executive Dean or designee shall in turn petition the provost for permission to conduct a seventh year review. If the provost approves the request, a new review will be conducted equivalent to the one that resulted in the non-renewal of the appointment. The conduct of a seventh year review does not presume a positive outcome. In addition, should the new review result in a negative decision, the faculty member's last day of employment is that stated in the letter of nonrenewal issued following the original negative decision.

The tenure-track faculty member may not request a seventh year review, appeal the denial of a seventh year review petition initiated by his or her tenure initiating unit, or appeal a negative

decision following a seventh year review, since the faculty member has already been notified that tenure has been denied at the conclusion of the sixth year review. ([Faculty Rule 3335-6-05\(B\)](#))

IX. Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

It is expected that all faculty will be responsible teachers, and among other things, their classes will meet regularly; they will remain up-to-date in course content; be available for weekly office hours; conduct teaching evaluations in a professional manner; and strive to perform as effective teachers.

The School employs multiple methods for reviewing teaching. These consist of a) the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) for each course, b) peer observations, and c) formal peer assessment of teaching materials, and d) annual reviews of teaching.

Additionally, if Eligible Faculty members or the Director have concerns or questions about aspects of teaching that appear to be problematic, additional reviews, including peer observation and assessment of teaching materials (beyond the number required) may be recommended or required.

Table 1. Teaching Review Requirements

	SEI	Peer Observation	Formal Evaluation of Methods and Materials	Annual Review of Teaching
Lecturer	Every course	1 in the year before promotion review	1 in the year before promotion review	Annually
Clinical Assistant	Every course	Every 2 years including first year of appointment	Three times within first six years, including the first year	Annually
Clinical Associate	Every course	Every 2 years; 1 in the year before promotion review including in first year of appointment if a new hire	Every 4 years including the first year of appointment if a new hire; 1 in the year before	Annually

			promotion review	
Clinical Professor	Every course	Every 3 years including in first year of appointment if a new hire	Every 4 years including in the first year of appointment if a new hire	Annually
Assistant Professor	Every course	Three before tenure review	Twice before tenure review	Annually
Associate Professor	Every course	Every 2 years	Every 4 years (a minimum of one before promotion review);	Annually
Professor	Every course		Every 4 years	Annually

1. Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI).

[Faculty rule 3335-3-35](#) requires students be given the opportunity to evaluate the quality of instruction provided in each of their courses, and accordingly, student opinions must be obtained in **every** formal course. Failure to evaluate every course will significantly affect performance reviews and merit pay.

In the School of Communication, SEIs are the primary tool used for evaluating student reactions to a professor's teaching because they cover every course. All faculty in the School are expected to have their students use the electronic SEI teaching evaluation form for each course they teach during the year and are encouraged to use class time to allow students to access them through the mobile application. Faculty may supplement, but may not replace, the evaluation instrument with their own. In addition, faculty may directly upload supplemental questions in accordance with SEI administrative deadlines and procedures for the inclusion of discursive comments. The university's SEI administration will provide the SEI results to each faculty member.

The Chairs of Communication Studies or Journalism Studies, in consultation and agreement with the School Director, will decide when to employ additional open-ended evaluations, although a faculty member may request them at any time.

Since open-ended comments are not representative statistically, they are not used in promotion and tenure decisions but are consulted on an as needed basis to provide additional context to the quantitative reports.

2. Peer Observations (Classroom Visits) are conducted by tenured faculty and will be scheduled as follows:

- a. Three times before a tenure review, untenured assistant professors will have their peer teaching observation for a representative course. Peer observations for clinical assistant professors will be conducted in the second year and every other year after that.
- b. Tenured faculty will have peer observations every two years and one in any year before seeking promotion. Clinical faculty seeking promotion will have observations occur as close as possible to the review for promotion. Because of scheduling issues, candidates for promotion need to notify the Chair of the P&T Committee at least one year in advance of her or his intention to be considered for promotion.
- c. In cases where the Director discerns that a particular faculty member or lecturer is facing teaching difficulties, the Director may require peer observation of classroom teaching performance and/or recommend the use of the university's instructional training resources.

3. Formal Evaluation of Teaching Methods and Materials (untenured faculty and tenured faculty seeking promotion)

A formal evaluation of teaching methods and materials will take place twice before a tenure review. Assistant professors undergoing a formal evaluation of teaching will submit an explanation of the peer teaching methods (e.g., formal class meetings, online meetings, etc.), and the review materials (handouts, exams, etc.) for each course they have taught through the School prior to their first evaluation of teaching methods and materials. For any evaluation following the first evaluation, materials for all courses that have not been covered in a prior review should be included.

Formal peer evaluations of teaching methods and materials for clinical assistant professors will be conducted three times within the first six years as a clinical assistant professor, and every four years after that. There will be a minimum of 1 evaluation of teaching materials and methods within one year prior to a tenured faculty member's submission of materials for promotion to professor or a clinical faculty member's request for promotion.

The materials to be submitted for each course offered during the period under review are:

- Course Objectives and Personal Assessment Form
- Narrative describing the contact hours within the course and how they were distributed (online versus in class, etc.)
- The Syllabus for each course offering
- All exams, written assignments and handouts for each course offering
- SEI reports from all courses taught at Ohio State (Cumulative SEI)

All peer teaching review materials will be due in electronic form to the main office on the same date as set by the School's Director for submission of all annual review materials. The review committee will also have access to prior teaching review reports.

Procedures for conducting the peer review of teaching methods and materials are as follows: Two tenured faculty members ("reviewers") will be assigned to the assistant professor ("reviewee") being reviewed. Each reviewer will be given all the peer review materials submitted by the reviewee. The pair of reviewers will assess all peer teaching review materials separately and will then meet together to reach consensus judgments on the following criteria:

- Appropriateness of course objectives,
- Degree to which instructor's personal assessment criteria matches well with the stated course objectives and method of delivery,

- Degree to which classroom instruction, assignments, and new technology are utilized to meet the state course objectives,
- Currency of readings,
- Consistency of assignments, examinations and course objectives,
- Syllabus construction and clarity
- Rigor of course requirements, and
- Student reaction and evaluation.

The focus of peer reviews is on assessing teaching quality and making suggestions for improvement. A single memo summarizing findings of this evaluation, and any suggestions for improving teaching, will be crafted by the pair of reviewers and provided to the reviewee, the eligible faculty, and the Director, and is included in the P&T dossier. The eligible faculty members' discussion of the candidate's teaching performance will also be summarized and included in annual review letters.

Peer Teaching Secondary Reviews

The faculty course materials review processes are intended to provide useful feedback to faculty members and to identify possible issues that may need attention. If an initial peer review identifies issues, the appropriate Committee Chair (Graduate, Undergraduate Journalism or Communication) would work with the faculty member to make sure the syllabus or course content issues are addressed in accordance with School policy and expectations. A brief report on how the issues were corrected would be included in the dossier file.

4. Annual Reviews of Teaching

Assistant, clinical, and associate professors can expect their overall teaching performance to be assessed by the relevant eligible faculty as part of the annual review process. The eligible faculty of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shares their assessment with the Director and this information forms that basis for the teaching section of the annual review letters. SEIs and Peer Observations, as well as the Formal Peer Evaluation report, are included and referenced within the annual reviews of teaching. Additionally, where applicable, aspects of graduate teaching in non-formal settings, such as research collaboration, mentoring, and guidance are addressed annually. The annual reviews take account of the abilities, strengths and weaknesses of each faculty member, and also comment on the teaching trajectory, anomalies, or particularly stellar achievements. The annual review also serves to aid the director in determining course load and teaching quality in assessing performance. If Eligible Faculty members or the Director have concerns or questions about aspects of teaching that appear to be problematic, additional aspects of teaching assessment may be recommended.

