

**Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures
Department of Materials Science and Engineering**

Table of Contents

I. Preamble	4
II. Department Vision and Mission.....	4
III. Definitions.....	4
A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty	4
1. Regular Tenure Track Faculty	4
2. Regular Clinical Track Faculty.....	5
3. Regular Research Track Faculty.....	5
4. Conflict of Interest	5
B. Promotion and Tenure Committee	5
C. Quorum.....	6
D. Voting Procedures and Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty	6
1. Appointment	6
2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal.....	6
IV. Appointments.....	6
A. Criteria	6
1. Regular Tenure Track Faculty	6
2. Regular Clinical Track Faculty.....	8
3. Regular Research Track Faculty.....	9
4. Auxiliary Faculty	9
5. Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty	10
B. Procedures	11
1. Regular Tenure Track Faculty	11
2. Regular Clinical Track Faculty.....	12
3. Regular Research Track Faculty.....	13
4. Transfer of track.....	13
5. Auxiliary Faculty	13
6. Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty	14

V. Annual Review Procedures	14
A. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty	15
1. Fourth-Year Review.....	15
2. Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period.....	16
B. Tenured Faculty.....	16
C. Regular Clinical Track Faculty	17
D. Regular Research Track Faculty	17
VI. Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards	17
A. Criteria	17
B. Procedures	18
C. Documentation	18
VII. Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion Reviews.....	18
A. Criteria	18
1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	23
2. Promotion to Professor	24
3. Regular Clinical Track Faculty.....	26
4. Regular Research Track Faculty.....	26
B. Procedures	26
1. Candidate Responsibilities.....	27
2. Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities	30
3. Eligible Faculty Responsibilities	31
4. Department Chair Responsibilities	31
5. External Evaluations	33
C. Documentation	34
1. Teaching.....	35
2. Scholarship.....	35
3. Service.....	35
VIII. Appeals.....	36
IX. Seventh-Year Reviews.....	36
X. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	36
A. Student Evaluation of Teaching.....	36

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching 36

Appendix A. Timetable..... 39

I. Preamble

In this Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) document, The Department of Materials Science and Engineering (MSE) shall describe, in qualitative terms, the department's criteria for appointments, promotion, and tenure within the context of the department's mission. This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policy and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>); and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the department and its faculty are subject.

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

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

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

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

II. Department Vision and Mission

Vision Statement. Our vision is creation of an environment that brings together a diversity of people and ideas through the process of discovery and learning for the advancement of materials science and engineering. We seek to create impact that is tangible and significant with excellence that is obvious.

Mission Statement. Our mission is to create and transfer knowledge through research and teaching excellence in materials science and engineering, and be a core asset to the Ohio economy for national and global competitiveness.

III. Definitions

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

1. Regular Tenure Track Faculty

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of regular tenure track faculty consists of all tenure track faculty whose tenure resides in the department.

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

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

2. Regular Clinical Track Faculty

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of regular clinical track faculty consists of all tenure track faculty whose tenure resides in the department. Clinical track faculty also participates in the appointment and promotion reviews of clinical track and research track faculty.

The eligible faculty for reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion of regular clinical track faculty consists of all tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in the department excluding the department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

3. Regular Research Track Faculty

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of regular research track faculty consists of all tenure track faculty whose tenure resides in the department. Research track faculty also participates in the appointment and promotion reviews of research track faculty.

The eligible faculty for reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of regular research track faculty consists of all tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in the department excluding the department chair, the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

4. Conflict of Interest

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

B. Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee consists of two professors who are appointed by the department chair. The term of service of each member of the P&T Committee is two years, with reappointment possible.

C. Quorum

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

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

D. Voting Procedures and Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

It is the obligation of the regular faculty to participate in this process. In all votes taken on personnel matters are by secret ballot. Only “yes” and “no” votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to consider whether they are participating fully in the review process when abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter. Participating in a conference call/video resulting in a vote is permitted. The vote count is recorded and reported to the department chair at the meeting. The Pattern of Administration (POA) describes the governance rights to be extended within the Materials Science & Engineering Department to regular, research track, and clinical track faculty.

1. Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast are positive.

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

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

IV. Appointments

A. Criteria

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

1. Regular Tenure Track Faculty

Instructor. Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but requirements for the doctorate degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. When an instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked without a formal request for an extension of the probationary period. In addition all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Tenure-track Assistant Professor. To be appointed as a tenure-track assistant professor, a candidate must meet or exceed the following minimum criteria.

- The candidate must possess an earned doctorate in a field of study relevant to materials science and engineering or welding engineering.
- The candidate's recommendation letters must establish the candidate as among the top of his or her peer group nationally.
- The candidate must demonstrate potential for excellence in teaching as determined in part by a record of teaching, the colloquium during the interview process, through individual and small group discussions with faculty, staff, and students, and excellence in verbal and written communication.
- The candidate must demonstrate potential for excellence in scholarship as determined in part by an ability to formulate and complete a major body of research, and by the ability to clearly communicate the results and their significance in the form of peer-reviewed publications.
- The candidate's stated goals and career development plan must be consistent with the department mission.
- The candidate's performance during the interview and the candidate's references should indicate the potential that the candidate will help the department fulfill its mission.
- The candidate must exhibit a strong potential to advance through the faculty ranks.

