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7. APPEALS

8. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS (Faculty Rule 3335-6-05B)
APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE
CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF MECHANICAL AND AEROSPACE ENGINEERING

1. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapter 6 of the Rules of the University Faculty (Additional Rules Concerning Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure), the Office of Academic Affairs procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews, the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering Pattern of Department Administration, and any additional policies established by the College and the University. Should these rules and policies change, the department shall follow the new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years on appointment or reappointment of the Department Chair. Definitions of terms in this document relating to groups and committees within the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering are found in the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering Pattern of Department Administration.

This document must be approved by the Dean of the College of Engineering and the Provost of the University before it can be implemented. It sets forth the Department's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the College and University, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments, faculty promotion and/or tenure, and rewards including salary increases. In approving this document, the Dean and Provost accept the mission and criteria of the Department, and delegate to it the responsibility of applying high standards in evaluating continuing faculty and candidates for positions in relation to its mission and criteria.

The general criteria specified for appointment, promotion, and tenure consider the traditional areas of teaching, research/scholarship, service, and citizenship/colllegiality. An overarching theme of the criteria and procedures set forth in this document is balance among, and integration of, these aspects of faculty performance in the context of maximum impact on the mission of the Department, the College of Engineering, and the University.

2. DEPARTMENT MISSION

The mission of the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering is the education of professionals in mechanical, aerospace, and nuclear engineering, the generation and dissemination of knowledge and technology, and the development of innovative solutions to problems in these fields.
3.0 APPOINTMENTS: CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

3.1 CRITERIA: FACULTY

Consistent with the goals and mission of the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering at The Ohio State University, the criteria for appointment of regular faculty must meet high standards of excellence. The expectations for scholarly promise of the successfully-appointed candidate must meet or exceed the Department’s official criteria for promotion and tenure in the case of tenure-track faculty, and promotion in the case of clinical track and research track faculty. For an appointment at the Associate Professor or Full Professor levels, the scholarly accomplishments of the candidate must meet or exceed the Department’s criteria for promotion to those levels. In general, the successful candidate must demonstrate high promise for performing independent, significant and visible research, excellence in teaching and service, and good departmental citizenship, as appropriate for the faculty category. The following is a list of criteria that must be met by the successful candidate as determined by the Search Committee and as agreed upon by the Department as a whole:

3.1.1 APPOINTMENT AS A TENURE TRACK ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

- The successful candidate must have an earned doctorate in a relevant field of study, or possession of equivalent experience.
- The successful candidate must provide clear evidence of research promise as defined by demonstrated ability to perform, complete and publish a major body of work that is relevant to his/her area(s) of specialization.
- The successful candidate must have uniformly outstanding recommendation letters that establish the candidate as one of the top candidates of his or her peer group nationally.
- The successful candidate must demonstrate potential for excellence in teaching, and must have excellent communication and writing skills.
- The successful candidate must display evidence of potential for good departmental citizenship.

3.1.2 APPOINTMENT AS ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE

- The successful candidate must meet or exceed the Department’s Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.
- If the candidate does not currently hold a faculty position, the candidate might not have had the opportunity to engage in teaching or in the training of graduate students, or in independently raising grant support for his/her research program. In this case, evidence of scholarship accomplishments must be presented which demonstrates the candidate's development of a national/international stature in his/her area of research. The candidate's previous research record must be comparable in depth and breadth to that of an Associate Professor within the Department. There should also be a high probability that the candidate will make an effective transition to a faculty position with regard to his/her research program, as measured by relevance to the future of his/her field and by funding potential. There must
also be a high potential for success as an instructor at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

3.1.3 APPOINTMENT AS FULL PROFESSOR WITH TENURE

- The successful candidate must meet or exceed the Department’s Criteria for Promotion to Professor, with particular emphasis on the requirement that the candidate have national and international recognition as a scholar in his/her area.
- If the candidate does not currently hold a faculty position, the candidate might not have had the opportunity to engage in teaching or in the training of graduate students, or in independently raising and continuing grant support for his/her research program. The candidate's previous research record must be comparable in depth and breadth to that of a Professor within the Department. In this case, evidence of scholarship accomplishments must be presented which demonstrates the candidate's development of a national/international stature in his/her area of research. There should be strong evidence that the candidate will establish a well-funded, productive, and nationally and internationally-recognized research program that will involve the education and training of Ph.D. and M.S. graduate students. There must also be a high potential for success as an instructor at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

3.1.4 APPOINTMENT AS ASSOCIATE OR FULL PROFESSOR, WITHOUT TENURE

Appointments at these levels generally entail tenure. However, a probationary period may be granted, according to the Faculty Rule 3335-6-03, by petition of the Department and College, for a period not to exceed four years. It is expected that, during the probationary period, the appointee will satisfy all the criteria for tenure at the appointment rank he/she has received.

3.1.5 APPOINTMENT TO CLINICAL TRACK FACULTY

Regular clinical track faculty appointments can be made at the Assistant, Associate or Full Professor level and will be referred to as “(Assistant, Associate, or Full) Professor of Practice in Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering.” These appointments are similar to regular tenure track faculty appointments in the expectations for scholarly promise and/or accomplishments, but with a greater emphasis on excellence in teaching related to professional engineering practice and little emphasis on research publication and external research funding. Research _per se_ is not acceptable as an evaluation criterion for hiring.

The successful candidate will have:
- an earned Ph.D. although exceptions can be made for extremely well-qualified candidates. An M.S. degree is required. Relevant industrial or governmental professional experience can be counted in place of a Ph.D.
- a strong component of professional engineering practice and accomplishment in his/her background. Professional specializations need to be well aligned with department needs.
- demonstrated communication and instructional skills and the ability to transfer and share knowledge.
- the ability to improve the curriculum in his/her area of expertise and create new courses where appropriate.
• a demonstrated interest in teaching and a strong interest in College of Engineering students.

3.1.6 APPOINTMENT TO RESEARCH TRACK FACULTY

Regular research track faculty appointments can be made at the Assistant, Associate or Full Professor level and will be referred to as “(Assistant, Associate, or Full) Research Professor in Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering.” These appointments are similar to regular tenure track faculty appointments in the expectations for scholarly promise and/or accomplishments, but with a greater emphasis on research and little emphasis on teaching. Teaching *per se* is not acceptable as an evaluation criterion for hiring.

The successful candidate will have:

• an earned Ph.D in Mechanical or Aerospace Engineering or relevant field in an area of interest aligned with department research needs.
• demonstrated research ability or potential in an area of interest aligned with department research needs demonstrated by:
  o Publications, patents
  o Strong track record or potential for externally funded research
  o Leading externally-sponsored research projects
  o Advising or co-advising of graduate students
  o Peer evaluations of research
  o Seminars, short courses and other research dissemination activities
• demonstrated communication skills and mastery of the English language in both written and verbal forms.

3.1.7 APPOINTMENT AS INSTRUCTOR

Appointment at the Instructor level should normally only be made if the offered appointment is that of regular tenure track Assistant Professor, with all of the criteria for appointment at that level being met with the exception that the appointee has not yet completed the Ph.D. degree at the outset of the appointment. Such an appointment should only be made when the award of the degree is imminent. Instructor appointments are limited to three years, with the third year being the terminal year.

3.1.8 APPOINTMENT AS PROFESSOR, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, OR INSTRUCTOR, WITH LESS THAN 100% TIME IN MECHANICAL AND AEROSPACE ENGINEERING

Criteria for original appointments and re-appointments in this category are the same as for tenure track faculty of comparable rank and 100% appointments in the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering. The Department shall be the tenure-initiating unit for appointments of greater than 50%. Appointments in the Department of less than 50% shall be offered in cases where other departments are the tenure-initiating units for the candidates. The Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering may or may not be the tenure-initiating unit for appointments of 50% in the Department.
3.2 CRITERIA: AUXILIARY FACULTY

3.2.1 VISITING PROFESSOR, VISITING ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, VISITING ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, AND VISITING INSTRUCTOR

The visiting faculty rank is to be conferred on a person with faculty credentials who typically holds a faculty appointment at another institution. The appointment of the visiting faculty member can only occur if the visiting person will be collaborating with a regular faculty member within the Department. Evidence of the collaboration should be provided in the nominating letter from a regular faculty member. Original and subsequent appointments will be at a rank compatible with the person’s qualifications.

3.2.2 LECTURER AND SENIOR LECTURER

The Lecturer and Senior Lecturer positions are to be used only when specific instructional needs are identified in the Department. Persons appointed to the Lecturer position are expected to have special qualifications which help meet the instructional need. Evidence of qualifications includes advanced degrees and/or experience related to the topics in the course. Persons appointed to the Senior Lecturer position will have advanced degrees and greater depth of experience related to the identified need.

3.2.3 PROFESSOR, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, OR INSTRUCTOR APPOINTMENT, WITH LESS THAN 100% TIME IN MECHANICAL AND AEROSPACE ENGINEERING

Criteria for original appointments and re-appointments in this category are the same as for auxiliary faculty of comparable rank with 100% appointments in the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering.

3.2.4 ADJUNCT PROFESSOR, ADJUNCT ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, ADJUNCT ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, AND ADJUNCT INSTRUCTOR

The adjunct faculty position is a title given to appropriately qualified individuals who provide substantial services to the Department for which a faculty title is needed. These positions are not salaried. Adjunct faculty will work closely with regular faculty in the Department on instructional and/or research activities. In order to receive the adjunct position, there must be a specific need in the Department for a person to perform departmental duties such as teaching courses, advising graduate students or providing research project leadership, which would bring support to the undergraduate or graduate education program. Adjunct faculty will not, however, be given primary responsibility for advising a graduate student.

The criteria for the adjunct appointment are dependent on the reason for the appointment. If the person seeks an adjunct appointment for teaching a course, that person must provide evidence that he/she has the capability for good teaching and has a good knowledge of the material taught in the course. Evidence of this includes an advanced degree and/or teaching experience in the subject area. The candidate is expected to demonstrate good communication skills, which can be judged through any appropriate means such as an interview. All candidates...
for adjunct faculty appointments will present a Department Seminar. If the purpose of the
adjunct appointment is for research collaboration and student advising, the criterion for
appointment is evidence of research excellence. Some possible means for judging research
excellence are publication of books and book chapters, journal and conference publications,
letters of recommendation, patents, and experience in performing and directing research within a
government laboratory, company or university. The criteria for research excellence should be
flexible. For example, the reward systems for researchers in industry do not place the same
emphasis on journal publications as is the case for researchers in universities. Therefore, the
judgment of research excellence should be done on a case-by-case basis.

The rank at which the appointment is made is based solely on the record of the applicant.

3.3 CRITERIA: COURTESY APPOINTMENTS

The courtesy appointment is a no-salary joint appointment for regular members of The
Ohio State University faculty from other tenure initiating units. Its purpose is to facilitate
research and curricular collaboration between faculty members from different departments. The
appointee’s rank in the tenure initiating unit will be respected in making the appointment in
Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering. Continuation of the appointment should reflect ongoing
contributions to the Department.