This promotion and tenure document is subject to continuing revision. It must be reviewed and either revised or reaffirmed on appointment or reappointment of the School Director. It is very desirable for the Director and faculty to reach consensus on the document, although formal faculty acceptance of the document is not required. Where divisions in the School make consensus or formal faculty approval impossible the Director may have to implement a promotion and tenure document without consensus. Revisions may be made at any time. Changes will be made in consultation with the School faculty until sufficient changes have accumulated to warrant distributing a new document. All revisions, as well as periodic reaffirmation, are subject to approval by the College office and the Office of Academic Affairs.

APPENDIX A

Expectations for Assistant Professors before Promotion to Associate Professor School of Communication

To reiterate the criteria provided in the body of the APT document: The School of Communication is a leading research and Ph.D. granting program in the field. Tenure reflects a level of achievement for early career scholars that provides a high degree of confidence that the candidates will develop and sustain over the course of their career a record of outstanding research accomplishment and scholarly impact in their areas of expertise consistent with a strong national and international scholarly reputation. Tenure also reflects a high level of capability as classroom instructor and research mentor, and a demonstrated capacity to contribute as a citizen of the School, College, University, and profession, as well as to society as a whole.

The material that follows is intended to provide more explanation and context regarding these promotion and tenure criteria as outlined in the APT document. Our hope is that this additional context will help candidates better understand how the eligible faculty approaches the tenure evaluation process and decision, and in so doing will help them better develop their own career decision-making. The guidance provided below should be interpreted in the light of the APT text in the body of the APT document, if any terms or phrases might otherwise be considered open to multiple interpretations.

Research

Success as an academic in a leading Ph.D. granting program requires a deep passion for and commitment to original and significant research and scholarship. Excellence typically reflects intellectual curiosity and capability, desire to contribute to knowledge and to society, and commitment to carrying out the best research of which one is capable. Criteria for research and scholarly excellence consistent with tenure in the School of Communication include quality, placement, productivity, distinctiveness of contribution and development of independence from one's advisors and other early mentors, cohesiveness, and potential for cumulative scholarly and social impact, as reflected primarily by peer reviewed publications, and, for some candidates, grants. This assessment can be a complex process, and is discussed in detail below.

Quality

Research quality. Research quality includes the significance, impact, and originality of intellectual/theoretical contribution, methodological rigor and in some cases methodological innovation, insight provided regarding significant social phenomena, and research designs that yield or involve the kind of data that support the intended contribution. A variety of means and criteria are used to assess research quality.

Placement. One of the key indicators of research quality is a function of the peer review process. The top-ranked general interest journals in each discipline, for example, typically provide especially careful and critical review of theoretical and/or substantive contribution, methodological rigor and where appropriate methodological innovation, research design, and potential scholarly impact. There is a clear presumption that work published in such journals has

passed a high level of scrutiny from reviewers and editors who are leaders in their disciplines, examining work in competition with submissions from the best researchers in the discipline or, in some cases, across multiple disciplines.

We emphasize, however, that such prestigious placement is a useful but not the only indicator of quality. Placement in such journals is a better fit for some scholars than for others. When placement is good (e.g., in strong sub-disciplinary and cross-disciplinary specialty journals) but not characterized by publication in the top general-interest journals in communication, allied fields, or the sciences more broadly, it is necessary for promotion and tenure reviewers to scrutinize more closely other evidence for quality and likely scholarly and social impact over the course of a career. Such evidence is discussed below. Conversely, even a record of prestige placements does not obviate the expert examination of quality by the promotion and tenure committee, eligible faculty, and external reviewers, and having some such placement(s) is not a guarantee of a successful tenure review.

An exceptional form of success involves positive peer review outcomes when those who submit and review include top scholars across many disciplines. There are a handful of highly-ranked multi-disciplinary journals that serve researchers across the sciences and social sciences. Likewise, when a candidate is successful as principal investigator in receiving major grant funding (e.g., NIH grants, NSF regular awards, NIH and NSF career awards, and major grants from Departments of Defense, Energy, and other federal agencies), this also demonstrates successful experiences in rigorous peer review from top experts in competition with leading scientists and scholars from a broad range of disciplines. We emphasize that such successes are by no means an expectation and indeed may be unusual at the assistant professor level; the presence of such success, however, is quite impressive with respect to peer review assessment of research quality and significance.

However, again, placement in leading general-interest journals in communication and allied disciplines, or successfully competing for grant funding on a national scale, are not the only ways to evidence superior research quality. Another way to demonstrate such research quality is an impressive record of more specialized publication in well-respected and relatively high impact sub-disciplinary or specialized interdisciplinary journals, especially for a researcher/scholar primarily focused on understanding a specific domain of communication activity and human behavior. The requisite level of quality, however, is less convincingly attested by placement alone. In such cases, the tenured faculty and Director will of necessity depend more heavily upon expert evaluations including external reviews and committee assessments of quality, level of productivity, how intellectually cohesive and theoretically and methodologically sound the work appears to be, and its potential for intellectual impact and the potential social importance of research findings. Within this context, external support from highly competitive funding sources such as NIH or NSF, including smaller grants typically intended as a first step towards building larger projects, is valuable (but by no means obligatory) additional evidence with respect to quality as assessed by peer review.

Journal impact factors are a helpful but imperfect indicator of placement quality. These impact factors and comparative rankings are indicated in Web of Science for each discipline. Impact factor is in part a function of the size of the discipline, whether the research specialty area is

currently “hot,” or if the journal focuses on review articles that receive heavy citation. Low impact factors (e.g., below 1.0 and in particular non-Web of Science), however, do suggest a less demanding journal, an extremely highly specialized journal, or a new journal that is yet fully to establish its reputation. Such outlets may be quite appropriate for some research and useful in building a research program (e.g., publishing on a new measure, an initial pilot study, or some small-scale research led by a graduate student), but should not represent a major element in the case for tenure and will receive little weight in the evaluation process.

Productivity

Productivity is a very important predictor of a candidate’s actual and potential intellectual and social impact, and of the likelihood of continuing research activity after promotion. In assessments of productivity, a number of factors must be weighed together and holistic judgments must be made.

Publication quantity. It is impossible to specify a single, fixed number of publications required of all faculty members. There are a variety of factors that predictably influence tenure expectations. Placement quality is a factor: When placement in top disciplinary or multi-disciplinary general-interest publications (or “flagships”) is limited or non-existent, a relatively larger number of more specialized publications generally are to be expected. Evidence of intellectual leadership and intellectual cohesiveness (see below) are factors that also influence judgments re productivity.

Pattern of productivity. The pattern of productivity is another factor considered by the School. A pattern of productivity in early years that diminishes markedly, or conversely a pattern of quite modest productivity with a sudden burst of publication prior to tenure review raises questions about the likelihood of continued scholarly productivity after tenure. Publications from graduate school or other institutions prior to coming to OSU are considered as part of the candidate’s research record, and a year or so of slowdown while transitioning to a new institution is to be expected. However, if the pattern of productivity shows substantially less success at OSU than elsewhere, that may raise concerns about the likelihood of success after tenure.