Associate Professor with Tenure. To be appointed as an associate professor with tenure, a candidate must meet or exceed the following minimum criteria.

- * The criteria established by the department for appointment as a tenure-track assistant professor.
- * All of the department's criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure (Section VII).

Full Professor with Tenure. An appointment as a full professor involves tenure. To be appointed as a full professor with tenure, a candidate must meet or exceed the following minimum criteria.

- * All criteria set forth for appointment as an associate professor with tenure.
- * The department's criteria for promotion to full professor (Section VII).

Associate Professor or Full Professor without Tenure. A probationary appointment as Associate Professor or Full Professor is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional, i.e. terminal year of employment is offered.

Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a senior rank and approved for tenure, if appropriate, but the university will not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency.

2. Regular Clinical Track Faculty

Appointment of regular clinical track faculty entails a three-, four- or five-year contract. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to regular clinical track faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the department wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see Faculty Rule 3335-7 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>).

Regular clinical track faculty are referred to as “(Assistant, Associate, or Full) Professor of Practice in Materials Science & Engineering”. Distinctions among ranks are based on the level of distinction attained by the candidate.

The activities of regular clinical track faculty must be consistent with the rationale for having regular clinical track faculty in the College. These activities may consist of, but are not limited to teaching of courses, laboratories and other practical experiences, creating and leading out-of-class learning experiences for students that are related to the practice of engineering. The scholarly emphasis of clinical track faculty is expected to be different from that of tenure-track and research track faculty; clinical track faculty are expected to be more engaged in activities dealing with the state of the practice of engineering, while tenure-track and research track faculty are expected to be more engaged in activities that advance the state of the art and science of engineering. The venues appropriate for dissemination of such scholarly contributions therefore may be very different from those expected of tenure-track faculty. Scholarly and professional service activities of clinical track faculty are expected to emphasize interaction with constituencies beyond the research community.

Instructor of Practice. Appointment is normally made at the rank of instructor of practice when the appointee has not completed the requirements for the terminal degree or has not obtained the required licensure/certification at the time of appointment. The department makes every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to a four-year contract. In such cases, if the instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor of practice by the beginning of the penultimate year of the contract period, a new contract is not considered even if performance is otherwise adequate and the position itself continues.

Assistant Professor of Practice. There must be clear and convincing evidence that a candidate for appointment as assistant professor of practice has, at a minimum:

- expertise in the candidate’s area of specialization
- experience in the practice of the discipline consistent with the title of the position
- professional accomplishments consistent with the title of the position
- the background and ability to share and transfer knowledge to students

Normally, the candidate must have an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in a field related to materials science or welding. Professional publications and actual teaching experience is desired but not required.

Associate Professor of Practice. There must be clear and convincing evidence that a candidate for appointment as an associate professor of practice has, at a minimum:

- exceeded the Materials Science & Engineering Department criteria for appointment as assistant professor of practice.
- met or exceeded the Materials Science & Engineering Department criteria for promotion to associate professor of practice.

Full Professor of Practice. There must be clear and convincing evidence that a candidate for appointment as a full professor of practice has, at a minimum:

- exceeded the Materials Science & Engineering Department criteria for appointment as associate professor of practice
- met or exceeded the Materials Science & Engineering Department criteria for promotion to full professor of practice.

3. Regular Research Track Faculty

Appointment of regular research track faculty entails one- to five-year contracts. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to regular research track faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the department wishes to consider contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see Faculty Rule 3335-7 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>).

Faculty members appointed to the regular research track are expected to focus their efforts on research. A research faculty member may, but is not required to, participate in limited educational activities in the area of his or her expertise. Research faculty members are expected to contribute to the department's research mission and are expected to demonstrate excellence in scholarship as reflected in high quality peer-reviewed publications and applications for successful competition of external funding of their research program.

The criteria for appointment, reappointment and non-reappointment, and for promotion for regular research track faculty shall be established by this promotion and tenure document and approved by a majority vote of the regular tenure-track faculty of the department and by the College and the Office of Academic Affairs. The criteria reflect the preponderance of responsibilities being in research activities. Excellence in research is a requirement, while a component associated with classroom teaching is not required.

Research Assistant Professor. Appointment at the rank of research assistant professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and a record of high-quality publications that strongly indicate the ability to sustain an independent, externally funded research program.

Research Associate Professor and Research Professor. Appointment at the rank of research associate professor or research professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria for promotion to these ranks.

4. Auxiliary Faculty

Auxiliary appointments are made for no more than one year at a time. Compensated auxiliary faculty include lecturers, senior lecturers, faculty with regular titles having appointments less than 50%, and visiting faculty. No-salary auxiliary faculty include adjunct faculty, faculty with regular titles having a zero percent appointment, and visiting faculty. Auxiliary faculty participate in the programs of the

department but are not regular faculty members. Auxiliary faculty do not have voting rights in department faculty meetings.

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct appointments are never compensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who volunteer considerable uncompensated academic service to the department, such as teaching a course, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of regular tenure track faculty. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of regular tenure track faculty. In the event that the department wishes to compensate an adjunct faculty member for work other than the voluntary service for which the adjunct title is provided, a concurrent appointment of limited duration for lecturer, workshop leader, etc. may be added for that purpose. Consideration for renewal must be done on an annual basis.