3.4 PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT: TENURE TRACK
FACULTY

A Search Committee, appointed by the Department Chair, shall be responsible for conducting
national searches for new, regular tenure track faculty members. The leading candidates will
normally be invited to visit the Department to speak with the Department Chair and members of
the faculty, and to deliver a prepared lecture at a Departmental Seminar. All faculty members
shall be asked to review the candidate’s resume and make pertinent comments to the Search
Committee and to the Department Chair. The relevant Technical Committee of the Department
may be asked to provide additional input to the faculty concerning its position with regard to the
candidate. The Search Committee will present its recommendations to the faculty.

The Department Chair will conduct a vote of the tenure track faculty. Votes of tenure track
faculty who have appointments of less than 100% in the Department will be counted in full only
if the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering is their tenure-initiating unit. An
offer will be made by the Department Chair only after giving careful consideration to all
competing candidates for the position, and after reviewing the recommendations of the Search
Committee and the Technical Committee, and consideration of the faculty vote. All
appointments require the approval of the Dean of the College of Engineering. Appointments at
the rank of Associate or Full Professor also require approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.
Appointments with tenure at either of these levels must also follow the Department’s tenure
approval procedures, described in Section 6.5.4. After the successful appointment of a new
faculty member, the Department Chair may nominate one or more appropriate mentors to aid the
new faculty member with regard to procedures and processes of research, teaching and service
within the University.
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3.5 PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT: CLINICAL TRACK FACULTY

The procedures to initially appoint clinical track faculty members at any level are modeled after those used for regular tenure track faculty members as described in Section 3.4 including the requirement for a faculty vote, but with the following modifications. Candidates will be evaluated primarily on their professional practice expertise in an area of mechanical and aerospace engineering, their instructional ability or potential, and their ability to contribute significantly to the department's curriculum.

The search for a clinical track faculty member can be initiated only after the position has been approved by the Dean of the College of Engineering. This would normally follow the case for such a position being made by the department based on value of the position and its financial viability. An offer will be made by the Department Chair only after giving careful consideration to all competing candidates for the position, and after reviewing the recommendations of the committees involved and consideration of the faculty vote.

The Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering department allows for transfer from the tenure faculty track to the regular clinical faculty track if appropriate to the circumstances. Such transfers must abide by the following:

- 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;
- When a tenured faculty member transfers to the regular clinical faculty track, tenure is lost; and
- The Executive Committee of the department will advise the department chairperson on the terms of the transfer and will vote on the transfer, such a vote being advisory to the department chairperson.

All appointments require the approval of the Dean of the College of Engineering. Appointments at the rank of Associate or Full Professor also require approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

The initial contract is probationary and the faculty member will be informed by the end of each probationary year as to whether he or she will be reappointed for the following year. By the end of the second to final year of the probationary contract, the faculty member will be informed as to whether a new contract will be extended at the conclusion of the probationary contract period. Contract renewal will be considered only if continuation of the position is approved by the Dean.

The procedures for contract renewal of clinical track faculty will be consistent with similar procedures for tenure track faculty, and would require a vote of the eligible faculty. During and until the end of the second and subsequent contract periods, regular clinical track faculty appointments may only be terminated for cause (see rule 3335-5-04 of the Administrative Code) or financial exigency (see rule 3335-5-02.1 of the Administrative Code) and the termination decision for either of these reasons shall result from procedures established by faculty rules.

3.6 PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT: RESEARCH TRACK FACULTY

The procedures to initially appoint research track faculty members at any level are modeled after those used for regular tenure track faculty members as described in Section 3.4, but with the
following modifications. Candidates will be evaluated primarily on their professional expertise in their research area of mechanical and aerospace engineering, their research ability or potential, and their ability to increase the scholarship and sponsored research in the department.

The search for a research track faculty member can be initiated only after the position has been approved by the Dean of the College of Engineering. This would normally follow the case for such a position being made by a sponsoring research group with a demonstrated funding track record and a willingness to fully fund the position for the period of initial appointment. A vote of all tenure track faculty with their tenure in Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering is required for initial appointments at the Associate Professor and Full Professor levels. Initial appointments at the Assistant Professor level require a vote only of the augmented P&T committee referred to in Section 6.5.1 as the Promotion Committee for research track faculty. An offer will be made by the Department Chair only after giving careful consideration to all competing candidates for the position, and after reviewing the recommendations and vote of the tenure track faculty (for appointments at the Associate and Full Professor levels) or Promotion Committee for research track faculty (for appointments at the Assistant Professor level).

The Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering department allows for transfer from the tenure faculty track to the regular research faculty track if appropriate to the circumstances. Such transfers must abide by the following:

- 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;
- When a tenured faculty member transfers to the regular research track, tenure is lost; and
- The Executive Committee of the department will advise the department chairperson on the terms of the transfer and will vote on the transfer, such a vote being advisory to the department chairperson.

All appointments require the approval of the Dean of the College of Engineering. Appointments at the rank of Associate or Full Professor also require approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

The initial contract is probationary, and the faculty member will be informed by the end of each probationary year as to whether he or she will be reappointed for the following year. By the end of the penultimate year of the probationary contract, the faculty member will be informed as to whether a new contract will be extended at the conclusion of the probationary contract period. Contract renewal will be considered only if continuation of the position is approved by the Dean.

The procedures for contract renewal of research track faculty will be consistent with similar procedures for tenure track faculty, and would require a vote of the eligible faculty. During and until the end of the second and subsequent contract periods, regular research track faculty appointments may be terminated for not meeting the terms of the contract (e.g., failure to obtain extramural support for the research). Appointments may also be terminated during a contract period for cause (see rule 3335-5-04 of the Administrative Code), or financial exigency (see rule 3335-5-02.1 of the Administrative Code), and the termination decision for either of these reasons shall result from procedures established by faculty rules.

### 3.7 PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT: AUXILIARY FACULTY

Requests from regular faculty for auxiliary faculty appointments shall be presented by the Chair to the Executive Committee, which shall then make a recommendation to the regular faculty. All faculty members shall be asked to review the candidate’s resume and make pertinent
comments to the Executive Committee and to the Department Chair. A final decision will be made by the Department Chair, after reviewing the recommendations of the Executive Committee and the regular faculty. The appointment is subject to the approval of the Dean of the College of Engineering. These appointments are made for one year at a time and require formal annual renewal if they are to be continued. A request for a continuing appointment must be accompanied by an annual report documenting professional activities and interaction with students and faculty of the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering.

3.7.1 VISITING PROFESSOR, VISITING ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, VISITING ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, AND VISITING INSTRUCTOR

Nominations for appointment to a visiting faculty position are to be submitted, in writing, to the Department Chair by a person holding a regular faculty position in the Department. Normally, this would be the faculty member with whom the visiting faculty member will be working. Final notification of approval will be by a letter from the Department Chair to the nominated visiting faculty member and to the regular faculty member making the nomination.

3.7.2 LECTURER AND SENIOR LECTURER

Identification of the need for such a position, and endorsement of an individual to fill the position, will come from the appropriate Technical Committee, with final written approval by the Department Chair.

3.7.3 PROFESSOR, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, OR INSTRUCTOR APPOINTMENT, WITH LESS THAN 100% TIME IN MECHANICAL AND AEROSPACE ENGINEERING

Original appointments and re-appointments in this category will be handled in the same manner as for regular faculty of comparable rank.

3.7.4 ADJUNCT PROFESSOR, ADJUNCT ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, ADJUNCT ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, AND ADJUNCT INSTRUCTOR

Each person seeking the position of adjunct faculty must have an advocate who has a regular faculty appointment in the Department. This advocate must detail in writing the specific tasks to be assigned to adjunct candidates during the appointment period. In addition, the home agency of the adjunct candidate must also supply documentation supporting such an appointment. Finally, the candidate must supply a resume.

The Executive Committee will evaluate the adjunct faculty candidate’s documentation and make a recommendation to the Department Chair as to the candidate’s suitability for the position and the appropriate rank to be conferred. The Department Chair shall then consult with the regular faculty, and either make the appointment, or reject the candidate’s request. This appointment must be in accordance with the policies and procedures approved by the Office of Academic Affairs. The Department Chair will send letters announcing the decision to the candidate, the internal regular faculty advocate, and the supporting agency.

For reappointment, the adjunct faculty member must submit an activity report describing the duties performed during the appointment period that relate to the purpose of the original
appointment. Additional activities related to the instructional and/or research needs of the Department should also be included in this report. Reappointment will be based on this report along with reports from both the regular faculty advocate and the supporting agency; the latter must indicate an agreement to continue support for the candidate.

3.8 PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENT: COURTESY FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

Each person seeking a courtesy appointment must have an advocate who has a regular faculty appointment in the Department. This advocate must provide a letter justifying the need for the courtesy appointment. In addition, the candidate must provide a resume and any other pertinent information detailing his/her research record.

The Executive Committee will evaluate the candidate’s documentation and, on that basis, make a recommendation to the Department Chair as to the candidate’s suitability for the position. The Department Chair, based on consultations with the regular faculty, shall then either approve or reject the candidate’s request. The faculty member who receives the courtesy appointment is expected to turn in an activity report every year, describing the contributions he/she has made to the Department. If the contributions to the Department are not substantial, the Department Chair can terminate the courtesy appointment.

4. ANNUAL REVIEWS

Procedures for annual reviews of tenure-track faculty are described below. Procedures for tenure-track faculty with appointments of less than 100% in the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering are the same if the Department is the tenure-initiating unit, with the exception that the Department Chair will seek input from the Chair(s) of other department(s) which may be involved. Tenure track faculty for whom other departments serve as tenure-initiating units will be evaluated by their tenure-initiation units, with input from the Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering Department Chair as appropriate.

4.1 ANNUAL AND FOURTH YEAR REVIEW PROCEDURES: PROBATIONARY TENURE TRACK FACULTY

In order to ensure that probationary faculty (regular tenure track faculty who are untenured) are formally aware of the progress of their professional development, during each spring quarter they will meet with, and be reviewed by, the Department Chair. Prior to that meeting, they will provide the chair with a summary of their professional achievements. The past year's activities, the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses, and their progress in professional development will be discussed. A written summary of the meeting will be given to the individual, a copy will be kept on file, and a copy will be forwarded to the dean of the college in accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (C)(2). The dossier will also be reviewed by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee. Their comments will be reported in the chair’s letter.

The chair’s recommendation to reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year of service is final. Any nonrenewal of a probationary appointment (except denial of tenure resulting from review for promotion and tenure) must result from a negative review following the
procedures for a fourth year review described below. The chair may initiate such a review in any year by so notifying the probationary faculty member in writing prior to the end of autumn quarter.

For a fourth year review, material from annual reports, yearly reviews, faculty evaluations of the progress of his/her professional development, and student evaluations of teaching will also be considered. To be positive, the fourth year review must amply demonstrate that an untenured faculty member is becoming an effective teacher and developing into a nationally/internationally recognized scholar. It must be concluded that, if he/she continues to develop, there will be a strong case for tenure.