Pipeline. Papers currently submitted or under revision, and recent conference papers likely to move into journal submission, are used to assess the pipeline and provide a sense of the candidate’s momentum; placement of papers under review or in revision is of interest in the assessment process. In addition, external grant efforts, even if unfunded, also indicate potential scholarly impact in the future. The competition for grants involves top researchers from many disciplines, and even well reviewed but unfunded applications made during tight funding times suggest a high level of research capability. Scoring and ratings of unfunded grant proposals can be listed in the dossier and discussed in the research narrative. Such a record of publications in process and unfunded as well as funded grant submissions will be considered in the discussion of research pipeline and can prove useful as evaluators assess future potential.

Scholarly monographs. Scholarly monographs can be an important contributor to judgments of productivity and quality if they are clearly scholarly contributions and not textbooks (though such monographs are in no regard an expectation); the quality of the publisher, reputation of the

manuscript reviewers and/or series editor, the publication status at time of tenure review, the nature and presence of book reviews in scholarly journals, and the expert judgments of evaluators within and outside the School, are important to this assessment. Candidates interested in such an approach should consult with their mentors and the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Editing anthologies is discussed below.

Book chapters. As noted above, a good record of publication in quality peer-reviewed Web of Science journals is an essential element in a tenure record. As a consequence, book chapters carry little or no weight in assessment of research productivity or quality. However, under some circumstances such publications can help in articulating the cohesiveness of a research program and/or visibility in the field. An opportunity later in the probationary cycle to make a case for the cohesiveness and impact of one's research program in a book chapter can be used to help support one's arguments for programmatic contribution and intellectual cohesiveness in the tenure portfolio. However, if presentation of a research agenda or theoretical perspective can be accomplished through publication in peer-reviewed journals (e.g. the *Communication Theory, Annals of the International Communication Association*), that is to be preferred over book chapters. Careful selectivity in agreements to do book chapters or edit anthologies is recommended, and assistant professors are advised to confer with their mentors.

Non-Web of Science journals. Non-Web of Science journal publication, as noted above, may be useful on occasion in building a research program (e.g., publishing on a new measure or some small-scale preliminary research one wishes to cite in future or providing a venue for early work led by a graduate student). Such publications have little or no persuasive impact with respect to demonstrating whether there is an adequate level of productivity. In particular, candidates are strongly discouraged from publishing in what are sometimes referred to as "pay to play" or "predatory" open access journals. These journals typically have relatively low quality peer review, little or no indexing, can be financially quite costly, and will sometimes require copyright transfer on submission which effectively captures the author's work so it cannot be withdrawn. Therefore, open access journals that are not listed with Web of Science, EBSCO, or Scopus will normally be entirely ignored in terms of assessing a candidate's record, and indeed can weaken rather than strengthen the impression of quality for that record.

Conference proceedings. Conference proceedings are considered much as other forms of publication: if they are listed in Web of Science, they are considered a form of journal publication and attention is paid to impact factor and ranking within a discipline's journals. If not, they are considered an alternative form of non-Web of Science publication and are given little weight in evaluation.

Encyclopedia entries. These carry no weight in tenure and promotion (nor in annual reviews). They typically might be undertaken as a favor to an editor or other colleague, or if the topic is so closely related to the scholar's interest that writing it takes little time. Generally, we advise assistant professors to avoid them. We recommend candidates consult with their mentor and/or the Chair of the P&T Committee if they are in doubt as to how to handle an invitation to contribute such an entry. In some cases, some handbooks with substantive chapters written by highly visible scholars may refer to themselves as encyclopedias; in such cases the candidate should provide relevant explanation in the research narrative.

Scholarly leadership, distinctive contributions, programmatic research/intellectual cohesiveness, significance to the field of communication, and potential for cumulative impact

Scholarly leadership means that one's research directions and ideas are driven by one's own capacity and expertise and by one's ability to articulate these ideas and design research to pursue them. By capacity and expertise we refer to a) evidence for a strong grasp of relevant theory, reflected in an ability to contribute to theory building or to take original or distinctive approaches to applying theory to important social problems that demonstrates a grasp on the relevant theories and extends their application in scientifically as well as socially valuable ways, b) the ability to design and conduct studies that propose and effectively test hypotheses arising from such thinking, and c) methodological expertise that permits the necessary data collection and data analysis, or collaboration with appropriate data analysis experts for highly specialized analyses. Regardless of what happens with any given collaborator, the research program can be expected to continue and develop apace, resulting in continued significant publication and impact and widespread recognition of the candidate as an authority in his or her own right. It is essential that evaluators conclude that the candidate has the capacity to be productive and to make a distinctive contribution without dependence on a specific individual or group of collaborators or mentors. Some scholars will always, and appropriately given their research foci, tend to work in collaborative teams. However, the University and School must be confident of continued successful research contributions after tenure when the candidate will be expected to increasingly lead such collaborative research efforts.

An intellectually cohesive or programmatic research portfolio is one in which distinctive research topics or questions are pursued in a way that suggests the development of an identifiable research identity for the candidate that clearly promises to mature in time to world-class scholarly expertise in the understanding and study of theoretical, methodological, and/or substantive issues significant to the discipline of communication as a whole and/or one or more of the component subfields studied here at the School of Communication. Such cohesiveness is important because it typically leads to cumulative scholarly and perhaps social impact consistent with a national/international scholarly reputation. Clear programmatic foci readily distinguishable from that of collaborators and mentors provide evidence of intellectual independence and distinctive contributions, even when the corpus is primarily collaborative.

The most direct way to evidence intellectual leadership is through publishing articles in excellent journals that are either single-authored or first-authored with graduate students or other untenured colleagues as co-authors. The more such publications exist, the more readily intellectual leadership can be inferred. However, we recognize that this model is not applicable to all candidates. In some areas, access to appropriate data sets or research populations, addressing especially complex social or scientific problems, or engagement in ambitious field research, is often possible only through collaboration with more senior colleagues. Such cases place greater demands both on the candidate and on our faculty as evaluators with regard to assessment of distinctive intellectual contribution and intellectual leadership; we emphasize, though, that such a scholarly approach can certainly be compatible with demonstration of intellectual leadership and distinctive contributions.

All of the following may prove valuable for making accurate evaluations: a strong record of first-authorship, detailed information about the contribution of various team members (especially senior co-authors), letters from senior collaborators explaining their role versus the candidate's unique contribution, a clear programmatic focus or substantive/methodological expertise that suggests the candidate was responsible for the key contributions in collaborative research, and information about co-author expertise that suggests lack of overlap with the expertise and contribution of the candidate. We recommend candidates clearly explain in their research narrative how their contribution to each relevant collaborative article contributes and exemplifies their distinctive research contribution. We also positively view co-authorship roles in which distinctive contributions arising from the candidate's expertise are crucial to research success even though the candidate is not leading the research project or publication, but these should be documented and in addition to and not instead of work led by the candidate. Obviously, it is best in such cases that all or almost all collaborative work is not done with one team, as the unique contribution of the candidate in such cases becomes harder to discern and will require more convincing documentation.

Generally, it is expected that in the first few years after the PhD or completion of a postdoc that there will be publications co-authored by advisors and other mentors, but there should also be growing evidence of independence from these mentors beginning as soon as practicable. We do recognize that in some cases there may be continuing involvement with a mentor on some publications (this may happen in a variety of areas, health and data science are typical examples) when access to hard-to-obtain data or populations depends on contacts and resources of such faculty. In those cases, it is essential to provide documentation regarding the limited role of the senior faculty member, and the School will normally seek a report from the senior faculty member concerning their role. Please see Appendix D regarding involvement with collaborative and team science projects and suggestions as to how to document one's role in such projects.