Instructor of Practice, Assistant Professor of Practice, Associate Professor of Practice, Full Professor of Practice. Auxiliary clinical appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Auxiliary clinical rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of regular clinical track faculty. Auxiliary clinical faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of regular clinical track faculty.

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer. Appointments as lecturer and senior lecturer are made only when a specific instructional need is identified. The person appointed must have the qualifications to teach the course, or courses, as demonstrated by a Ph.D. degree or an equivalent experience for a lecturer or by a Ph.D. degree for a senior lecturer. The appointment must be approved by the P&T Committee and approved by the faculty and chair. Renewal of lecturer and senior lecturer appointments must be done on an annual basis. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion.

Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%. Appointment at regular titles is for individuals at below 50% FTE, either compensated or uncompensated. The rank of auxiliary faculty with regular titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of regular tenure track faculty. Auxiliary faculty members with regular titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of regular tenure track faculty.

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

Emeritus Faculty. A candidate must be a regular faculty member who has served the MSE department and who, upon retirement, is recommended by the department chair for emeritus status.

5. Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty

Occasionally the active academic involvement in this department by a regular faculty member from another department at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in this department. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course from time to time, or a combination of these. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized. Consideration for renewal must be done on an annual basis.

B. Procedures

See the Faculty Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>) for information on the following topics:

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

1. Regular Tenure Track Faculty

A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must be consistent with the university policies set forth in the most recent update of A Guide to Effective Searches (www.hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf).

Searches for tenure track faculty proceed as follows:

The dean of the college provides approval for the department to commence a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints with regard to salary, rank, and field of expertise.

The department chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search (if relevant) as well as other fields within the department.

The search committee:

- Appoints a Diversity Advocate who is responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants.
- Develops a search announcement for internal posting in the university Personnel Postings (formerly known as the "green sheet") through the Office of Human Resources Employment Services (www.hr.osu.edu/) and external advertising, subject to the department chair's and the dean's approval. The announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search.
- Develops and implements a plan for external advertising and direct solicitation of nominations and applications. If there is any likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must assure that at least one print (as opposed to on-line) advertisement appears in a location likely to be read by qualified potential applicants. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency ("green card"), and strict U. S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their appointment to a tenure track

position included an advertisement in a field-specific nationally circulated print journal.

- Screens applications and letters of recommendation and presents to the full faculty a summary of those applicants (usually three to five) judged worthy of interview. If the faculty agrees with this judgment, on-campus interviews are arranged by the search committee chair, assisted by the department office. If the faculty does not agree, the department chair in consultation with the faculty determines the appropriate next steps (solicit new applications, review other applications already received, cancel the search for the time being).

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

Following completion of on-campus interviews, the search committee solicits written comments from those meeting with the candidates. Unattributed comments are aggregated for each candidate and made available to the eligible faculty for their consideration. Additionally, the eligible faculty review supporting materials including teaching and research statements, and external letters of evaluation for each candidate. Following the review, the search committee presents a ranked list of the final candidates with a synopsis of their supporting materials justifying the ranking to the eligible faculty for consideration and vote. Votes are conducted for each candidate from highest ranked to lowest until a recommending vote is obtained. The recommending vote is communicated to the department chair in writing by the P&T Committee.

If the offer to the final candidate involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank in a recommending vote conducted in accordance with Section III.D. The search committee in consultation with the P&T Committee and department chair proposes the rank for final candidates. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair.

In the event that more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the department chair decides which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the department chair.

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

2. Regular Clinical Track Faculty

Searches for regular research track faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty. Highly qualified regular research track candidates may occasionally be considered for appointment without a national search, only when there is a reasonable likelihood that a national search would not result in finding more highly qualified and/or more diverse candidates. The Dean of Engineering must first approve the decision to interview a candidate without a national search. Any regular department faculty member may also initiate a request for the appointment of an individual as a clinical faculty member. The nominating faculty member provides a written statement of the proposed involvement of the candidate in the programs of the department. The candidates for this appointment provide, to the

department chair, a dossier containing an application letter from the candidate, his/her curriculum vitae and at least two reference names, indicating the type and level of appointment, and the reasons why the candidate should be appointed in the department. The department adds one more reference name for a junior level (assistant professor rank) appointment and 3 more reference names for a senior level (associate or full professor ranks) appointment. If approved for consideration by the department chair, the dossier (for appointment at the associate or full professor ranks) is evaluated by the department P&T Committee, which submits its evaluation to the department chair. After a review of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate, a recommending vote is made by the eligible faculty according to section III.D. The recommending vote is communicated to the department chair in writing by the P&T Committee. The department chair recommends the appointment to the College of Engineering.

For reappointment, the clinical faculty member must submit an activity report, at the request of the chair, summarizing the duties performed and services provided during the previous appointment and requesting reappointment. The recommendation to reappoint is voted upon by the eligible faculty of the department.

3. Regular Research Track Faculty

Searches for regular research track faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty. Highly qualified regular research track candidates may occasionally be considered for appointment without a national search, only when there is a reasonable likelihood that a national search would not result in finding more highly qualified and/or more diverse candidates. The Dean of Engineering must first approve the decision to interview a candidate without a national search. From that point, the on-campus interview and decision-making processes are identical to those following a national search. The department chair determines the details of the offer, including the length of the initial contract.

For reappointment, the research faculty member must submit an activity report, at the request of the chair, summarizing the duties performed and services provided during the previous appointment and requesting reappointment. The recommendation to reappoint is voted upon by the eligible faculty of the department.