A probationary faculty member eligible for fourth year review is first considered by the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee. The candidate and his/her dossier, including his/her statement of accomplishment, will be reviewed for a recommendation. At the conclusion of its deliberation, the P&T Committee will prepare a written report for each candidate.

Following the report by the P&T Committee, probationary faculty members being evaluated for fourth year review are next considered by all the tenured faculty of the Department. A meeting of all tenured faculty will be held with open discussion of each candidate. Prior to this meeting, the candidate's complete dossier will be available for review by the tenured faculty. At the conclusion of these deliberations, a vote of the tenured faculty with tenure in the Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering department is held on each candidate, by secret ballot. The results of these deliberations will be made available to the candidate.

The report of the P&T Committee, modified to reflect the discussion among the tenured faculty, and the vote of tenured faculty, act as recommendations to the Department Chair. If the Chair's decision is in disagreement with that of the tenured faculty, he/she will discuss his/her reasoning with the tenured faculty. The Chair’s decision will be made known to the candidate. The Chair will forward his/her recommendation to the Dean of The College of Engineering together with the candidate's dossier, the report by the P&T Committee, and the vote of the tenured faculty. A final decision not to continue appointment after a negative review is made by the Dean after reviewing the dossier, the departmental faculty vote, and the chair’s recommendation.

A probationary faculty member can request exclusion of time for reasons permitted under the Faculty Rule 3335-6-03. The Department will not require a faculty member to apply for excluded time, nor shall a faculty member’s decision to request excluded time prejudice the P&T Committee, the tenured faculty, or the Department Chair concerning their perception of the faculty member’s performance.

4.2 ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES: TENURED FACULTY

The Department Chair will meet with each faculty member to discuss that person's work, identify ways in which it might be facilitated or improved, and provide feedback to the faculty member. This will be followed up by a letter to the faculty member from the Chair summarizing the conversation. The letter will include the main points of the conversation, and may be combined with notification of that faculty member's recommended salary increment for the following year.
4.3 ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES: CLINICAL TRACK FACULTY

The procedures for clinical track faculty members at any level are similar to those used for probationary faculty in that the term of the contract is specified, and is subject to renewal or non-renewal. In order to ensure that the faculty member is formally aware of the progress of his/her professional development, during each spring quarter he/she will meet with, and be reviewed by the Department Chair. Prior to that meeting, the candidate will provide the chair with a summary of professional achievements. The past year's activities, the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses, and progress in professional development will be discussed. A written summary of the meeting will be given to the individual, and a copy will be kept on file. The annual meeting with the Department Chair and the summary letter will focus on the faculty member's instructional activities during the past year as well as other advising and curriculum duties for which they are responsible.

Any non-renewal of the contract must result from termination of the position or a negative performance review, the latter occurring either during an annual review of a probationary contract or in the penultimate year of the contract. A vote of the tenure track faculty is required in such cases. Performance reviews for clinical track faculty members would recognize that performance expectations for clinical track faculty emphasize teaching and curriculum development in areas of the curriculum with a significant professional practice component.

4.4 ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES: RESEARCH TRACK FACULTY

The procedures for research track faculty members at any level are similar to those used for probationary faculty in that the term of the contract is specified, and is subject to renewal or non-renewal. In order to ensure that the faculty member is formally aware of the progress of his/her professional development, during each spring quarter he/she will meet with, and be reviewed by, the Department Chair. Prior to that meeting, the candidate will provide the chair with a summary of professional achievements, and the sponsoring research group will also provide a formal assessment of the faculty member’s progress. The past year's activities, the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses, and progress in professional development will be discussed. A written summary of the meeting will be given to the individual as well as the sponsoring research group, and a copy will be kept on file. The meeting with the Department Chair and the summary letter will focus on the faculty member's research, sponsored research funding and scholarship during the past year, as well as graduate student advising and other service duties for which he/she is responsible.

Any non-renewal of the contract must result from termination of the position or a negative performance review, the latter occurring either during an annual review of a probationary contract or in the penultimate year of the contract. A vote of the tenure track faculty is required in such cases. Performance reviews for research track faculty would emphasize research performance including externally funded research, leadership of sponsored research projects, advising of graduate students, high quality, peer-reviewed publications, and peer evaluations of research.
4.5 ANNUAL REVIEWS: DOCUMENTATION

All faculty members are responsible for providing annual reports to the Department Chair each winter quarter, using the format shown in Appendix A, along with updated curriculum vitae. At a minimum, the annual report shall contain student evaluations of classroom instruction as reflected in SEI reports and responses to ME departmental questionnaires. Contributions to teaching in the form of mentoring of students or curriculum development should also be documented, along with a self-assessment by the faculty member of his/her teaching activities and philosophy. Documentation of research activities shall include citations of journal articles and conference proceedings that appeared during the preceding calendar year; listings of other publications, and of presentations made during the subject year; and details of externally funded grants and contracts in force during the year. Professional service activities should also be included. The annual report will become a part of the faculty member's personnel file and will be an important part of the salary determination process.

Tenure track faculty members are also encouraged, at their option, to document their contributions in the area of teaching in the form of Teaching Files, as described in Appendix B. The Teaching File should be updated once every three years and allows for a more comprehensive documentation of teaching performance. Clinical track faculty members are required to document their contributions in the area of teaching and curriculum development using Teaching Files.

5. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS

Procedures for merit salary increases and other rewards for regular faculty are described below. Procedures for tenure track faculty with appointments of less than 100% in the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering are the same if the Department is the tenure-initiating unit, with the exception that the Department Chair will seek agreement from the Chair(s) of other department(s) which may be involved. Tenure track faculty for whom other departments serve as tenure-initiating units will be evaluated for merit salary increases and other rewards by their tenure-initiation units, with input from the Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering Department Chair as appropriate.

5.1 MERIT SALARY INCREASE CRITERIA FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

Merit salary recommendations will be based upon the balance of contributions to the graduate and undergraduate academic activities in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service.

5.1.1 TEACHING

Merit increases will be considered in recognition of excellence in teaching. The diversity of teaching activities of each faculty member shall be taken into account. Among the factors to be considered are classroom performance, laboratory and project course supervision and teaching, program and course development, development of pedagogical materials, supervision of
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doctoral, masters' and honors undergraduate students, and related activities outside the classroom.

5.1.2 RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP

Merit increases will be considered in recognition of excellence in research/scholarship leading to significant publications. Among the factors to be considered are articles accepted by, or published in, refereed journals, invited or reviewed conference presentations, research grants, review papers, monographs, and seminar and colloquium presentations.

5.1.3 SERVICE

Merit increases will be considered in recognition of the strength of service to the Department, the University, and the engineering profession. In addition to administrative service and service on department and university committees, other meritorious service includes unusual or difficult special assignments, participation on national and international advisory committees, governing boards, and organization of conferences and workshops.

5.2 MERIT SALARY INCREASE CRITERIA FOR CLINICAL TRACK FACULTY

Merit increases will be considered in recognition of excellence in teaching and strength of service to the Department. The diversity of teaching activities of each faculty member shall be taken into account. Among the factors to be considered are classroom performance, laboratory and project course supervision and teaching, course development, development of pedagogical materials and student interaction and advising.

5.3 MERIT SALARY INCREASE CRITERIA FOR RESEARCH TRACK FACULTY

Merit increases will be considered in recognition of excellence in research. The diversity of research activities of each faculty member shall be taken into account. Among the factors to be considered are publications in high quality refereed journals, sponsored research funding, graduate student advising, and other scholarly activities. Performance in occasional graduate teaching in the research area of expertise may be taken into account, if applicable.

5.4 MERIT SALARY INCREASE PROCEDURES FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

Annual salary adjustments will be based upon merit as reflected in the yearly contributions of a faculty member to the academic activities of the Department in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service. Since the Department has major responsibilities for both graduate and undergraduate educational activities, individual faculty contributions to both areas are evaluated. For a given professional rank, comparative norms of contributions in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service are established by the Department Chair. Annual salary adjustments are based upon such comparative evaluations.
After reviewing the annual reports of the faculty members, other relevant documentation, and other pertinent information (equity and market factors, promotions, etc.), the Department Chair will make recommendations to the Dean regarding salary adjustments.

5.5 MERIT SALARY INCREASE PROCEDURES FOR CLINICAL TRACK FACULTY

Annual salary adjustments will be based upon merit as reflected in the yearly contributions of a faculty member to the academic activities of the Department in the areas of teaching, curriculum development, and service to students. In order to help in evaluation and documentation of teaching performance of clinical track faculty, it is required that they develop and maintain Teaching Files as described in Appendix B.

In order to help in evaluations of teaching performance in cases where it is documented by teaching files, the Department Chair shall periodically appoint a teaching evaluation panel composed of ME faculty members, students, alumni and external academics to review the teaching files and issue brief summary reports on the faculty members. The teaching panel shall be convened approximately every three years. A recommended panel membership is as follows:

- One or more faculty members from the department, one of whom will serve as chair of the panel
- One or more alumni employed in industry, who received their BSME at OSU and graduated between 5 and 10 years prior to their panel service
- One peer from the academy, who may be an engineering emeritus faculty member, a current (non-ME) faculty member, a Ph.D. alumnus, or other current faculty member with teaching expertise
- One representative from the Office of Faculty and TA Development at OSU, and
- One or more student representatives from Pi Tau Sigma and/or the ASME student section.

For a given clinical track faculty rank, comparative norms of contributions in the areas of teaching and service are established by the Department Chair. Annual salary adjustments are based upon such comparative evaluations. After reviewing the annual reports of the faculty members, other relevant documentation, and other pertinent information (equity and market factors, promotions, etc.), the Department Chair will make recommendations to the Dean regarding salary adjustments.

5.6 MERIT SALARY INCREASE PROCEDURES FOR RESEARCH TRACK FACULTY

Annual salary adjustments will be based upon merit as reflected in the yearly contributions of a faculty member to the research activities of the Department. In order to help in evaluation and documentation of research performance, it is required that each research track faculty member maintain detailed documentation and records of all research contributions and scholarly activities in the form of annual reports as detailed in Sections 4.5 and 5.7. The sponsoring research group will also review the annual reports and provide the Department Chair with a written evaluation of the research faculty member.

For a given research track faculty rank, comparative norms of contributions in the areas of research are established by the Department Chair. Annual salary adjustments are based...
upon such comparative evaluations. After reviewing the annual reports of the faculty members, other relevant documentation, and other pertinent information (equity and market factors, promotions, etc.), the Department Chair will make recommendations to the Dean regarding salary adjustments.

5.7 DOCUMENTATION

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to submit an annual report of his/her activities, as described in Section 4.5. Faculty will also be invited to provide in writing any additional information relevant to salary adjustments. In all cases, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to see that his/her professional achievements are brought to the attention of the Department Chair.

6. REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

6.1 GENERAL CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

The Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering hereby establishes general criteria for promotion and tenure, which are intended to promote the following attributes in terms of faculty performance:

- Excellence in teaching,
- Excellence in scholarship,
- Effectiveness of service to the academic and professional communities and society, thereby demonstrating commitment to citizenship and collegiality in the fulfillment of one’s responsibilities to students and colleagues.