In any event, we strongly encourage at least some clearly that is sole-authored or authored with graduate student co-authors only to better demonstrate the capacity to conduct, write up, and publish high-quality research on one's own, even if the portfolio emphasis is on team science and collaborative work. This also permits evaluators to compare the intellectual quality of such manuscripts to collaboratively-produced manuscripts to help confirm that collaborative work led by the candidate reflects the quality they are capable of without the assistance of their collaborators. Grants received (or with respect to pipeline, proposals submitted) by the candidate as Principal Investigator (alone or when Principal Investigator duties are shared) also provide evidence of intellectual leadership in conjunction with other such evidence, even though these often require senior collaborators to be viable; senior collaborators might be overgenerous about authorship but are unlikely to cede or share fiscal control over a significant grant unless it is justified by the extent of the candidate's intellectual leadership and contribution.

Candidates whose expertise is primarily methodological may have challenges in that their role is often collaborative. In such cases, some independent journal publications on methods may help address the issue of independence and programmatic quality; other such candidates may take the lead on independent articles addressing substantive questions, while employing their methodology. In such cases, the intellectual cohesiveness may center more on creative and

original application of methodology, innovation and development of important methods, and application to important questions, rather than on topical cohesiveness.

Programmatic quality and cohesiveness are important predictors of a scholar's prospects for having a broad scholarly (and perhaps social) impact over the arc of a career. True mastery over the research literature and relevant methods can typically only be accomplished in a limited number of domains. It is the accumulation of research and contributions that normally builds a career, a reputation, and a record of substantive contributions. Such cohesiveness is assessed subjectively by the faculty and by external reviewers. Candidates' research narratives, and if available programmatic discussions in a theory article or book chapter, can assist evaluators in making such judgments.

Significance of theoretical, substantive, and/or methodological contributions to the field of communication is of course most readily demonstrated by publication in highly-regarded journals in the communication field. If a major portion of the candidate's work is published in journals from other fields, the P&T committee and the committee of the eligible faculty will make a qualitative assessment of the scholarly merit and significance of the candidate's work with respect to important issues, questions, and/or methods in the communication field or in its component sub-disciplines.

It should be noted (see Teaching section below) that faculty are strongly encouraged in their work with graduate students to publish with them in well-respected general interest and leading specialty journals in Communication, even when much or most of their publication record is in journals outside of Communication. Absence of such publication in strong Communication journals with graduate students can be a matter of significant concern. Such publication is an important aspect of a faculty member's mentorship role in training and preparing graduate students for the academic job market in Communication, where most of our students go. The Eligible Faculty should provide continuing feedback regarding progress in this direction during annual reviews. Faculty who come to the School trained in disciplines other than Communication therefore are strongly encouraged to familiarize themselves with relevant theoretical and empirical literature in Communication (syllabi in Contemporary Communication Theory and appropriate Communication graduate electives are a good starting point). Doing so is also important to effective teaching of undergraduate and graduate communication classes.

Scholarly and Social Impact

We seek scholars who contribute to the empirical, research-based understanding of communication phenomena in ways that are intellectually and socially important. Potential for scholarly and social impact involves, in part, subjective assessment of the candidate's scholarly contribution and expertise by internal and external evaluators.

Placement of research in quality communication journals clearly attests to the significance of work to understanding communication-related phenomena. Placement of research in quality journals in allied disciplines may frequently be the more appropriate choice given the topic, methods, or desire to impact a wider intellectual audience; however, it does mean that the

candidate will need to articulate to evaluators the kinds of contributions they seek to make as scholars to understanding communication phenomena.

A relevant objective measure of scholarly impact involves the number of Web of Science citations, especially to work led by the candidate. Web of Science citation is a required element of the dossier. Candidates have the option of providing Google Scholar and/or Scopus data, information about news coverage, etc., in their research narrative (with relevant tables appended to the dossier as necessary) to further document impact of their research. Citation both within and outside of the Communication field is welcome; as we encourage faculty members to have the broadest intellectual influence of which they are capable.

Citations do have issues as a criterion in evaluating candidates for tenure. Being a co-author, even third or fourth author, in graduate school with a prominent mentor on what proves to be an influential publication can lead to relatively high citation counts even in the absence of impact of the candidate's own work. Conversely, if the best work of the candidate is in the year or two prior to review, there is little time for citations to build. Nonetheless, an unusually low citation count signals reason for concern; there would have to be a high degree of confidence and strong supportive evidence given productivity, placement record and pipeline that this picture would change for a positive decision to be made. Conversely, a strong count for first-authored work can be quite impressive for an assistant professor. Therefore, the citation pattern is examined so as to help make inferences regarding the long-term prospects for intellectual impact.

We welcome and value citation from outside the Communication discipline as well as within it; however, if the candidate has little or no citation from scholars publishing in Communication or closely allied specialty journals, this may signal a matter of concern. Proportions of citations, however, are not an issue. For example, a respectable absolute count of citations within Communication, or journals in which Communication scholars in the relevant subfield frequently publish, that represent a small percentage of a large citation count overall, would not be seen as a problem.

Evidence for social impact is welcome but, as there are no ready metrics for such influence and because the social impact of foundational research may be better understood after a generation rather than after a few years, it is not essential. Evidence for social impact includes documented use of one's research by policy-makers or in judicial decisions, news coverage in major reputable publications in contexts suggesting the scholarly value of the research for understanding some social issue, and invitations to participate in state or federal expert panels. Such social impact evidence can enhance evidence for a scholar's potential influence, but do not replace citation and other more conventional metrics. Social media counts, hit counts, etc., are problematic as evidence given ample recent experience suggested that controversy or support for partisan positions is a better route to social media success than careful, evidenced-based study. Internet postings in quality curated sites such as The Conversation or the Psychology Today blog are valued as a form of community outreach and are addressed under Service.

In summary, a candidate's research portfolio is assessed as a whole. Tenured faculty must assess evidence that a candidate is an excellent researcher who has a very high likelihood of making continuing distinctive, significant research contributions over the course of their career, resulting

in a substantial national and international research reputation and impact as a leading scholar in her/his area of specialty. The candidate's task is to perform at a level during the probationary years that permits such a confident determination. There are various routes through which this can be demonstrated, as noted above. We advise that people place articles as well as they can, publish as much quality work as they can manage, pursue funded research if it is a fit for their research direction and if they can do so while maintaining a good publication record. All these should help document a record of scholarly leadership and a distinctive and cohesive research program that has clear scholarly and/or social impact, with well-evidenced potential for significant and on-going impact over a career.

Teaching

The School values the teaching role highly and takes pride in the excellence of our faculty as instructors and mentors. Instruction and mentorship is a natural extension of a love for and commitment to knowledge and understanding that is central to the academic life. Tenure requires at the least a solid level of performance as a classroom instructor. Mentorship is emphasized in promotion and tenure decisions; excellence in mentoring students is an essential role in a top PhD program. True excellence in the instructional and mentorship roles, combined with a good record of performance in service, may have an impact in those tenure cases in which the research portfolio is quite strong, but there nonetheless is some disagreement among eligible faculty about some of the parameters of the research portfolio given the high level of expectations at the School of Communication. This is the case for two reasons: it is clear that the faculty member can contribute as a research mentor, teacher, and colleague in ways that significantly benefit the School, and because in our experience across-the-board high performance suggests a level of capability and commitment that is usually reflected in continued strong research performance over a career. Conversely, such a research record is unlikely to be given the benefit of the doubt when instruction, mentorship, and/or service are unimpressive. Conversely, teaching and service excellence do not substitute for excellence in research, and tenure is not possible without a very strong research record consistent with a top research unit, which promises continued scholarly success over a career; there are other academic institutions that are better suited to faculty for whom research excellence is not a defining characteristic.