4. Transfer of track

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

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

Tenure is lost upon transfer and transfers must be approved by the department chair, the college dean, and the executive vice president and provost. Transfers from the regular clinical track and from the regular research track to the tenure track are not permitted. Regular clinical track faculty members and regular research track faculty members may apply for tenure track positions and compete in regular national searches for such positions.

5. Auxiliary Faculty

Any regular department faculty member may initiate a request for the appointment of an individual as an auxiliary faculty member. The nominating faculty member provides a written statement of the proposed involvement of the candidate in the programs of the department. The candidates for this appointment provide to the department chair a dossier containing an application letter from the candidate, his/her

curriculum vitae and at least two reference names, indicating the type and level of appointment, and the reasons why the candidate should be appointed in the department. If approved for consideration by the department chair, the dossier (for appointment at the associate or full professor ranks) is evaluated by the department P&T Committee, which will submit its evaluation to the department chair. After a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate, the decision is made by a vote of the eligible faculty. The department chair makes the recommendation for the appointment to the College of Engineering provided the candidate receives a majority of the votes of the eligible faculty members.

Reappointments are considered every year. For reappointment, the auxiliary faculty member must submit an activity report, at the request of the chair, summarizing the duties performed and services provided during the previous appointment and requesting reappointment. This report should be submitted each year at the same time as all faculty Activity Reports. If the contributions are not substantial, the chair may recommend termination of the appointment. The recommendation to continue or terminate is voted upon by the regular faculty of the department on an annual basis.

6. Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty

Any regular faculty member may nominate a regular faculty member of another department within the university for a courtesy appointment in MSE at the same rank, based on expected contributions to the mission of the department. The nominating faculty member must provide a written statement explaining the reasons for the appointment and the candidate must provide an up-to-date curriculum vitae. The department chair makes the appointment provided the candidate receives a majority of the votes of the eligible faculty members.

Faculty members with courtesy appointments must file a brief activity report each year, at the request of the chair, summarizing their contributions to the department for the previous year. This report should be submitted each year at the same time as all faculty activity reports. If the contributions are not substantial, the chair may recommend termination of the appointment. The recommendation to continue or terminate is subject to a majority vote of the regular faculty of the department with a 2/3 quorum requirement. Promotion in rank in the candidate's home department is recognized in the reappointment process.

V. Annual Review Procedures

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the Faculty Annual Review Policy (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>).

The annual reviews of every faculty member are based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and service as set forth in the department's policy on faculty duties and responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant. The purpose of the review is to provide constructive feedback in writing to the faculty member about his/her performance, and an assessment of general progress toward his/her goals and contributions to the department mission. The annual review also provides the basis for merit salary increases. The annual review also provides the basis for a preliminary evaluation for P & T considerations. The timetable for this process is given in Appendix A.

The department chair is required (per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35 [<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>]) to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04 [<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>]) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

A. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty

The annual review for probationary faculty members involves four steps:

- * Submission of an annual activity report by the faculty member by March 1.
- * Review of the annual activity report by the department P&T Committee resulting in an evaluation report from the committee to the department chair.
- * A meeting between the faculty member, a member of the P&T Committee, and the department chair during spring semester of each year reviewing the P&T Committee Committee's evaluations.
- * Review of the annual activity report and the P&T Committee report by the department chair resulting in a written evaluation.

The procedures for the review are described below.

The faculty member is responsible for documenting his/her accomplishments and contributions for the previous calendar year. The annual activity report is due in the Chair's office, along with current curriculum vitae by March 1 each year.

The P&T Committee will review the faculty member's annual activity report and provide a written report to the department chair with an evaluation of faculty member's strengths and weaknesses. If the committee and the department chair are not in substantial agreement, the department chair will meet with the P&T Committee to achieve a consensus evaluation and recommendation.

A meeting between the faculty member, a member of the P&T Committee, and the department chair takes place during the Spring semester of each year reviewing the P&T Committee's evaluations. The department chair integrates the P&T Committee's report with his/her own evaluation and prepares a single written evaluation which is provided to the faculty member by the end of April. The evaluation explicitly identifies strengths and weaknesses, contain a clear statement of the areas of performance needing improvement, and suggest ways and means to bring about improved performance. A copy of the report is placed in the faculty member's P&T file. Within ten days after receiving the report, the faculty member may elect to provide a written response. Any response also becomes a permanent part of the file.

If the consensus evaluation of the faculty member's performance is below adequate and (for tenure-track faculty) the likelihood of progressing toward tenure is deemed to be low, the case will be brought to a meeting of the eligible faculty for review and a vote on whether the faculty member should be reappointed according to the procedure outlined in the Fourth Year Reviews. Voting proceeds as described in section III.D.

If the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 [<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>]) is invoked. Following completion of the comments process, the complete dossier is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

1. Fourth-Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluations are optional and the dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

External evaluations are only solicited when either the department chair or the eligible faculty determine that they are necessary to conduct the Fourth-Year Review. This may occur when the candidate's scholarship is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the scholarship without outside input.

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

The eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote and the P&T Committee forwards a written performance review to the department chair. The department chair conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 [<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>]) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

2. Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D) (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period. Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>).

No more than three years may be excluded from the probationary period for any reason, except in extraordinary circumstances. The faculty or department chair may advise a faculty member to apply to exclude time from the probationary period, but may not require the individual to do so.