Criteria are enumerated below for each of the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The measures of quality/effectiveness which will be used for evaluation, as well as the manner of documentation of performance, are described in Section 6.6. Though the evaluation of faculty performance shall consider the different aspects enumerated above, it is not our intent to consider performance in any of these areas with no regard to its relationship to performance in the others. The integration of different aspects of faculty performance to maximize the impact on the mission of the department and the institution is highly valued, as is balance between contributions in the different areas. For instance, the forging of synergistic links between creative scholarship and effective teaching strengthens both activities, and is consistent with the unique status of The Ohio State University as the premier research institution, as well as the largest land grant institution, in the state of Ohio.

We expect also that the balance between contributions in the different areas will vary between different tenure track faculty members, given the differences in opportunity and need in the different areas of research and instruction in a field as broad as Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering. Evaluation of tenure track faculty performance for purposes of tenure and/or promotion shall, therefore, reflect this awareness.

We note as well that the criteria for promotion of clinical track and research track faculty members are distinct from those for tenure track faculty members and from each other. The criteria for clinical track faculty members primarily emphasize teaching in areas of the
curriculum closely linked to professional practice, whereas those for research track faculty members primarily emphasize research and scholarship.

6.1.1. TEACHING

Each tenure track faculty member is expected to teach courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Differences among the different technical areas of the department, departmental needs, scheduling matters, enrollment considerations, and other factors are expected to impact the degree of diversity represented in the candidate faculty member’s teaching history. Since some of these factors may lie beyond the candidate's control, the candidate's teaching record should exhibit variety subject to these constraints.

The successful tenure track faculty candidate for promotion and/or tenure is expected to demonstrate excellence as a teacher in terms of:

- Teaching of undergraduate and graduate courses,
- Mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students in research, and academic advising of students,
- Curriculum development, including course and lab development, and
- Involvement in graduate exams, theses, and dissertations, in a capacity other than that of advisor.

The successful clinical track faculty candidate for promotion is expected to demonstrate excellence as a teacher in terms of:

- Teaching of undergraduate and graduate courses emphasizing professional practice, and
- Curriculum development, including course and lab development.

Evidence of commitment to teaching, and effectiveness as a teacher, should be presented. Student and peer evaluations of teaching are the primary measures used for evaluation of teaching performance for all regular tenure track and clinical track faculty. Appropriate documentation of teaching activities is required and is described in Sections 6.6.1, 6.6.2, and 6.6.3.

6.1.2. RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP

The successful tenure track faculty candidate for promotion and/or tenure, and the successful research track faculty candidate for promotion, are expected to:

- conduct scholarly research,
- disseminate the research findings and knowledge produced, by contributing to the technical literature,
- attract external funding to support the conduct of the research, and
- involve graduate students in the research activities.

Candidates for promotion at either level must provide clear and compelling evidence that they are building and/or maintaining an active, productive research program, and can be expected to continue to do so. The conduct of the research may involve either the candidate and his/her graduate students primarily, or significant collaboration with other researchers. In either case, the record must clearly indicate the nature of the candidate's research contributions and his/her scholastic identity. Evidence of accomplishments must be presented which demonstrates the candidate's development of a national/international stature in his/her area of research. Evaluation of the candidate's research/scholarship accomplishments will primarily be based on

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs
12/28/10
his/her publication and funding records, and the external peer evaluation letters, which are elaborated upon in Sections 6.6.4, 6.6.5, and 6.6.6.

The notion of scholarship is more broadly defined for evaluating this aspect of the performance of clinical track faculty. For such cases, scholarship is defined to include the application and advancement of a body of knowledge via activities other than those noted above. The scholarship of learning and teaching is one such activity. Others include development of new methodologies for teaching including approaches to broadening engineering education, development of novel product and/or system designs and design methodologies, and creative engineering activities as evidenced by patent applications and competitive professional awards.

6.1.3 SERVICE

The successful tenure track faculty candidate for promotion and/or tenure, and the successful clinical track faculty candidate for promotion, are expected to demonstrate a history of effective service, which may include service to:
- Professional societies, and organizations such as funding agencies,
- The department, college, and university communities
- Student groups and organizations, and
- Other public and private entities beyond the University.

Appropriate documentation of service activities is required, using the measures described in Section 6.6.7. The faculty candidate’s attitude and professional conduct in the discharge of her or his duties is of importance and demonstrates a commitment to citizenship and collegiality, as noted in Section 6.6.7. From a somewhat broader perspective, members of the Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering faculty are expected to adhere to the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME), the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, and/or the American Nuclear Society (ANS) Code of Ethics.

6.2. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE

This section describes requirements, in addition to those in Section 6.1, which are specific to promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. The essence of these requirements is that the candidate's performance should provide compelling evidence that he/she will continue to develop professionally, and can be expected to bring credit to The Ohio State University in the future.

6.2.1. TEACHING

The general aspects of teaching effectiveness, as well as measures for evaluation, are described in Section 6.1.1. Expectations specific to promotion at this level with tenure are discussed here.

Classroom teaching by the candidate should show evidence of commitment to teaching and development as an effective instructor. This may be in the form of good student/peer evaluations and/or a clear trend of consistent improvements in classroom performance. The candidate is expected to have taught both undergraduate and graduate courses.

The candidate is expected to show evidence of development as an effective mentor of graduate and undergraduate students in research. It is expected that there will be a transient
period when the candidate establishes the necessary facilities to support his/her research, establishes his/her identity among graduate students, and attracts student researchers. It is expected that the candidate would have guided several M.S. students to the completion of their theses, and that he/she would have some Ph.D. students well along in their programs of study. It is also expected that the candidate would be serving, or have served in, a number of thesis/examination committees for graduate students advised by other faculty members, especially in the area of the candidate’s research interest.

While there are no specific requirements in the area of curriculum development, candidate contributions that would be valued include the introduction/modification of graduate courses in the area of the candidate’s research interests, and enhancement/revisions of undergraduate courses/laboratories as part of an overall plan of curriculum revision.

6.2.2. RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP

While general expectations are elaborated earlier in Section 6.1.2, some aspects specific to promotion at this level with tenure are discussed in this section. The successful candidate is expected to present the evidence of the following characteristics for a well-developed research program: the clear establishment of a research identity; the demonstrated ability to develop graduate students as apprentice researchers and to advise them effectively through the program; the ability to identify and secure funding at some reasonable level to support these research activities; and consistency. There must be clear and compelling evidence that the candidate has actively undertaken the building of a research program and will continue to build and maintain that program for the foreseeable future.

The quality and quantity of scientific publications in refereed archival journals will be considered in the evaluation. The quality of the contribution will be regarded highly, while the quality of the journal will be considered as a factor. For a variety of reasons, it is difficult to define a specific number of expected archival publications that would be deemed satisfactory. Yet, the successful candidate is clearly expected to have more than several publications at this level. It is both expected and appropriate that the candidate will include publications co-authored with the doctoral advisor. However, some of the archival publications should be authored by the candidate with his/her own research team members, including graduate students.

It is natural that a transient period will occur as the candidate builds interest in his/her work, acquires and develops graduate student researchers, builds a laboratory, and the like. It is also clear that the significance and duration of such transients is a function of the number of colleagues and the degree of infrastructure in place to support and assist the candidate, according to the research area, upon arrival. Moreover, there is a marked variation in the delay of the peer review process from one journal (or one area) to another. However, once a reasonable period of adjustment is past, the research program of the candidate should begin to produce in a fairly steady manner.

For successful promotion to associate professor with tenure, the Department must be confident that an appropriate scholarly level of performance on the part of the candidate can reasonably be expected to continue. This confidence will derive from such factors as the nature and extent of work in progress, number and status of graduate students under the candidate's direction, funding in place and proposals submitted, and papers accepted and under review. The candidate's own plans for future research directions should also be clear and feasible.
6.2.3. SERVICE

The well-rounded member of the faculty of a premier institution such as The Ohio State University is expected to assume a leadership role in his/her research community and its professional activities. While it is understood that junior members of the faculty must wait their turn for some of the responsibilities, the Department does expect to see the evidence of high quality contributions to department administration and to other areas as defined by the department; and the candidate's involvement on the national level. Thus, the evaluation of service will encompass administrative and committee service within the university, as well as professional society activities that utilize the candidate's expertise.

The successful candidate is anticipated to be a colleague for the rest of the careers of the faculty members in the department. It is therefore necessary that the faculty member carry out his or her teaching, research, and service activities in a manner that instills in the faculty a high degree of confidence in terms of expectations for positive future working relationships. The candidate's professional conduct in the performance of his/her duties will be evaluated in this context.

6.3 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO TENURED PROFESSOR

This section describes requirements, in addition to those in Section 6.1, which are specific to promotion to the rank of tenured Professor. The essence of these requirements is that the candidate's record is one of excellence in teaching and research/scholarship, and of effective service.

6.3.1 TEACHING

The general aspects of teaching effectiveness, as well as measures for evaluation, are described in Section 6.1.1. For promotion to tenured Professor, the candidate should demonstrate excellence in teaching, as documented by student and peer evaluations. The candidate is expected to have a record commensurate with the duration of his/her employment, with particular emphasis on the period since the last promotion. The candidate is expected to have:

• A record of consistently effective classroom teaching of undergraduate and graduate courses, with particular emphasis on the preceding five years. Measures of quality, which may be used to demonstrate excellence, are the successful use of innovative techniques or third-party evaluations of classroom performance to improve teaching effectiveness, teaching awards for classroom instruction, and variety of courses taught.
• A record of effective mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students in research. The candidate shall have graduated at least some Ph.D. students, and usually, a greater number of M.S. students. Consistency in the area of mentoring students over the period of interest is important, a steady stream of students being indicative of a continuing and sustained effort. It is also expected that, at the time of consideration for promotion, the candidate will have a number of Ph.D. and M.S. students at various stages of their programs of study.
• A record of significant contributions in the area of curriculum development, in the form of development and/or modifications of courses and labs.
A record of meaningful and consistent involvement in graduate exams, theses, and dissertations, in a capacity other than that of advisor.

6.3.2 RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP

While general expectations are elaborated upon in Section 6.1.2, some aspects specific to promotion to tenured Professor are discussed in this section. The candidate should demonstrate, over the duration of his/her research career, excellence in research/scholarship, as documented by external peer evaluations, the publication record, and funding history. The candidate is expected to have:

- A record of acknowledged excellence in the conduct of scholarly research. The excellence of the candidate’s research efforts and scholastic accomplishments must be recognized nationally and internationally by acknowledged scholars in his or her area. Such a record is usually accompanied by a coherent research program which has produced important results relating to one or a few central research issues of acknowledged significance in the academic community. Furthermore, consistency of the research effort is important as well, it being required that the candidate maintain an active research program at the time of consideration for promotion.