Instruction

Classroom instruction is a central element of the teaching role. Instruction is assessed by internal peer review of syllabi, assignments, and other materials, including assessment of course content coverage, rigor, and use of class time; through peer visits to the classroom; and by assessing ratings on the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI). For candidates for promotion and tenure, some early challenges are not uncommon; in such cases, we look for a clear pattern of improvement on these criteria over time to levels indicative of high quality instruction. Creation of new courses, curriculum innovations, and creation of widely accessible teaching resources, if part of the record, are included in the assessment of candidates' instructional role, though they are not expected of probationary faculty.

Mentorship

Mentorship is particularly important to the teaching role in a one of the world's leading PhD programs in Communication. Mentorship is assessed by the performance of the candidate in graduate committees as reported by colleagues, the record of the candidate with PhD and MA advisees, by graduate student placement in quality employment, and in publication with graduate (and if appropriate, undergraduate) students. While we particularly value placement in research-oriented academic environments as indicative of a high level of research training, we also recognize the value of placement in corporate, non-profit, and government settings requiring research training, and in teaching-oriented post-secondary institutions for students who find their passion is for teaching.

To underscore this emphasis on research mentorship, we strongly encourage faculty to co-author with their advisees and other graduate students, and to encourage their students in turn to take the lead on subsequent collaborative work. Often in the social sciences, this is indicated by listing the faculty mentor as “corresponding author”; it may be helpful to arrange with the graduate student lead author that you be listed as such, which permits you greater ability to oversee and mentor the revision process. To further support our emphasis on research mentorship, we favor a pattern in which the faculty member may begin as lead author and then move to co-authorship with a graduate mentee as lead, and regard the latter publications with comparable weight as we give to publications led by the candidate. Therefore, there is no pressure to maintain first authorship for the sake of tenure review when it would be reasonable to allow the graduate student to take the lead on the project (assuming there is also a good record of first-authored publications by the candidate).

Because graduate students typically seek employment in the Communication discipline, we strongly encourage collaborative publication with graduate students in journals in the communication discipline to demonstrate mentorship—especially in the leading general interest and specialty journals in the discipline—as that is typically prioritized by search committees in the field. We also appreciate evidence of involvement with undergraduates in research labs and in undergraduate theses and research competitions.

Service

Service commitments and responsibilities should rise steadily during the pre-tenure years. While service expectations for untenured assistant professors are substantially less than they are for tenured faculty, it is important for such faculty to demonstrate their commitment to the profession, the School, and the University as well as to the field.

Expectations of School service. Candidates are encouraged to self-nominate or, if someone else nominates you, run for election to School committees. Additionally, candidates can make their interests known to the Director for possible appointment. Most of our assistant professors are members of at least one School committee each year (with the exception of the first year at Ohio State). There may be times in which an assistant professor is not an official member of any single committee. However, even in those years, there are numerous opportunities to participate

in faculty governance and development at the School level. Being a good citizen of the School includes involvement in the work that needs to be done.

Expectations of service to the academic profession. Untenured assistant professors are strongly encouraged to actively engage in reviewing manuscript submissions to journals. We also typically see untenured faculty members reviewing for at least one division of a major organization (ICA, NCA or AEJMC) each year or engaging in other equivalent professional organization service very early in their careers. It is common for our assistant professors to review 3-6 journal articles per year on average. Editorial board service on high impact journals serves as an indicator of recognition of the candidate's expertise by senior colleagues. Such service is by no means an expectation, and we don't suggest pushing to be included on an editorial board unless you are a very active reviewer for a journal. We encourage assistant professors to speak to their mentors for guidance on enquiring about a possible editorial board service if you are a frequent reviewer for a given ISI journal. Likewise, service as a peer reviewer for NIH, NSF, and other major U.S. and international grant programs indicates recognition for a scholar's special expertise. Leadership roles within professional organizations, typically related to the candidate's research specialty, are also favorably considered.

College/University/State of Ohio/national service. Typically, opportunities for this type of service are through invited lecture(s) in other programs, serving as a graduate faculty representative, or serving on committees that overlap with your research or teaching interests. There sometimes are opportunities to speak to groups or organizations off-campus (in the Columbus area or elsewhere in the state, in the country, or in the world). At the local and national level, there are occasionally opportunities for discussing research with representatives of the news media (if you wish to pursue these, be conscious of the potential risks as well as benefits and consult with mentors and with University media relations professionals about potential pitfalls). There are an increasing number of outlets for public education and discussion on-line, and publication and "hits" on quality curated sites such as The Conversation are considered a form of community outreach. There may be opportunities to serve on state or national advisory or review boards or committees. All of these opportunities offer a chance to demonstrate a service commitment to Ohio State and the School.

In summary, candidates are encouraged to make significant contributions to the field by doing excellent research and publishing in visible outlets where the research can affect the thinking of others. Quality teaching is expected, and quality research mentorship also is regarded as an important criterion for promotion and tenure. We encourage candidates to contribute in positive ways to the School, the University and the discipline; quality service is also a hallmark of a quality academic who will contribute to the School, University, profession, and society over the course of their career.

APPENDIX B

Expectations for Associate Professors before Promotion to Professor School of Communication

In accordance with university code ([3335-6-02](#)), "*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.*"

Promotion from associate professor to professor, then, is recognition of distinguished research, teaching and service. To be promoted to professor, the candidate must have made or clearly demonstrated the ability to make a significant contribution to the stature of the University. He or she must have achieved a distinguished national/international reputation as an outstanding and productive scholar in the field. There should be evidence of momentum such that it leads the University to expect such productivity and intellectual impact will continue for many years to come. Because the title of associate professor is itself an indication of distinction, promotion to professor is neither automatic nor to be expected in all cases.

The College of Arts and Sciences also recognizes that, "[w]here a candidate has made truly extraordinary contributions in the areas of **teaching** or **service**, that record may warrant promotion in combination with a less extensive, though excellent record of continued productivity in **scholarship**." In the School of Communication, then, an excellent though less extensive record of continued research productivity may justify promotion from associate professor to professor rank when teaching or service contributions are "truly extraordinary." In teaching, extraordinary contributions would typically involve outstanding performance as an instructor and mentor, as well as formal recognition in the discipline as well as by the College/University for outstanding teaching accomplishments. Likewise, extraordinary service contributions should be documented both within the School in annual reviews, acknowledgements through awards and other recognition in the University, and through outstanding service contributions to the discipline or society as a whole. Such teaching and service contributions—whether within or beyond the university—must be documented in ways that can be reviewed by external evaluators as well as by the eligible faculty against the criteria stated in the College guidelines and in this APT document.

The School and University use a number of indicators for gauging excellence in these areas.

Research

Quality and placement. Associate professors are encouraged to consider how they are demonstrating research productivity, not only in terms of quantity of publications but also in terms of quality, impact and continuity. Associate professors should concentrate their efforts on producing high quality peer-reviewed publications that make an impact on the field.