A faculty member may also apply for an exclusion of time due to adverse events that were beyond the faculty member's control, such as childbirth/adoption and impeded productivity. These requests are reviewed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, which advises the department chair on the matter. Approval is based on the nature of the adverse event, the extent to which it was beyond the faculty member's control, and the faculty member's productivity before and after the period of the event. A negative recommendation by any of these parties terminates the review process.

The faculty member remains on duty regardless of time excluded from the probationary period. Annual reviews are conducted in every probationary year regardless of time excluded. Approved exclusions do not limit the department's right to recommend nonrenewal of appointment during an annual review.

B. Tenured Faculty

The annual review for tenured faculty members involves four basic steps:

- * Submission of an annual activity report by the faculty member by March 1st,
- * Associate Professor Only: review of the annual activity report by the department P&T Committee resulting in an evaluation report from the committee to the department chair by March 31st,
- * A meeting between the faculty member and the department chair to review the annual activity report. If appropriate, the meeting will include a member of the P&T Committee to review the P&T committee evaluation.

- * Review of the annual activity report and the P&T Committee report by the department chair followed by a written evaluation prepared by the department chair.

The procedures and timeline for the review are described below.

The faculty member is responsible for documenting his/her accomplishments and contributions for the previous calendar year. This report must be submitted to the department chair by March 1st each year.

The department chair will prepare a written evaluation which will be provided to the faculty member in a meeting on or about May 30th. The evaluation will explicitly identify strengths and weaknesses, contain a clear statement of the areas of performance needing improvement, and suggest ways and means to bring about improved performance. A copy of the report is placed in the faculty member's personnel file. Within ten days after receiving the report, the faculty member may elect to provide a written response. Any response also becomes a permanent part of the file.

C. Regular Clinical Track Faculty

The annual review process for regular clinical track probationary and nonprobationary faculty is identical to that for tenure track probationary and tenured faculty, respectively.

In the penultimate contract year of a regular clinical faculty member's appointment, the department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member continues. If the position does not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year is the terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) must be observed.

If the position continues, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member is offered a new contract. This review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for regular tenure track faculty except that external letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

D. Regular Research Track Faculty

The annual review process for regular research track probationary and nonprobationary faculty is identical to that for tenure track probationary and tenured faculty.

In the penultimate contract year of a regular research faculty member's appointment, the department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If the position does not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-08 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) must be observed.

If the position continues, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member is offered a new contract. This review proceeds identically to the Fourth-Year Review procedures for regular tenure track faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of renewal of contract.

VI. Merit Salary Increases and Other Rewards

Merit salary increases are based on the faculty member's overall performance and contributions to the department, college and university missions. Performance during the previous calendar year, sustained

performance over the previous five years, and the appropriateness of the faculty member's salary relative to his/her peers are all considered in reaching judgments about salary increases.

A. Criteria

Merit salary increases are based upon accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

- * Salary increases are considered in recognition of excellence in teaching. The diversity of educational activities among the faculty are considered. Other factors considered are teaching awards; outstanding classroom performance; leadership in program and course development; development of innovative instructional materials including e-learning digital material, textbooks, laboratory-manuals, and class notes; supervision of graduate research; and teaching activities outside the classroom including both formal and informal advising of undergraduate and graduate students, and advising students involved in internships and similar professional experiences.
- * Salary increases are considered in recognition of excellence in scholarship. Among the factors considered are contract and grant success, awards, patents, books, refereed articles, conference presentations, and presentations to academia and industry.
- * Salary increases are considered in recognition of excellence in service and leadership to the department, the college, the university, the profession, and society at large. Meritorious service includes participation on national and international review and/or editorial boards, advisory committees, governing boards, organization of conferences and workshops, and support activities for industry, government, and other groups. Membership and participation on department, college and university committees are expected of all faculty members and do not stand alone as meritorious. Noteworthy leadership in such activities is, however, meritorious. Service to students through advising student organizations is also recognized.

B. Procedures

The department chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the dean, who may modify these recommendations. Salary increases are formulated in dollar amounts rather than percentage increases, with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries.

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

C. Documentation

The annual performance review of every faculty member requires that an updated CV and an annual performance summary for the previous 12 months be submitted to the department chair no later than March 1st.

VII. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

A. Criteria

The promotion and tenure process in MSE has an important role in achieving the department mission. Meeting the demands of the mission requires excellent performance by the department's faculty. The

criteria for promotion and tenure establish the required level of excellence. MSE will adhere to Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, which provides general context and guidelines for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews. Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility is exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the university enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established academic patterns. In such cases care must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

In general terms, individuals are recommended for promotion in rank, or promotion in rank with tenure, based on demonstrated and documented contributions which enable the department to accomplish its mission. No individual is promoted or promoted and granted tenure without the full expectation that the individual continues to be a productive faculty member. No individual is promoted or promoted and granted tenure without the full expectation that the promotion serves to continue to improve the quality of the department's faculty and programs.

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

(<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/statementonprofessionalethics.htm>).

Teaching

The core of the department's mission is education through teaching and advising. All department faculty must be involved in teaching and mentoring of students. There must be compelling evidence in the documentation of teaching and mentoring activities that the candidate is an effective teacher. The specific criteria considered are described below.