- A record of consistency and excellence in contributions to the technical literature, especially during the period after the last promotion. The candidate shall have produced a significant body of publications in refereed journals, particularly in high quality archival journals appropriate to the research area, refereed conference proceedings, book chapters and other forms. Other measures of the quality, which may be used, include invited talks and research seminars given by the candidate. It is difficult to place absolute numerical requirements on the publication record, given the wide variability in acceptance rates, prestige and visibility within journals and other publications. However, it is essential that the publication record be commensurate with a sustained record of research, and dissemination of research results, over the duration of the candidate’s research career. The publication record in archival journals is of primary importance for promotion to Professor.

- A record of excellence in involving graduate students in research. This aspect of research/scholarship overlaps with the mentoring aspect of the candidate’s teaching performance, which has been described previously in the document. In addition to the comments relating to graduation of Ph.D. and M.S. students as part of such mentoring, it is expected that the candidate will have co-authored a number of publications with his/her graduate students, and that he/she will have facilitated research presentations by graduate students at technical conferences. Awards and honors secured by graduate students, such as best paper/presentation awards and university/national fellowships based on research progress and results, reflect positively upon the candidate’s involvement of graduate students in research, and will be so treated. Also, honors and fellowships awarded to Ph.D. students after graduation, as well as placement at prestigious institutions, will be similarly treated.

- A record of sustained funding at a reasonable level to support the research activities of the candidate. Each faculty member is expected to create and maintain an externally supported research program. The funding history of the candidate, including the seeking
of the funding, should be consistent with this requirement, especially for the period since the last promotion.

In addition to demonstrating a record of excellence in the different areas of research/scholarship, the candidate should provide evidence of ongoing research activity in the form of papers in review for publication, continuing grants/contracts, submitted proposals, and Ph.D./M.S. students at different stages in their programs of study.

6.3.3 SERVICE

For promotion to tenured Professor, the candidate faculty member is expected to have compiled a record of effective service, as described below. In the process of doing so, the candidate shall have demonstrated responsible departmental citizenship and collegiality:

- A record of effective service to professional societies, and organizations such as funding agencies, often in leadership roles. Such service may take the form of editorships of prestigious journals, conference proceedings, and symposium proceedings; organization and/or chairing of sessions at technical conferences or workshops; technical committee chairmanships in societies; service as reviewer of technical proposals for governmental funding agencies, and as reviewer of conference and journal papers.

- A record of effective service to the department, college, and university, again involving leadership roles often. Service in departmental committees in leadership roles is expected of the candidate. Service to the department may also take the form of faculty advising of student groups and organizations by the candidate. It is expected and natural that candidates for promotion at this level would have had significantly more opportunities for service to the college and university, and would have availed of such opportunities.

6.4 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION OF OTHER THAN TENURE TRACK FACULTY TO NEXT LEVEL

6.4.1 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE

The teaching and service criteria for promotion from Assistant Professor of Practice to Associate Professor of Practice shall be qualitatively similar to corresponding criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, as described in Sections 6.1.1, 6.1.3, 6.2.1, and 6.2.3. Teaching of courses with an emphasis on professional practice shall be emphasized. Also, the scholarship criteria for such promotion will emphasize broader notions of scholarship as noted in Section 6.1.2. Further, since teaching and service criteria carry more weight for clinical track faculty, expectations on relative contributions in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service shall be appropriately adjusted.

6.4.2 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE

The teaching and service criteria for promotion from Associate Professor of Practice to Full Professor of Practice shall be qualitatively similar to corresponding criteria for promotion to tenured Professor in the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, as described in Sections 6.1.1, 6.1.3, 6.3.1, and 6.3.3. Teaching of courses with an emphasis on professional
practice shall be emphasized. Also, the scholarship criteria for such promotion will emphasize broader notions of scholarship as noted in Section 6.1.2. Further, since teaching and service criteria carry more weight for clinical track faculty, expectations on relative contributions in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service shall be appropriately adjusted.

6.4.3 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE RESEARCH PROFESSOR

The criteria for promotion from Assistant Research Professor to Associate Research Professor shall be qualitatively similar to the scholarship/research and service criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, as described in Sections 6.1.2 and 6.2.2. The expectation in service contributions is that external service will be emphasized. Also, since there are no teaching expectations of research track faculty, the expectations on contributions in scholarship/research shall be appropriately adjusted.

6.4.4 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO FULL RESEARCH PROFESSOR

The criteria for promotion from Associate Research Professor to Full Research Professor shall be qualitatively similar to the scholarship/research criteria for promotion to tenured Professor in the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, as described in Sections 6.1.2 and 6.3.2. The expectation in service contributions is that external service will be emphasized. Also, since there are no teaching expectations of research track faculty, the expectations on contributions in scholarship/research shall be appropriately adjusted.

6.5 PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

Procedures for promotion and/or tenure review are described in this section. In all matters involving voting by tenure track faculty, votes of tenure track faculty who have appointments of less than 100% in the Department will be counted in full only if the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering is their tenure-initiating unit. Clinical track faculty and research track faculty will not have voting rights on promotion and tenure issues for tenure track faculty. In addition, clinical track faculty will have voting rights on promotion issues only for clinical track faculty, and research track faculty will have voting rights on promotion issues only for research track faculty.

6.5.1 COMPOSITION AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE AND OF THE PROMOTION COMMITTEES FOR CLINICAL AND RESEARCH TRACK FACULTY

The Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee consists of at least five tenured members of the faculty with the rank of Professor for whom the Department is the tenure initiating unit, who are appointed by the Chair and normally serve three year terms. The membership of the committee should normally include representatives of all the technical interest area groups of the department, the latter being defined in the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering Pattern of Departmental Administration.
The P&T Committee is responsible for initial screening of tenure track candidates for promotion and/or tenure, and for working with the candidates to ensure that their promotion dossiers are complete and in the required format. The P&T Committee, working with the Chair, is responsible for soliciting and collecting letters of evaluation from outside the university, as is required by the review procedure and as described in Section 6.5.2. The Committee is responsible as well for the arrangement of classroom visits for peer evaluation of classroom teaching, as described in Section 6.5.3. Finally, it is the responsibility of the P&T Committee to verify the details of the overall record of the tenure track faculty candidate.

The chair of the P&T Committee is appointed by the Department Chair, and serves as chair of the meetings of the eligible faculty held to discuss promotion and tenure cases. The P&T Committee Chair is the Procedures Oversight Designee required by the university Guidelines and Procedures document. The eligible faculty consists of all tenured faculty in the Department, for consideration of cases involving tenure track faculty for promotion and/or tenure at the Associate Professor level. For consideration of tenure track faculty cases for promotion to the Professor level, the eligible faculty consists of all the tenured Professors in the Department. The P&T Committee will present an initial report assessing the candidates at the meetings of the eligible faculty, and will revise this initial report to include the comments and assessments made by the eligible faculty at these meetings. The P&T Committee will also be responsible for conducting and reporting the results of voting by the eligible faculty, as required by the promotion and tenure process.

For consideration of the promotion of clinical track faculty, the Promotion Committee shall consist of the members of the P&T Committee, supplemented if needed by up to two other Full Professors belonging to the tenure track or clinical track categories and named by the Department Chairperson to serve in this committee for three-year terms. The Department Chairperson has the option of naming the P&T Committee as the Promotion Committee for clinical track faculty. This committee shall perform the screening, evaluation, and organizational functions listed above for all promotion cases involving clinical track faculty. The eligible faculty consists of all tenured faculty in the Department and clinical track faculty at the rank of Associate Professor and above, for consideration of clinical track faculty promotion to the Associate Professor level. For consideration of clinical track faculty cases for promotion to the Professor level, the eligible faculty consists of all the tenured Professors in the Department and clinical track faculty at the rank of Full Professor.

For consideration of the hiring and promotion of research track faculty, the Promotion Committee shall consist of the members of the P&T Committee, supplemented if needed by up to two other Full Professors belonging to the tenure track or research track categories and named by the Department Chairperson to serve in this committee for three-year terms. The Department Chairperson has the option of naming the P&T Committee as the Promotion Committee for research track faculty. This committee shall perform the screening, evaluation, and organizational functions listed above for all promotion cases involving research track faculty. The eligible faculty consists of all tenured faculty in the Department and research track faculty at the rank of Associate Professor and above, for consideration of research track faculty promotion to the Associate Professor level. For consideration of research track faculty cases for promotion to the Professor level, the eligible faculty consists of all the tenured Professors in the Department and research track faculty at the rank of Full Professor.
6.5.2 SELECTION OF EXTERNAL REFERENCES

External references shall be used to evaluate the quality of the research performed by candidate tenure track or research track faculty members, at the time of promotion and/or tenure. Recognized authorities in the candidate’s area of research, at other peer institutions, will be asked to evaluate the quality of the candidate’s research. Peer institutions include peer universities, national laboratories, and reputable industrial research organizations. It is essential that the credentials of the external references be outstanding, and that they have deep appreciation of the criteria used by major research universities in evaluating research contributions of faculty.

The P&T Committee, or the Promotion Committee for research track faculty, shall compile a list of five or more external referees. The committee may solicit the input of the Chair and other faculty in compiling this list. The candidate shall also compile a list of three external referees. The candidate is offered the chance to view the list compiled by the appropriate review committee (P&T Committee or Promotion Committee), and indicate if he/she has objections to any of the persons named in that list. The candidate may object to up to two of the names on the review committee’s list. If there are objections, additional names are provided by the review committee to ensure that there are five or more names in its list at the end of this process.

6.5.3 CLASSROOM VISITS FOR PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Classroom visits shall be used to evaluate the quality of the teaching of candidate tenure track or clinical track faculty members, at the time of promotion and/or tenure. Student evaluations of classroom instruction will be supplemented by multiple classroom visits to the candidate’s classes, in the quarters preceding the candidate’s promotion/tenure review process, fourth-year review process, or contract renewal evaluation process. The visit(s) will be conducted by departmental faculty who are familiar with the courses involved, at the request of the P&T Committee, or Promotion Committee for clinical track faculty. The candidate will be informed about the period in the quarter over which the visit(s) will occur. The visiting faculty members shall document their evaluation of the candidate’s classroom teaching, using the evaluation form included as Appendix C, and supplementing it by additional written comments submitted to the appropriate review committee (P&T Committee or Promotion Committee for clinical track faculty), if necessary.

6.5.4 DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW PROCEDURES

The procedures to be followed for the consideration of tenure track faculty candidates for promotion and/or tenure at the Associate Professor level, and for promotion to tenured Full Professor are similar and are outlined below. The evaluation criteria and expectations are described in Sections 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3. The review committee for these cases is the P&T Committee.

The procedures to be followed for the consideration of clinical track faculty candidates for promotion to Associate Professor of Practice, and for promotion to Full Professor of Practice are similar to the procedures for tenure track faculty candidates, but for the differences noted below. The review committee for these cases is the Promotion Committee for clinical track faculty. The evaluation criteria and expectations are described in Sections 6.4.1 and 6.4.2.
The procedures to be followed for the consideration of research track faculty candidates for promotion to Associate Research Professor, and for promotion to Full Research Professor are similar to the procedures for tenure track faculty candidates, but for the differences noted below. The review committee for these cases is the Promotion Committee for research track faculty and research scientists. The evaluation criteria and expectations are described in Sections 6.4.3 and 6.4.4.