Placement of original research in high-quality journals (e.g., top disciplinary journals and major sub-disciplinary journals with good impact factors, see Appendix A for a more complete discussion) is an excellent indicator of research quality. Still, the final criterion for excellence in

research is obtained through other professors' reading of the research articles produced since tenure. We rely on a reading by the professors in the School as well as the reading of other professors in Communication and allied fields from around the world. The research should provide evidence of a very high quality and sustained productivity since tenure.

Appointment as professor is preceded by national and/or international recognition as a leading scholar in our field, with a programmatic body of research and scholarship that demonstrates continued development of theory, substantive/policy implications, and/or methodological competence significantly beyond that characterized by work that had been completed by the time of tenure. There should also be evidence of momentum such that it leads the University to expect such productivity and intellectual impact will continue for many years to come.

The quantity and even the placement of published articles or books alone does not demonstrate the intellectual impact of a scholar on a field. The importance of research in any form is a function of its intellectual originality and merit, as well as its reception by peers. A scholar's citation impact and trajectory also are important measures of scholarly influence and standing, and therefore have particular utility in assessing a candidate's readiness for promotion to professor. However, if an unduly large percentage of citations are to work done early in the candidate's career, especially to work co-authored with advisors, with limited evidence for impact of more recent publication, it may diminish the impact of citation count with respect to promotion to professor. External letters are also useful in assessing the intellectual impact of a candidate's work.

Textbook writing is considered a contribution to teaching, not to scholarship. Editing books is an acceptable and appropriate activity for a tenured faculty member, but this activity should not be considered a substitute for publication of original research and are not considered an important indicator of scholarly productivity; rather, they may help serve as a marker of role or reputation in the field, when the collection is an intellectually significant one. Encyclopedia entries typically do not carry weight at all in the review process; in some cases major handbooks are being called "encyclopedias" for marketing purposes, and contributions are comparable to book chapters; if that is the case, explanation can be provided in the research narrative and they may also be considered markers of role or reputation in the field.

Rate and pattern of productivity

The research record should provide evidence of very high quality and sustained productivity since tenure. We recognize that for some faculty, temporary interruptions in the continuity of research productivity may occur as a result of personal/family circumstances or an evolution of research direction that requires retooling and rebuilding programmatic momentum. While the full record since tenure is considered, primary attention is normally given to the research record in the past five years in assessing the candidate's prospects for continued excellence and productivity after promotion, and a strong record of productivity, placement, and intellectual cohesiveness is expected over those years.

It is unusual for a candidate to come up for promotion for professor without five years in rank as an associate professor. However, exemplary candidates who have demonstrated outstanding

productivity since tenure, excellent journal article placement and other markers of success (e.g., a well-received scholarly monograph, leadership on major funded grant proposals, quality classroom teaching and advising/mentorship, and a commitment to service in line with the expectations of a professor), may be considered earlier.

Associate professors who have maintained a steady pace of productivity with placement in first-rate journals over a sustained period and have developed a clear programmatic focus leading to a strong national and international reputation in a readily discerned area of expertise may in due time be candidates for promotion to professor even if their rate of productivity is somewhat less than for others who may be more quickly promoted. Evidence for cumulative scholarly impact (e.g. Web of Science citation count and trajectory) that is clearly comparable to many other professors in the School and with evidence that work since tenure is continuing to be well-received and influential on other scholars, combined with a consistent, sustained record of placing programmatic work in high-quality journals, suggests that such candidates may be ready for promotion.

Intellectual cohesiveness/programmatic research significant to the field of communication

A research record largely characterized by pursuing a loosely-connected set of ideas, perhaps driven largely by the interests of graduate students rather than the faculty member's own research program, is unlikely to result in promotion. The theory, methods and procedures of the research conducted are likely to be less developed. A series of papers that build on one another will probably have a cumulative impact greater than an assortment of papers on unrelated topics. Researchers may construct programmatic research agendas in various ways, but in every case, one should be able to discern cohesive, distinctive, and cumulative research contributions.

Candidates for promotion should be making important contributions to theoretical, methodological, and/or substantive questions significant to the field of Communication and/or the component subfields studied here at the School. Significance of theoretical, substantive, and/or methodological contributions to the field of Communication is readily demonstrated by publication in highly-regarded journals in the Communication field. If a major portion of the candidate's work is published in journals from other fields, the P&T committee and the committee of the eligible faculty will make a qualitative assessment of the intellectual merit and relevance of the candidate's work with respect to important issues, questions, and methods in the communication field and in its component subdisciplines.

Faculty who come to the School trained in disciplines other than Communication are strongly encouraged to familiarize themselves with relevant theoretical and empirical literature in Communication (syllabi in Contemporary Communication Theory and appropriate Communication graduate electives are a good starting point in exploring this literature). In addition to supporting quality research significant to the field of Communication, doing so is important to effective teaching of undergraduate and graduate communication classes, and successfully advising and placing graduate students from the School in communication programs. As noted below under teaching, as part of graduate training and mentorship publication with graduate students in high-quality general interest or specialized Communication journals is very desirable, even if much or most of the candidate's publication record is in

journals outside of Communication. The Eligible Faculty should provide continuing feedback regarding progress in this direction during annual reviews.

We welcome and value citation from outside the Communication discipline as well as within it; however, if the candidate has little or no citation from scholars publishing in Communication or closely allied specialty journals, this may signal a matter of concern. Proportions of citations, however, are not an issue. For example, a respectable absolute count of citations within Communication, or journals in which Communication scholars in the relevant subfield frequently publish, that represent a small percentage of a large citation count overall, would not be seen as a problem.

Scholarly leadership

There is no question that collaborative research is highly valuable and becomes even more valuable and valued after tenure. It will be important to demonstrate the ability to work with colleagues, graduate students and junior faculty on research projects. However, associate professors still need to make sure that there is strong evidence of scholarly leadership and should still be writing some senior authored pieces in high quality outlets. Having a distinctive research agenda is a key to providing evidence of intellectual leadership. Another way to provide evidence of independent thought and unique contribution to the field is to produce a major scholarly work such as a scholarly monograph that is published by a high-quality publisher and is well-received by reviewers. Faculty members who are active in “team science”, typically in teams working on funded research, can demonstrate their scholarly leadership and contribution by serving in the lead role (Principal Investigator or joint Principal Investigator of record) on major successfully funded research applications and resulting publications, in addition to first-authoring peer-reviewed articles.

Evidence of societally and policy relevant research

If at all possible, the associate professor should explore the possibilities of producing fundable societally or policy-relevant research (by societally or policy relevant research we mean research that has the potential to impact decision-making and resource allocation by government or quasi-governmental entities, or to otherwise directly impact society and the quality of life of Americans or people around the world). Some research areas are more conducive to generating external grants than others but it is wise for all to explore the possibilities and apply for external funding. Such external funding is an objective endorsement (via rigorous peer review in a highly competitive environment) of the importance of the faculty member’s research program with respect to its potential for a larger impact on society and provides evidence of national recognition. Past funding record and future potential to generate external funds are taken into consideration when determining whether someone should be promoted to professor.

Other evidence for social impact is welcome but, as there are no ready metrics for such influence and because the social impact of foundational research may be better understood after a generation rather than after a few years, it is not essential. Evidence for social impact includes documented use of one’s research by policy-makers or in judicial decisions, news coverage in major reputable publications in contexts suggesting the value of the research for understanding

some social issue, and invitations to participate in state or federal expert panels. Such social impact evidence can enhance evidence for a scholar's potential influence, but do not replace citation and other more conventional metrics. Social media counts, hit counts, etc., are problematic as evidence given ample recent experience suggested that controversy or support for partisan positions is a better route to social media success than careful, evidenced-based study. Internet postings in quality curated sites such as The Conversation are valued as a form of community outreach and are addressed under Service.