Quality of Teaching

Quality is judged based upon the faculty member's:

- * command of his/her subject matter,
- * ability to incorporate new developments, and growth in the field over time,
- * the ability to appropriately select and organize educational material,
- * the ability to integrate and relate the subject matter to other fields of knowledge,
- * the ability to present the knowledge effectively in order to maximize learning, and
- * curriculum development in light of the needs of industry, society and the discipline.

Evidence of quality is derived from curriculum development activities, anonymous student comments and evaluations, anonymous student exit interviews, anonymous surveys of alumni and employers, and peer reviews by fellow faculty members.

Effectiveness of Teaching

The effectiveness of teaching is judged based upon the candidate's:

- * capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the subject,
- * creativity, spirit, and enthusiasm which vitalize learning and teaching,
- * ability to arouse curiosity and creativity in students, and
- * ability to select appropriate teaching techniques reflecting the needs of the students.

Evidence of effectiveness is derived from student comments and evaluations, and peer reviews.

Relevance and Impact

The relevance and impact of the candidate's teaching is judged based upon

- * the appropriateness of the material selected,
- * the relationship of the material to fundamental understanding of the discipline,
- * the relationship of the material to state-of-the-art professional practice, and
- * contributions to curriculum development in light of expressed industrial and societal needs.

Evidence of relevance and impact is obtained from student comments and evaluations, alumni surveys, industrial collaborators and peer reviews.

Excellence in Mentoring

Excellence in mentoring is judged based upon the candidate's

- * skill and extent of participation in the general guidance and advising of both undergraduate and graduate students, and
- * ability to guide undergraduate and graduate students to the successful completion of degree requirements.

Evidence of excellence in mentoring is obtained from student comments and evaluations, student exit interviews, surveys of alumni and employers, and successful graduate advising.

Scholarship

There must be convincing evidence that the candidate is effectively engaged in scholarship.

Collaborative, interdisciplinary, and individual efforts are all valued. Student participation in research is required. The scholarship of discovery, application and integration are all valued. Scholarship must be of high quality to be of value and it must have impact on the field. Impact may be on the intellectual direction of the academic field or on professional practice. The specific criteria used to evaluate scholarship are described in the remainder of this section.

Quality of Scholarship

The quality of a candidate's scholarship is judged based upon:

- * publication in respected archival journals,
- * participation in respected colloquia, conferences, symposia and other scholarly forums,
- * the presence of a coherent vision and an effective, well articulated and focused plan for scholarly activity,
- * demonstration of sustained progress toward scholarly goals, and
- * the ability to attract and involve students in scholarly work.

Evidence of the quality of the scholarship is obtained primarily by analysis of the candidate's record and review by appropriate evaluators.

Effectiveness of Knowledge Dissemination

The department mission requires that the results of our scholarship must be disseminated. The effectiveness of dissemination is judged based upon:

- * substantial contributions to the body of knowledge,
- * a sustained level of productivity, and
- * utilization of all of the appropriate dissemination mechanisms to reach the intended audience in the profession and society. Journal papers, conference presentations, books and trade publications and patents are all important vehicles depending on the nature of the scholarship and should be balanced accordingly.

Evidence addressing the effectiveness of knowledge dissemination is primarily obtained from the candidate's record and the comments of evaluators.

Relevance and Impact

Scholarship that is not relevant to the field or has no impact on the field is of little value in accomplishing the mission of the department. Relevance and impact may be relative to fundamental understanding of the field or one of its subdisciplines, or it may be directly related to professional practice. Relevance and impact are judged by the following:

- * sustained record of funding support for research and scholarly activities.
- * the presence of original and creative work that is used by others in the profession and society,
- * recognized leadership in the field,
- * patents, software, and new product or process developments,
- * active involvement on industry and government panels and policy forums,
- * active participation in cross-disciplinary scholarly activity, and

Evidence of relevance and impact is obtained by the faculty member's record and evaluators' comments.

Excellence in Mentoring

- * record of advising students to timely completion of their degrees,

- * significant involvement of undergraduates and graduate students in scholarly activity, and
- * placement of graduate students who are highly regarded and successful in industry, government, or academia.

Evidence of excellence in mentoring is obtained from analysis of the faculty member's record, students' exit interviews, and surveys of former students and former students' employers.

Service

Faculty members are expected to engage in service activities that enhance the academic programs of the department, college and university; and help us meet our mission as a land grant institution. For purposes of promotion and tenure, service includes, but is not limited to, service to the university, the profession, and public and private entities.

Quality of Service

Leadership and organizing abilities as demonstrated by successful completion of assigned or elected tasks and significant involvement in committee work at any level (department, college, university, nationally, internationally) are required.

Effectiveness of Service

The effectiveness of a candidate's service is demonstrated by

- * editorship of journals, books and other professional publications,
- * development of highly regarded short-courses and symposia,
- * a sustained record of consulting services to industry and society (consultation without compensation is highly valued),
- * a sustained record as a reviewer for professional publications, and
- * participation on proposal and program review panels for government agencies.

Evidence of effective service is obtained from analysis of the candidate's record, evaluators' comments, and surveys of those served.

Relevance and Impact

The relevance and impact of service activities are judged by

- * significant professional society activities,
- * significance of administrative service to the department, college or university, and
- * nature of service on advisory boards and panels for industry or government.

Evidence of the relevance and impact of service is obtained from analysis of the candidate's record and evaluators' comments.