During the spring quarter of each year, the P&T Committee will review the performance of tenure track faculty members with respect to their teaching, research, and service, for purposes of promotion and tenure consideration. In the same time frame, the Promotion Committee for clinical track faculty and the Promotion Committee for research track faculty and research scientists, both described in Section 6.5.1, will review the performance of the appropriate categories of faculty members or research scientists for purposes of promotion. Past annual reports from the faculty members, as well as their updated curriculum vitae, shall be used for this purpose. Student evaluations of teaching shall also be used, as well as the Teaching File and its evaluation by the Teaching Evaluation Panel, if available for the faculty member. The P&T committee and the Promotion Committees shall recommend to the Chair that the faculty members under review either be considered or not considered for promotion and/or tenure the following academic year. For those faculty members not considered for promotion and/or tenure the following academic year, the committee shall provide constructive feedback to the faculty members concerned, with the active involvement of the Chair. In case any of the three committees is unable to reach a clear consensus on a faculty member being reviewed by the committee, the Chair may call for a meeting of the faculty eligible to vote on the issue, to provide additional input before proceeding further.

For those faculty members to be considered for promotion and/or tenure, complete dossiers will be compiled by the beginning of the autumn quarter, following the format of the Core Dossier specified by OAA (http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook/xi_ptannual2006_dossier.php). The candidates are responsible for the compilation of the dossiers, with assistance from the P&T Committee or the Promotion Committees as needed. While the Core Dossier needs to be filled in its entirety by tenure track faculty members, clinical track and research track faculty members need fill only the relevant sections of the document.

External evaluation of each tenure track and research track faculty candidate's scholarly work will be requested from authorities in his/her field of expertise. The P&T Committee, or the appropriate Promotion Committee, will select the external references from lists compiled by the committee and the candidate, as described in Section 6.5.2. The completed dossier should contain at least five letters from external references, with more than half of these letters being from persons named by the P&T Committee (or Promotion Committee) and the Chair. The P&T Committee and Promotion Committee should solicit letters from appropriate numbers of references from the two lists, to ensure this result. A sample letter, to be used for requesting external evaluations of the candidate’s research, is attached as Appendix D. All letters received in response shall be included in the dossier.

Peer evaluation of the tenure track and clinical track faculty candidate’s classroom teaching is based on the completed evaluation forms (Appendix C) used by faculty members for classroom visits, as well as additional comments provided by them. All of the completed evaluation forms, as well as the additional comments provided, shall be included in the dossier. The Teaching Files and their assessment by a Teaching Evaluation Panel shall be included for clinical track faculty, and may be included if available for tenure track faculty members.
The candidate’s dossier, including his/her statement of research and teaching accomplishments, as appropriate, will be reviewed. At the conclusion of this evaluation, the P&T Committee (or the appropriate Promotion Committee) will draft a document to accompany the candidate’s dossier during its consideration by the eligible faculty of the Department. This document shall assess the candidate’s performance and record in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service.

All the candidates are next considered by all the eligible faculty of the Department for the case under consideration, as defined in Section 6.5.1. A meeting of all eligible faculty, chaired by the P&T Committee Chair (or Promotion Committee Chair), will be held with open discussion of each candidate. Prior to this meeting, the candidate’s complete dossier will be available for review by the eligible faculty. The P&T Committee or appropriate Promotion Committee shall prepare a written report on the candidate discussing the qualifications of the candidate and reflecting the faculty discussion. This report shall accurately characterize the views of the eligible faculty as articulated at this meeting, and will serve as the report of the eligible faculty on the candidate.

The P&T Committee or appropriate Promotion Committee shall conduct a vote of all eligible faculty concerning the promotion and/or tenure for each candidate, by secret ballot. The Office of Academic Affairs has emphasized the need to ensure that faculty votes on major policies such as tenure and promotion represent views of faculty who participated in a very real sense in the process of deliberation that is expected to precede the voting. Voting rights on promotion and tenure issues will therefore be restricted to eligible faculty members who meet this requirement or faculty members who are on travel and participate in the meeting via conference call. If participation via conference call is not possible, and the justification for this is documented, documents related to the P&T case under discussion will be put up on a secure web site accessible to the faculty member on travel. Contingent upon verification that the faculty member on travel logged into that web site, opened the pages, and scrolled to the end, the faculty member will be allowed to vote electronically.

The Committee will forward the report of the eligible faculty, and the recommendation of the eligible faculty as indicated by the results of their vote, to the Department Chair. For the ballot to be considered valid, it must involve voting by three-fourths of the eligible faculty. A majority of two-thirds of the faculty casting votes affirmatively on the case would be considered a positive outcome. The Department Chair shall then prepare a separate letter assessing each candidate’s performance, and recommending either for or against promotion and/or tenure. The Department Chair will report in this letter the number of votes cast in favor of the promotion and/or tenure, and the number against. The vote of the eligible faculty members, and their report, act as recommendations to the Department Chair. If the Chair's decision is in disagreement with that of the eligible faculty, he/she will discuss his/her reasoning with the group.

Consistent with Chapter 3335-6 of the Faculty Rules, as soon as the report of the eligible faculty and the Chair's letter are completed, the candidate should be notified in writing of the completion of the departmental review and of the availability of the report and the letter. The candidate may provide the Department Chair with written comments on the review for inclusion in the dossier, within ten calendar days of notification of the completion of the review. The P&T Committee and/or the Department Chair may provide written responses to the candidate's comments, for inclusion in the dossier. Only one iteration of comments on the departmental level review is permitted.
The Chair will forward the candidate’s dossier including the report and vote of the eligible faculty, and his/her own letter, along with candidate comments and departmental responses if applicable, to the Dean of the College of Engineering.

Procedures for appeal of the results of the above review, for tenure track faculty members, are described in Section 7.

6.6. PROMOTION/TENURE DOCUMENTATION

It is essential that faculty members fully document their accomplishments relevant to the expectations described in Sections 6.1 and 6.2 of this document for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, Sections 6.1 and 6.3 for promotion to tenured Professor, and Sections 6.1 and 6.4 for promotion of clinical track and research track faculty.

The faculty candidate shall provide, in support of his/her case for promotion and/or tenure, a core dossier carefully and accurately completed as appropriate depending on the faculty category, following the standard format determined by the Office of Academic Affairs. If requested, the faculty candidate should be prepared to supply copies of his/her publications, and original letters of acceptance for publications that are unconditionally accepted without any further revisions, but not yet printed. If requested, the candidate should be able to provide copies of the student evaluations, course syllabi and other appropriate course materials, descriptions of any courses developed, Teaching Files if applicable, and documentation of awards and citations.

Measures to be used to characterize faculty member performance and record in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service are described in the following subsections, along with procedures for documentation.

6.6.1 STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION

Student evaluation of classroom instruction is an essential measure of the quality of teaching performance of tenure track and clinical track faculty. A mandatory component of such student evaluation is the use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) questionnaire (or other equivalent instrument) provided by the Office of the Registrar, and the ME departmental questionnaire, for each course taught by the candidate faculty member. In considering the student evaluation information, student responses to different questions and the pattern of their responses over all the courses taught by the candidate should be examined, rather than reducing the information to a single number and judging the quality/effectiveness of teaching by that number.

While a faculty member may distribute SEI and ME departmental questionnaires to his/her class, the faculty member may not handle the completed questionnaires. The normal procedure is for a student volunteer to collect the questionnaires and deliver them to the undergraduate/graduate advising office. Faculty members may use OSU-approved web-based software packages such as Carmen or other web-based procedures for electronic SEI submission to conduct these surveys instead, if class schedules do not permit timely distribution of the forms to the classes. In such cases, the faculty members need to notify the Department Chair or Associate Chair in advance. Faculty members may also use the computer-based surveys in addition to distributing the surveys in class, at their option.

Additional student evaluations of classroom instruction, which are not mandatory, may also be obtained from the following sources:
Senior exit surveys, which consist of detailed questionnaires covering the entire ME undergraduate curriculum and are given to all graduating seniors during their last quarter of study. The seniors are requested to complete the questionnaires and mail them to the ME department.

Letters from recent alumni who have taken courses from the candidate faculty member. Such letters may be sought in cases where they are deemed helpful to a more complete assessment of teaching performance. All responses to such solicitations shall be considered in performing the assessment, regardless of the nature of the responses.

6.6.2 EVALUATIONS BY PEERS AND OTHERS

Peer evaluation of classroom instruction, and of other aspects of teaching by the candidate faculty member, is mandatory, and will follow the procedures described in Section 6.5.3. The variety of courses taught by the candidate will also be taken into account in this evaluation. Furthermore, successful use of innovative educational techniques to improve teaching effectiveness will be recognized. Peer evaluation of the quality of the candidate’s contributions in the following areas of teaching shall also be performed, where appropriate for the faculty track:

- Mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students in research, and academic advising of students.
- Curriculum development, including course and lab development. Examples of contributions in this area are the introduction of graduate courses, significant revision and updating of the undergraduate and graduate curricula, upgrading of laboratory component of courses, and updating of graduate courses by incorporation of research results.
- Involvement in graduate exams, theses, and dissertations, in capacity other than that of advisor. Meaningful involvement implies that the candidate provides appropriate guidance to the graduate students involved, by sharing his/her expertise and perspective.

Additional measures of the effectiveness of teaching, involving evaluation and recognition by others, including academic peers in some instances, are listed below, and will be used if they are available. By their nature, these measures are not mandatory.

- Authorship of textbooks, wide use of such texts implying a significant measure of positive peer recognition.
- Teaching awards for classroom instruction.
- Grants for teaching and course development, especially if they involve significant peer evaluation.
- Refereed publications in journals dedicated to engineering education.
- Successful and properly documented use of classroom visits by colleagues, or other parties such as the Office of Faculty and TA Development, to improve teaching effectiveness.
- Letters from alumni with graduate degrees, advised by the candidate, commenting on the quality of the mentoring received by them.

6.6.3 TEACHING FILE

The Teaching File allows for more comprehensive documentation of teaching performance. It would contain course conduct and student performance information, in addition to student and
peer evaluations of the faculty member’s teaching performance, and is described in Appendix B. The Teaching File is mandatory for clinical track faculty members. Tenure track faculty members are encouraged, at their option, to use this form of documentation of teaching performance.

6.6.4 PUBLICATION RECORD

The successful tenure track and research track faculty candidate's publication record should document consistency of scholarly endeavor, and be commensurate with that of leading scholars in his/her field, when they were at a similar stage in their careers. While a publication record appropriately consists of several components apart from archival papers, it is the archival journal papers that serve as the foundation on which the remainder of the record should be built and evaluated. Thus, a reasonable representation of the candidate's work is required to appear in the most reputable journals in his/her research area.