In summary, the promotion committee and the Director will always look for a cohesive set of excellent publications in highly respected journals and will expect solid evidence of unique contributions, outstanding scholarly reputation and leadership in a sub-discipline of our field, and, when relevant and appropriate given the research program, evidence that the individual has the potential to secure external grants.

Teaching and Mentorship

Excellent classroom teaching as well as mentoring and guiding graduate students continue to be highly valued activities for associate professors and professors. Associate professors are expected to maintain quality classroom teaching evaluations for graduate and undergraduate courses. Additionally, associate professors are encouraged to become involved in curriculum development, including aspects of course development and overall curriculum issues within the School. Supervising undergraduate honors students and their senior theses are appropriate and encouraged activities.

The graduate student load typically increases during the years subsequent to tenure. We generally expect increased evidence of ability to supervise graduate teaching and research assistants as well as additional collaboration with graduate students on research projects. These additional collaborations with graduate students bring added responsibility. Special care should be taken to make certain that graduate students are able to graduate on time, with high-quality theses and dissertations, and with a research/publication record that enables them to obtain positions at high-quality institutions. Co-publication with graduate students including articles first-authored by the student, preferably in major Communication journals as they are the most helpful placements in providing students entrée to job opportunities at major universities, is one of the most important indicators of successful mentorship of graduate students, and is particularly emphasized when assessing readiness for promotion to professor.

There can be a tension between having a large number of graduate students and being able to direct enough attention to each of them. Therefore, it is wise to exercise caution about the total number of graduate students supervised and the amount of graduate committee involvement, to find a workable balance between numbers and quality/amount of attention. Similarly, faculty with areas of specialization that are less likely to invite large numbers of advisees may be well-advised to balance this through greater service on graduate committees and other contributions to the program. In the end, the faculty member is responsible for his or her record with graduate students, and this record will include their number, the quality of their work, their placement at research-oriented institutions and other forms of placement success, and the timeliness of

completion of their degrees. All of these factors are considerations in the faculty member's teaching record.

Service

After tenure, it is expected that faculty members will take on increasingly important service roles in the School, college, and University as well as to the Field. These roles can include serving on School and University committees, serving in leadership roles on these committees or providing solicited or even unsolicited help on any variety of activities, especially in regard to tenure and promotion reviews, curricular design or implementation, and other areas that are important to School, College or University functions.

Expectation of School service. During associate professor years, it is critical to be a conscientious and dependable member and where appropriate Chair of School committees, and to serve as a positive role model and mentor for junior faculty. Professors are deeply engaged in helping chart the direction of the School and bearing much of the administrative load. Because appointment to professor involves these additional responsibilities, evidence of the willingness and ability to participate constructively in School administration is an important consideration in appointment to professor, and experience as a committee chair is a valued indicator of such willingness and ability.

Associate professors are encouraged to run for election to School committees. Additionally, they should make their interests known to the Director, who can appoint faculty members to certain committees. Generally speaking, most of our associate professors are members of at least one School committee each year. There are numerous additional opportunities to participate in faculty governance and development at the School level. Being a good citizen of the School includes involvement in the work that needs to be done. The Eligible Faculty, consisting of all tenured faculty members of the School, offers an opportunity to help out in School governance, and there is often need for help in teaching reviews and observations as well as developing reports on research. Contributions in these areas are always appreciated and demonstrate a commitment to the School and its faculty.

Expectations of service to the field of Communication. Leadership roles in the discipline also are important and can include reviewing journal articles, serving as an editorial board member, and serving in key leadership roles for organizations or organizational divisions.

Associate professors are strongly encouraged to actively engage in reviewing manuscript submissions to journals and becoming active on editorial boards. We suggest that associate professors accept invitations to editorial boards for Web of Science (ISI) journals whenever possible. Editorial board service on strong journals, and editorships, are looked on favorably at the School and College level. Additionally, we expect associate professors to assume leadership roles in our national organizations (ICA, NCA, and AEJMC) to the extent possible. These include being a division head, serving on or leading an organizational committee, or assuming higher offices.

College/University/State of Ohio/National service. It also is important to serve the College and University in any number of service roles. Associate professors often have opportunities to

participate on College or University committees, interdisciplinary University programs, the university senate or other deliberative body, or may be invited to participate on ad hoc panels or committees investigating a potential policy change or the implications of outside forces on OSU governance. Additionally, there are sometimes opportunities to speak to groups or organizations off-campus (in the Columbus area or elsewhere in the state) when their interests or needs intersect with your teaching and research. At the local and national level, there are occasionally opportunities for discussing your research with representatives of the news media who believe your insights/expertise will be of interest to their readers or viewers (we recommend that you seek the assistance of experienced senior faculty and University media relations personnel to help ensure that your communications with the media serve you, the School, and the University positively).

You may also be asked to serve on grant or program review panels or advisory groups nationally (which have the advantage of providing further evidence of your national reputation as an expert in your area of research). These responsibilities are over and above those of serving as a graduate faculty representative, or serving on committees that overlap with your research or teaching interests. We encourage your participation in those activities and opportunities, as they are part of the role of a senior scholar.

Candidates may wish to note hits on the Conversation or other curated sites intended to provide balanced, thoughtful academic consideration to a wider public, as another form of community outreach.

In summary, the years as associate professor should provide evidence of one's contributions to the School, the university and the field. Key considerations in promotion will include assessment of excellence in research, teaching and service, and provide evidence for the likelihood of continued strong, or even stronger, contributions for the future.

APPENDIX C

Mentoring Guidelines

The School of Communication employs a formalized mentoring system. Any assistant or associate professor may request a professor to serve as a mentor. In our School, all assistant professors, shortly after they begin employment, are **required** to put in writing in a memo to the Director whether or not they desire a mentor, and that mentor's name (if one is desired). The assistant professors should ask their designated mentor(s) if he/she is willing to serve in this capacity. This decision must be made by the second full semester of appointment. The School strongly discourages assistant professors from selecting more than two mentors. Some faculty may not be able to serve a mentoring role if they are overextended.

The mentor's purpose is not to serve as an advocate for the mentee, but rather as a resource for questions concerning research, teaching or service. As a member of the tenured faculty, a mentor's first obligation is to the School. The mentor is not an advisor or an advocate for the mentee, and is expected to participate in an objective way during deliberations of the eligible faculty and of the P&T Committee, if the mentor serves on that committee.

During the annual review process, mentors sometimes provide clarifying information to the promotion and tenure committee when particular issues come up related to teaching, research or service. Detailed knowledge of a mentee's struggles or accomplishments may unduly influence an objective assessment if the mentor develops a close relationship with a mentee. If a mentor moves beyond expression of his or her objective assessment of the candidate to advocacy for the candidate during an evaluation, the Director, or the Chair of the Committee of Eligible Faculty, or the Procedures Oversight Designee (POD), may first point out the apparent advocacy and if it continues suggest the mentor recuse him/her self during the evaluation. Undue advocacy is reflected when a mentor goes beyond stating his or her viewpoint and respectfully acknowledging points of disagreement to rebutting colleagues repeatedly, and/or when the tone of the mentor's comments becomes unduly heated.