Excellence in Mentoring

Mentoring with respect to service responsibilities is judged by the quality of

- * career guidance given to students, and
- * help given to new faculty with respect to career development and growth as well as

* advice to members of industry and society in areas of professional responsibility and relevance.

Evidence of excellence in mentoring is obtained from exit interviews with students, comments from faculty and staff, and evaluators' comments.

Integration

By necessity, the evaluation of faculty performance considers the dimensions of teaching, scholarship, and service. The ideal, however, is an individual who balances and integrates these activities into a synergistic whole. The integration of teaching, research and service to maximize the impact of the individuals activities on the department, college, university and society is highly valued.

1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) provides the following general criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure:

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

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

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

Superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in this document, is an essential qualification for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure. Insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the department and university that are dedicated to the discovery, application, and dissemination of knowledge. The recommendation to award tenure and promote to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has established, and gives the expectation of continuing, a program of high quality and effective teaching and scholarship relevant to the mission of the department.

The following table illustrates the minimum standards for promotion to associate professor with tenure. The performance judgment levels used in each category are exceptional, excellent, good, adequate and poor. The faculty member must exhibit adequate or better service. While teaching performance may not have fully evolved at this stage of the faculty member's career, it is essential that the scholarship record be exceptional or at least excellent to attain promotion. The basis for these judgments is described below. In making the evaluative judgments, the process will take into account how the faculty member stands in relation to his/her peers (i.e. at their early stages of an academic career) in the same field outside the university.

Table 1. Equivalent Minimum Performance Expectations for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

TEACHING	SCHOLARSHIP	SERVICE
Good	Excellent	Adequate

Teaching

The evaluation of teaching performance is based on the general criteria described in the previous section. To be judged excellent in teaching, the candidate's quality and effectiveness must be judged excellent, mentoring must be excellent and relevance must be at least good. To be judged good, the candidate must rate at least good on quality, effectiveness, mentoring and at least adequate on relevance and impact. A candidate who consistently rates poor on any of the teaching criteria will not be recommended for promotion or tenure.

Scholarship

The evaluation of scholarship is based on the general criteria described in the previous section. To be judged excellent in scholarship, the candidate's scholarly quality and effectiveness must be judged at least excellent. The scholarly work must also be relevant to the mission of the department and there must be evidence that the candidate's work is significant and beginning to have a substantial impact on the field.

To be judged good, the candidate's scholarly quality and effectiveness must be judged at least good. The scholarly work must also be relevant to the mission of the department and there must be evidence the candidate's work is significant and beginning to have a substantial impact on the field.

It is particularly important that the record provides evidence that the candidate's scholarly performance will continue to improve and the candidate has the potential for maintaining excellence in his/her chosen field. The faculty member's career development plan is particularly important in this regard as it is the record of work in progress.

Service

The department does not expect a junior faculty member to be involved in service activities at high levels. Moderate, but effective, involvement in departmental committee activities and some involvement in professional society activities at the national level is the minimum expected to be judged adequate.

2. Promotion to Professor

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) establishes the following general criteria for promotion to the rank of professor:

Promotion to the rank of professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in teaching; has produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated leadership in service.

The department does not expect all faculty members to follow the same path in achieving the level of excellence necessary for promotion to full professor. Diversity of effort is required to meet our mission and is supported by the department. As a consequence Table 2 summarizes the equivalencies of the minimum requirements with respect to teaching, scholarship, and service that the department considers in reaching judgments about promotion to full professor. Each row in the table describes a different set of minimum performance levels that will result in a recommendation in favor of promotion. The

performance judgment levels used in each column of Table 2 are exceptional, excellent, good, adequate and poor. Since convincing evidence of national and international reputation is required for this promotion, a minimum evaluation of Excellent is required for scholarship.

Table 2. Equivalent Minimum Performance Expectations for Promotion to Full Professor

TEACHING	SCHOLARSHIP	SERVICE
Exceptional	Excellent	Good
Excellent	Exceptional	Good
Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
Good	Exceptional	Excellent

Teaching

Exceptional teaching corresponds to the situation in which all dimensions of the candidate's teaching: quality, effectiveness, impact and relevance, and mentoring are clearly and consistently judged outstanding. Individuals meeting this standard are widely recognized as outstanding teachers. Only the very best teachers fall in this category.

Excellent teaching means that all dimensions of the candidate's teaching: quality, effectiveness, impact and relevance, and mentoring are consistently judged excellent.

Good teaching corresponds to the situation in which teaching quality and effectiveness are judged high and the other dimensions are at least good.

Scholarship

Exceptional scholarship corresponds to the situation in which all dimensions of the candidate's scholarship: quality, effectiveness, impact and relevance, and mentoring are clearly and consistently judged outstanding. Only the very best scholars fall in this category.

Excellent scholarship means that all dimensions are consistently judged to be of high quality. Scholars in this category are clearly leaders in their field and are making contributions that are internationally recognized.

Good scholarship corresponds to the situation in which the quality and effectiveness of scholarly activity is judged high and the other dimensions are at least good.

Service

Excellent service means that all dimensions of service are consistently judged to be of high quality. Candidates rated excellent will be active nationally in the appropriate professional societies and will be involved in leadership roles either in professional societies or in policy-making panels and councils. Candidates in this category also provide high quality leadership within the department, college and university. Candidates will also be very active in service to industry through professional consultation or professional education and short courses.