In view of the wide variability in acceptance rates, prestige, and visibility within journals and other publications, it is difficult to define absolute numerical requirements on the publication record. However, it is essential that this record be commensurate with a sustained record of research and dissemination of research results. Collaborative research efforts are encouraged where appropriate. When work is co-authored, the faculty member must be able to indicate what his/her contribution to the work was in terms of both effort and substance.

A complete publication record will include more than archival journal papers. Conference papers (both refereed and otherwise), book chapters, magazine articles, and patents are all worthy products of the faculty member's research activities. While these are generally considered to be secondary to the archival publications, in some research areas more consideration may be warranted, especially for patents and refereed conference publications. It is important, however, that the conferences should be widely recognized as refereed, selective, and of high quality. The visibility of these conferences as focal points for research in the area must also be established.

The candidate should be able to show that the publication record has been built and/or sustained during his/her tenure at The Ohio State University. Consistent with the Department's educational mission, the publication record of the candidate is expected to have the graduate student involvement. The candidate will also have facilitated research presentations by graduate students at technical conferences.

The quality of the papers, and of the journals in which the papers appear, will be assessed. The external evaluators will also be specifically asked to comment on the quality of the research presented in the papers.

6.6.5 FUNDING RECORD

In addition to publications, a productive tenure track or research track faculty member being considered for promotion is expected to acquire and maintain external resources to support his/her research activities. The external funding should allow the candidate to build the infrastructure to support such activities, eventually generating high quality results. The funding (and the seeking of funding) should be documented as an ongoing, consistent activity. It is recognized, however, that it is the quality of the product and the consistency of the effort that are regarded highly, rather than the amount of funds received.
6.6.6 EXTERNAL PEER EVALUATION LETTERS

External letters will be solicited from recognized authorities at peer institutions and in the candidate's areas of research, for critical evaluation of tenure track and research track faculty and research scientists being considered for promotion. It is understood that, in addition to universities, peer institutions include reputable government and industrial research organizations. Measures of research/scholarship accomplishments also include invited research seminars, research awards, and professional honors. Fellowships and honors awarded to graduate students, such as university/national fellowships and best paper/presentation awards, reflect positively upon the faculty candidate's involvement of graduate students in research. The placement of graduated Ph.D. students in prestigious organizations and/or evidence of success of former students reflect favorably on the mentoring they received from the candidate, and on the institution they graduated from. Letters seeking information on the nature of mentoring they received may also be sought from alumni with graduate degrees who were advised by the faculty candidate.

6.6.7 SERVICE MEASURES

Measures of service to professional societies and organizations include, but are not restricted to, the following:
- Editorships of journals, conference proceedings, and symposium proceedings,
- Organization and/or chairing of sessions at technical conferences or workshops,
- Leadership roles in societies, including technical committee memberships,
- Service as reviewer of conference and journal papers, and
- Service as reviewer of technical proposals.

Measures of service to other public and private entities beyond the University include, but are not restricted to, the following:
- Service on panels and commissions
- Professional consultation to governmental and educational organizations.

Service to the department, college, and university takes the form of participation in committees at these various levels, the significance of the service being greater if the candidate assumes a leadership role. Faculty advising of student groups and organizations by the tenure track and clinical track candidate is also a significant form of service, especially if such advising is shown to contribute to improved effectiveness of operation of these groups.

Ours is a large, complex endeavor that requires of all of us, hard work, cooperation, professionalism, ethical behavior, and a collegial attitude. It is therefore entirely appropriate to consider the candidate’s professional conduct in the discharge of her or his department (and other university-related) responsibilities as part of the evaluation. The successful candidate in this area will:
- demonstrate prompt and consistent attendance at assigned committee and other departmental meetings, as well as effective and efficient completion of the work external to the meetings necessary for the committee, or other body, to fulfill its responsibilities.
- satisfy the need of the department to participate in activities that reach beyond the department, such as faculty governance, outreach, and service.
- treat departmental staff, and faculty with professionalism and respect.
- treat students with professionalism and respect both in the classroom, and individually.
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• be available for a reasonable period of time each week to meet with students.
• make good use of departmental resources.
• treat members of the public with whom he/she interacts as a representative of the university, professionally and with respect.
• practice fiscal integrity in all interactions with funding agencies/sponsors and other external customers.

7. APPEALS

Faculty Rule (3335-6-05A) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and/or tenure decisions for tenure track faculty. Further detail on appeals alleging improper evaluation is contained in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05.

8. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS (Faculty Rule 3335-6-05B)

Every effort should be made to consider new information about a tenure track faculty 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 Dean 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 Chair must approve proceeding with a petition for a seventh year review of probationary tenure track faculty. 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 tenure track Assistant Professor's seventh and last year of employment.

If the Dean concurs with the tenure initiating unit's petition, the Dean 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 non-renewal issued following the original negative decision.

A tenure track faculty member may not request a seventh year review, appeal the denial of a seventh year review petition initiated by his/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.
APPENDIX A
ANNUAL REPORT FORMAT
ANNUAL REPORT FOR PROFESSOR
(YOUR NAME)

2005 CALENDAR YEAR

RESEARCH ACTIVITIES IN CALENDAR YEAR 2005

I Publications

List your publications under one of the four interest areas: Applied Mechanics; Design and Manufacturing; Dynamics Systems; and Energy, Fluid, and Thermal Engineering. Also, for each publication that you list, indicate within parentheses which of the four focus areas in our departmental strategic plan the publication belongs to. The four focus areas are: Advanced Transportation; Energy and Environmental Quality; Materials and Manufacturing; and Micro- and Nanotechnology. If you feel the publication does not belong to any of the four focus areas, please indicate ‘Other’ within parentheses.

a) Editorial Boards

List all editorial board appointments (journal editor or associate editor) that were active at any time during the 2005 calendar year. If the appointment was only active during part of the year, list the date of appointment, or the date of completing the term.

b) Books and Monographs

b1) Books you authored that were in print during calendar year 2005. Give the authors, title, publisher, edition, year of publication, and number of pages. If the book first appeared during 2005, give the month of publication.

b2) Books you edited that were in print during calendar year 2005. Give the editors, title, publisher, edition, year of publication, and number of pages. If the book first appeared during 2005, give the month of publication.

b3) Book chapters you authored that appeared in print during calendar year 2005. Give the author(s), title, editors, publisher, and page numbers.

b4) New book projects you have under contract with a publisher that were under contract during calendar year 2005. Give the author(s), title, publisher, and expected year of publication.

b5) Book chapters you authored that were accepted for publication during calendar year 2005. Give the author(s), title, editors, and publisher.

c) Journal Articles

c1) Papers that appeared in archival journals. Include only papers that appeared in print during calendar year 2005. Also, include only those printed in journals with a formal review process. Give author(s), title, journal, volume, number, month, and page numbers. Please include the month of the issue since we may have to prepare academic year data from this material.

c2) Papers that were accepted by archival journals. Include only papers for which you received a formal letter of acceptance during calendar year 2005. Also, include only those accepted by journals with a formal review process. Give author(s), title, and journal name.

c3) Papers that appeared in magazines or non-refereed journals. Include only papers that appeared in
print during calendar year 2005. Also, include only those printed in journals or magazines that do not have a formal review process. Give author(s), title, journal, volume, number, month, and page numbers.

c4) Papers that were accepted by magazines or non-refereed journals. Include only papers for which you received a formal letter of acceptance during calendar year 2005. Also, include only those accepted by journals that do not have a formal review process. Give author(s), title, and journal name.

c5) Abstracts, and extended abstracts. Include only abstracts that appeared in print during calendar year 2005. Give author(s), title, journal, volume, number, month, and page numbers.

d) Conference Proceedings

d1) Papers that appeared in refereed proceedings. Include only papers that were presented during calendar year 2005. Also, include only those presented in conferences with a formal review process. Give author(s), title, conference, volume, editors (if applicable), month, and page numbers. Please include the month of the conference.

d2) Papers that were accepted for refereed proceedings but have not yet been presented. Include only papers for which you received a formal letter of acceptance during calendar year 2005. Also, include only those accepted by conferences with a formal review process. Give author(s), title, and conference.

d3) Papers that appeared in non-refereed proceedings. Include only papers that were presented during calendar year 2005. Also, include only those presented in conferences and workshops that do not have a formal review process. Give author(s), title, conference, volume, editors, month, and page numbers.

e) Other Publications

All other publications such as videotapes, web based materials, book reviews, reports etc. Include only material published during 2005 and provide, as nearly as appropriate, the same information as for the above categories.

f) Patents

Patents on which you are listed as an inventor that were granted during calendar year 2005.

II Presentations

a) Meetings and Conferences

Include only presentations you made yourself, not papers presented by co-authors. Include only presentations made during calendar year 2005. Give title, conference or meeting and month of the presentation.

b) Workshops and Short Courses

Include only presentations you made yourself, not papers presented by co-authors. Include only presentations made during calendar year 2005. Give title, conference or meeting, and month of the presentation.

c) Seminars

Include only seminars presented during calendar year 2005. Give title, location, and month of the presentation.

III Graduate and Undergraduate Students Advised; Postdoctoral Researchers Supervised

a) Ph.D. Dissertations completed during calendar year 2005
Give student's name, dissertation title, program (ME, NE, EM, BME, One of a Kind etc.), any co-advisors, month of completion, and student's current employment (if known).

b) M.S. Theses completed during calendar year 2005

Give student's name, thesis title, program (ME, NE, EM, BME etc.), any co-advisors, month of completion, and student's current employment (if known).

c) Non-thesis M.S.'s completed during calendar year 2005

Give student's name and program (ME, NE, EM, BME etc.), and month of completion.

d) Undergraduate honors projects completed in calendar year 2005

Give student's name, thesis title, and month of completion.

e) Postdoctoral research supervision completed in calendar year 2005

Give researcher’s name, Ph.D. degree and degree granting institution, duration of employment (Start date – Finish date), current employment

f) Current doctoral students in calendar year 2005

Give student's name, program, expected quarter of completion, and source(s) of support during calendar year 2005. Indicate source of funds for student tuition, viz, project or cost-share.

g) Current master's students in calendar year 2005

Give student's name, program, thesis or non-thesis, expected quarter of completion, and source(s) of support during calendar year 2005. Indicate source of funds for student tuition, viz, project or cost-share.

h) Current undergraduate honors students in calendar year 2005

Give student's name and source(s) of any support.

i) Current postdoctoral researchers supervised in calendar year 2005

Give researcher’s name, Ph.D. degree and degree granting institution, duration of current employment (Start date – Present)

IV Sponsored Research and Development Programs in Calendar Year 2005

Include only projects that were active during calendar year 2005. Give project title, principal investigator, co-investigator(s), other investigators, sponsor, amount of current award, start and finish dates of current award, and project expenditure in calendar year 2005. Also, for each project that you list, indicate within parentheses which of the four focus areas in our departmental strategic plan the project belongs to. The four focus areas are: Advanced Transportation; Energy and Environmental Quality; Materials and Manufacturing; and Micro- and Nanotechnology. If you feel the project does not belong to any of the four focus areas, please indicate ‘Other’ within parentheses.