The School recommends at least an annual meeting between mentors and mentees to discuss progress and issues. The mentee should initiate these meetings. Faculty mentoring should cover the following areas:

1. Information about the system of governance (policies and procedures) within the unit and university.
2. Research: provide guidance on scholarly activities (reading manuscripts, suggesting publication outlets, providing feedback on grant proposals), advice on how to achieve short-term and long-term goals.
3. Teaching: reinforce the message that teaching is an important component of annual reviews and the promotion and tenure process, provide guidance on teaching issues.
4. Service: provide information about service expectations.
5. Suggestions regarding work-life balance as requested or needed.

While mentors can provide an important role in reaching promotion, the junior faculty member has ultimate responsibility for compiling a record of scholarship, teaching and service that merits

promotion and tenure. Mentees must take responsibility for their own growth and success, be proactive in seeking out information and guidance, and be open to constructive feedback. Ultimately, the mentor is one faculty member among many. Any advice a mentor provides must be considered only within the context of the mentee's goals and capabilities. The decisions and choices that untenured faculty make are ultimately their own.

APPENDIX D.

P&T Guidelines for Collaboration

General guidelines and suggestions for Assistant Professors to evaluate and select collaborative research opportunities, and document the nature of their contributions, are below.

First of all, it is important to recall that collaborative research will be evaluated as an integral part of the candidate's entire research program and performance, including the nature of the candidate's distinctive intellectual contribution as well as the composition and cohesiveness of her or his research program. As stated in Appendix A, "Criteria for assessing the potential for an outstanding research career include quality, productivity, distinctive intellectual contribution and cohesiveness, and potential for scholarly impact. Potential social importance of the research contribution is also considered...Distinctive intellectual contributions and capacity to do quality work independent of guidance from senior faculty are assessed by looking at the intellectual cohesiveness of the research program, at work published without senior collaborators, and at documentation of the candidate's intellectual leadership and distinctive contributions in their collaborative research efforts..."

Here we focus on the most sensitive situations: collaboration of an Assistant Professor with senior faculty members. Consistent with the expectations for research as stated in Appendix A, we suggest the following to junior faculty and their senior collaborators when engaging in collaborative research, which are also guidelines for the Eligible Faculty when evaluating collaborative research of an Assistant Professor candidate during both mandatory and non-mandatory reviews.

- 1) To the extent possible, collaborative projects should align closely with the junior faculty member's distinctive research program on which she or he can take the lead, and serve as the lead author on resulting publications.
- 2) Ensure that projects on which the junior faculty member is not taking the lead are ones that are not time-intensive for the junior faculty member (excepting when the lead author is a graduate student working with the junior faculty member, per Appendix A).
- 3) If the junior faculty member's specialization and role is a certain "method" or "approach," the team and the Eligible Faculty may need to recognize and overcome the unintentional bias against "methodological contribution" (in comparison to "theoretical contribution") that underestimates effort and contribution by "the method person" especially when the method is complex and critical for answering the research questions. For example, some methods or approaches (e.g., neuroscientific, psychophysiological, computational, network) implies certain theorization and perspectives on the research topics, and have significant implications for each step of the project, including the conceptualization and design of the study. In such cases, "the method person" in fact is likely to take a relatively central role on the project, along with "the theory person."
- 4) Conversations with the mentors, the Chair of the Eligible Faculty, the Director, and other senior faculty members regarding the junior faculty member's role can be useful.

- 5) To better understand the contribution of the junior faculty member, document the explicit contributions of the junior faculty. See below for a template form that the junior faculty member is encouraged to take advantage of to propose (at the planning stage) and document her or his contribution to each project or publication. The form will be signed by the PI, lead author, and/or senior authors on the publications. The form can be revised to better suit the nature of the work.
- 6) Discourage junior faculty members from relying on work done in collaboration with senior faculty members for the majority of their significant publications, or from becoming too closely associated with a single senior faculty member and his/her research program. What is too much should be a matter of ongoing discussion with the mentors, the Chair of the Eligible Faculty, and the Director, and addressed each year in the annual review process. Remember, per Appendix A, it is important to demonstrate distinctive research identity, intellectual leadership, and programmatic coherence: Collaborative work can contribute to this demonstration or not, and it is important to think carefully about how such collaborative work fits into one's overall portfolio.
- 7) Consider significant co-authored work by junior faculty members with senior faculty members, in which a convincing case is made that the work would not have been possible, at least at a comparable level of excellence, without the contribution of the junior faculty member, as a significant and valued contribution. Such work would not replace work led by the junior faculty member, but still would form a valued part of the research portfolio. This is especially important for faculty whose expertise is largely methodological. Also see the suggestion above regarding "the method person."
- 8) Recognize when a senior coauthor, or former graduate school or post-doc mentor, is participating primarily because they are sharing a data set that they have had a substantial resource investment in creating, or are providing access to such data, study populations, or research facility as a function of their contacts or position, and have a modest direct contribution to the study design, analysis, and write-up. When there is documentation of this limited role (e.g., letters from the senior coauthors), the research can be considered clearly led by the candidate and not considered a "mentored" publication. Meanwhile, the research record should still include some high-quality work led by the candidate with no senior co-authors.
- 9) Last, note that extensive collaboration of an Eligible Faculty member (e.g., tenured faculty) may lead to exclusion of the collaborator from serving on the Committee of the Eligible Faculty for the candidate's review case because of conflict of interest. The considerations, as stated in the APT, are:

Generally, faculty members who have collaborated with a candidate on 50% or more of the candidate's published work since the last promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of that candidate. The School also recognizes that there may be instances in the patterns of collaboration or the quality of collaborative work suggests a conflict of interest even though less than 50% of the total work is with a specific

colleague. Additionally, there may be conflicts in instances in which the candidate may have collaborative work with multiple co-authors, and the sum of the collaborative effort is greater than 50% of the total work even though any specific individual's collaboration is less than 50%.

An Example of Documenting Research Contribution to Collaborative Research (Multi-authored Publications)

Your name: _____

The publication reference:

The PI(s), lead-author(s), and/or senior author(s) other than the faculty above, please sign here to show your agreement on the following evaluation:

Sign _____ Date _____

Sign _____ Date _____

Sign _____ Date _____

Sign _____ Date _____

Tasks	How much work is required by the tasks for this particular publication (compared to most other publications in our field?)	My contribution to the tasks	Explanation of your role (You can add additional narrative pages.)
1. Conceptualization (articulating basic research question, proposing theoretical ideas and mechanisms & specification of hypotheses)	_N/A or little _more _less _similar	_none _some _most _all	
2. Developing study design	_N/A or little _more _less _similar	_none _some _most _all	
3. Study implementation (including stimuli, programming, IRB)	_N/A or little _more _less _similar	_none _some _most _all	
4. Overall project/team management	_N/A or little _more _less _similar	_none _some _most _all	
5. Recruitment & data collection	_N/A or little _more _less _similar	_none _some _most _all	
6. Data preprocessing and analysis (including programming)	_N/A or little _more _less _similar	_none _some _most _all	
7. Writing	_N/A or little _more _less _similar	_none _some _most _all	
8. Revision(s)	_N/A or little _more _less _similar	_none _some _most _all	
9. Securing funding & resources (e.g., grants, hires, equipment)	_N/A or little _more _less _similar	_none _some _most _all	
10. Overall	more _less _similar	_none _some _most _all	
11. Please explain how this work fits into your research program.			