V Proposals submitted in calendar year 2005

Include proposals submitted in calendar year 2005. Give project title, principal investigator, co-investigator(s), other investigators, sponsor, amount of award sought, and proposed start and finish dates. Indicate decision status.

VI Awards and Honors Received During Calendar Year 2005
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Include professional society grade promotions, particularly promotions to fellow grade, as well as awards and prizes. Give the title of the award, society or sponsor and activity for which the award was made, if appropriate. Include also university, college and department awards.
TEACHING ACTIVITIES IN CALENDAR YEAR 2005

I Classroom Teaching Performance

a) Courses taught in calendar year 2005
   List courses taught including the quarter of offering. If multiple sections of a course were taught by you, indicate the number of sections taught, as well.

b) Student evaluations for courses taught in calendar year 2005
   SEI summaries and completed departmental evaluation forms are available to the department chairperson and need not be submitted. If other student evaluations were sought, you may attach them here.

c) Third party evaluations of classroom performance in calendar year 2005 (Optional)
   Materials are relevant here include documentation of consultations with the Office of Faculty and TA Development, or of peer consultation on teaching techniques.

d) Involvement in graduate student exams and theses in capacity other than advisor
   List graduate student exams and theses defenses, during calendar year 2005, in which you participated in a capacity other than advisor or co-advisor

II Self-assessment by faculty member

This statement should be limited to three pages, and should include the following items as appropriate:

a) Statement of teaching philosophy of faculty member, including teaching goals for next few years
   If you submitted a statement as part of a recent annual report, you need not submit one for 2005. You may, however, do so if you wish.

b) Course content modifications or enhancements in calendar year 2005
   Significant revision and updating of undergraduate and graduate courses, updating of graduate courses by incorporation of research results, introduction of new courses. Introduction of new experiments or laboratory courses. Revision of existing laboratory courses.

c) Novelty and innovation in instruction in calendar year 2005

d) Measures taken to improve effectiveness of instruction in calendar year 2005

III Other Teaching Activities

List the following activities as appropriate:

a) Authorship of textbooks published in calendar year 2005

b) Conference activities and presentations related to teaching in calendar year 2005

c) Publications in journals devoted to engineering education in calendar year 2005

d) Teaching awards and awards for textbooks received in calendar year 2005

e) Grants for teaching and/or course development in calendar year 2005
SERVICE ACTIVITIES IN CALENDAR YEAR 2005

I Professional Service Activities During Calendar Year 2005

Include professional society and other professional service activities such as conference chairpersonships, or organizing/program committee memberships, journals and funding agencies for whom reviewing was done, professional society committees, government advisory panels etc.

II University Service During Calendar Year 2005

Indicate term since most university assignments are on an academic year basis. Also indicate committee chair assignments.

a) Administrative assignments in the department

b) Departmental committees

c) College committees

d) University committees

III Consulting Activities in Calendar Year 2005

Indicate companies or individuals for whom consulting work was done, and the nature of the work done (e.g. engineering analysis, expert witness, engineering design etc.).
APPENDIX B
THE TEACHING FILE
The Teaching File

The teaching file prepared by each faculty member would contain course conduct and student performance information, which would enable subsequent evaluation by members of the teaching evaluation panel. It would also offer an opportunity for self-assessment by the faculty member. These two components are intended to supplement student and peer evaluations of the faculty member and to enable a comprehensive evaluation of teaching performance.

Course conduct and student performance information

The information in this part of the file will include the following:

- Detailed course syllabus, reading assignments etc.
- Samples of graded student performance (anonymous) in each course:
  - Homework assignments
  - Exams
  - Design projects and project evaluations if applicable
  - Course project reports if applicable
  - Laboratory reports if applicable
- Distribution of grades assigned to students for courses

Self-assessment by faculty member

This statement will be limited to three pages, and should include the following items:

- Statement of teaching philosophy of faculty member
- Course content modifications or enhancements over the period covered.
- Novelty and innovation in instruction, where appropriate.
- Accommodation of the changing nature of professional practice
- Teaching goals for the next 3 years
- Measures taken to improve effectiveness of instruction
- Conference activities related to teaching
- Publications in ASEE Prism, ASEE Journal of Engineering Education, or other appropriate journals

Student evaluation of instruction

Student evaluation of instruction is an essential part of the evaluation of teaching performance, and the following procedures are proposed:

- Distribution and collection of course evaluation forms will administered by Pi Tau Sigma and/or the student section of ASME. Students will be advised of the importance attached to the process, so that they will be thoughtful in their responses. They will also be advised to respond to the departmental questionnaire first, so that they can collect their thoughts and impressions before responding to the SEI questionnaire.
- Results from the departmental questionnaire will be maintained by the department, as is the current practice, and will be made available to the teaching evaluation panel.
- The interest area groups will be asked to select ten questions from the master set of questions used for the SEI to be used for each of the courses of interest to the section.
Thus, the faculty members teaching the courses would be able to select the most appropriate questions.

- The SEI report generated by the University will be made available to the teaching evaluation panel.

Peer evaluation

Peer evaluation of classroom instruction and of other aspects of teaching by the faculty member will address the following areas of teaching:

- Successful and properly documented use of classroom visits by colleagues, or other parties such as the Office of Faculty and TA Development, to improve teaching effectiveness
- Mentoring of graduate (if applicable) and undergraduate students and academic advising of students. One method of evaluating this will be exit interviews of graduating seniors conducted by the department Chair or associate chairs and exit surveys/interviews of graduating graduate students conducted by the Graduate Studies Committee. Letters may also be solicited from alumni with graduate degrees and advised by the faculty member, commenting on the quality of the mentoring received by them
- Curriculum development, including course and lab development. Examples of contributions in this area include: significant revision and updating of the undergraduate and graduate curricula, upgrading of the laboratory component of courses, updating of graduate courses by incorporation of research results, and the introduction of new courses.
- Meaningful involvement in graduate exams, theses, and dissertations, in capacity other than that of advisor. Meaningful involvement implies that the faculty member provides appropriate guidance to the graduate students involved, by sharing his/her expertise and perspective.
- Involvement with undergraduates in research
- Advising of undergraduate honors theses.
- Confidential statements on student preparedness by colleagues who teach subsequent required courses, which will be solicited by the teaching evaluation panel
- Evaluations by Office of Faculty and TA Development

Additional measures of the effectiveness of teaching, involving evaluation and recognition by others, including academic peers in some instances, are listed below, and will be used if they are available. By their nature, these measures will not apply to all faculty members.

- Authorship of textbooks, wide use of such texts implying a significant measure of positive peer recognition.
- Awards for textbooks
- Teaching awards for classroom instruction.
- Grants for teaching and course development, especially if they involve significant peer evaluation
- Mentoring of other teachers by providing guidance, sharing notes etc.
Benefits of Review

The results of the teaching evaluation will be used to reward faculty members who excel in teaching, as well as to evaluate clinical track faculty members. As such, it will be a significant factor in the determination of raises and the promotion process, and it will provide input into various teaching awards (department, college, university, ASEE). In addition, it will provide relief to some faculty concerns about using student evaluations as the only means of evaluating teaching.

The results may also be used for diagnostic purposes to identify problems in teaching. If the problems in teaching effectiveness are general, we will organize workshops through the Office of Faculty and TA Development. If problems are identified with a specific course, the interest area will be asked to propose changes to improve the course. If there are problem associated with the teaching effectiveness of an individual faculty member, the faculty member will be referred to the Office of Faculty and TA Development.

Summary

The teaching file will require each faculty member to assemble appropriate documentation. Much of it will be accumulated over a period of three years. Also, some of the written material will be included in the individual faculty member's annual reports and resume. Therefore, creating the teaching file at three-year intervals will involve mainly assembling course material collected annually and editing other material that was provided for annual reports.
The following questions, condensed from the university SET list, are provided as possible guides for comments. Use the back of the form for additional comments.

**Preparation:**

1. Well prepared for class?

2. Has a thorough knowledge of the subject?

**Communication:**

3. Speaks clearly and audibly?

4. Writing/drawing at the board legible?

5. Presentation at an appropriate pace/level?

6. Explanations clear/concise?

7. Encourages questions/discussion?

8. Questions answered clearly?

9. Proportion of basic and applied material appropriate?

**Effectiveness:**

10. Holds class attention?

11. Stimulates interests in the subject?

12. Has a good relationship with students?

**General Comments:**
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SAMPLE LETTERS TO EXTERNAL REFERENCES
SAMPLE LETTERS TO EXTERNAL REFERENCES  

Dear < >

Dr. < > is currently being considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure in the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering at The Ohio State University. It is our practice to request evaluations of the quality of the research of a candidate and of his or her professional standing from recognized authorities in the candidate's field such as yourself.

Our criteria for such a promotion are similar to those of most other research universities. We do evaluate the candidate's achievements with respect to research contributions, teaching performance, and service to the university and the profession. Specifically, I wish to receive your comments regarding Dr. < >'s:

1) Professional reputation;
2) The impact of his work and publications;
3) His participation in professional organizations and activities.
4) How you would compare him to leading individuals in his peer group?

I am enclosing a copy of < >'s current resume and selected publications. Your discussion of any of these papers that are in your area of expertise would assist this review.

Any additional comments that you may wish to make regarding < >'s professional career would be appreciated. We are constrained by the college and university time schedules for processing promotion requests. Accordingly, I must request your response <date>.

It is my duty to inform you that, under the provisions of the Ohio Open Records Act all documents relating to P&T reviews, including letters of evaluation, are public records. Therefore we are unable to guarantee confidentiality.

I would like to thank you for taking the time to provide us with your opinion in this most important matter. We do recognize the time and effort needed to respond to these requests and we very much appreciate your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Professor and Chairperson

Enclosures
Dear < >:

Dr. < > is currently being considered for promotion to the rank of Professor in the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering at The Ohio State University. It is our practice to request evaluations of the quality of the research of a candidate and of his or her professional standing from nationally recognized authorities in the candidate's field such as yourself.

Our criteria for such a promotion are similar to those of most other research universities. We do evaluate the candidate's achievements with respect to research contributions, teaching performance, and service to the university and to the profession. Specifically, I wish to receive your comments regarding < >’s:

1) Professional reputation;
2) The impact of his/her work and publications;
3) His/her participation in professional organizations and activities.
4) How you would compare him/her to leading individuals in his peer group?

I am enclosing a copy of Dr. < >’s current resume and selected publications for your reference. Your discussion of any of these papers that are in your area of expertise would assist this review.

Any additional comments that you may wish to make regarding Dr. < >’s professional career would be appreciated. We are constrained by the college and university time schedules for processing promotion requests. Accordingly, I must request your response by <date>.

It is my duty to inform you that, under the provisions of the Ohio Open Records Act all documents relating to P&T reviews, including letters of evaluation, are public records. Therefore we are unable to guarantee confidentiality.

I would like to thank you in advance for taking the time to provide us with your opinion in this most important matter. We do recognize the time and effort needed to respond to these requests and we very much appreciate your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Professor and Chairperson

Enclosures