Good service corresponds to significant and active involvement in the appropriate professional societies and active participation in department, college and university governance.

3. Regular Clinical Track Faculty

Promotion to Associate Professor of Practice. Promotion to Associate Professor of Practice should be based on the candidate's:

- demonstrated record of recognition at a national or international level
- accomplishment in the area of teaching or instruction as it relates to professional practice
- contribution to the scholarly mission of the Materials Science & Engineering Department, College, and University
- promise of continued professional growth
- demonstrated commitment to citizenship and collegiality.

Evaluation of candidates with respect to these criteria will be performed subject to the different emphases for clinical track faculty in teaching, scholarship and service described earlier.

Promotion to Full Professor of Practice. Promotion to Full Professor of Practice should be based on the candidate's:

- demonstrated impact and clear stature within the national and international community
- distinguished accomplishment in the area of teaching or instruction as it relates to professional practice
- sustained contribution to the scholarly mission of the Materials Science & Engineering Department, College, and University
- distinguished commitment to citizenship and collegiality.

Evaluation of candidates with respect to these criteria will be performed subject to the different emphases for clinical track faculty in teaching, scholarship and service described earlier.

4. Regular Research Track Faculty

Promotion to Research Associate Professor. For promotion to Research Associate Professor, a faculty member must have a substantial record of high quality focused research consistent with an appointment devoted primarily to research. The candidate's scholarship must be judged "excellent," with "adequate" service contributions. Publications must appear in high quality peer reviewed venues and be judged by external evaluators as having substantial positive impact on the field. A record of continuous peer reviewed funding is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation. The candidate must have exhibited strong potential for continued career progression and advancement through the faculty ranks.

Promotion to Research Professor. For promotion to Research Professor, a faculty member must have a national and international reputation built on an extensive body of high quality publications and with demonstrated impact on the field. The candidate's scholarship must be judged "excellent," with "adequate" service contributions. A record of continuous peer reviewed funding is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding.

B. Procedures

The MSE department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) and the

Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>). The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty tracks in the department.

1. Candidate Responsibilities

Review Process for Probationary Faculty

Mandatory review for probationary tenure-track faculty is for:

- an assistant professor in his/her final year of probation.
- an associate professor without tenure in his/her final year of probation.

The probationary faculty members are informed by the department chair of their mandatory status by **January 15**. All probationary faculty members must submit their dossiers to the department chair by **April 15th**. The candidate is responsible for assembling the materials and following the most recent guidelines from the Office of Academic Affairs and the department.

The department P&T Committee will review the dossier and meets with the candidate if necessary to seek clarification and amplification. The final dossier and a list of names (addresses, phone and fax numbers, institution and relationship to the candidate, if any) of at least 6 potential external evaluators along with a completed External Evaluator Form for each must be provided by the candidate to the P&T Committee by the end of Spring semester.

The P&T Committee independently prepares a list of at least 6 external evaluators for each probationary faculty member for the mandatory review. The list is shown to the candidate to provide him/her an opportunity to reject up to two names from the committee's list. The committee adds a new name for each name rejected by the candidate.

The department chair seeks letters of evaluation from at least 9 external evaluators (less than half of them will be from the candidate's list) by the end of Spring semester. Other names are provided by the P & T executive committee in consultation with the faculty. Letters of evaluation are also sought by the department chair by the end of Spring semester from units within OSU in which the faculty member holds salaried joint appointments such as centers or other departments.

Once the dossier is complete (i.e., it contains at least six external letters of evaluation), the P&T Committee, in a series of meetings, evaluates the candidate's performance using the criteria described above in this document.

In a final meeting (to be held in the first week of Autumn Semester), the P&T committee chair presents the dossier to the P&T committee for a final vote. All eligible faculty votes on the case. The candidate is allowed to update his or her dossier before the final meeting and voting by the TIU. It is the obligation of the eligible faculty to participate in this process. Thus an absentee ballot is not allowed, but a conference call resulting in a vote is permitted. The P&T chair tallies the votes recording the number of votes in favor of recommending promotion and tenure, the number not in favor, and the number of abstentions. A positive recommendation will require a simple majority (yes votes) of all votes cast (yes and no votes).

The P&T chair reports the results of the faculty evaluation including the numerical outcome of the faculty vote in writing to the department chair for inclusion in the dossier by **October 1**. The department chair

independently evaluates each case and makes a written recommendation to the dean. In the event that the department chair's evaluation deviates from the faculty recommendation, the department chair so informs the eligible faculty in a meeting and invites comments and discussion before the chair's recommendation to the dean is finalized.

The department chair notifies the candidate in writing of the availability of the two letters of recommendation (one by the department chair the other from the P&T chair) by **October 10**. The candidate may provide written comments on the departmental review for inclusion in the dossier within 10 calendar days of being notified. The committee and the department chair may provide written responses to the candidates' comments. The department chair delivers an appropriate number of copies of the completed dossier to the Dean of the College of Engineering by the due date (**November 1**).

The department's process with major milestones is summarized in the table presented in Appendix A.

Review Process for Non-Mandatory Faculty

The P & T review of a non-mandatory tenure-track faculty member is carried out in two stages; the preliminary review and the final review. The preliminary review is carried out as part of the annual review. During the annual review based on the annual activity report, a decision is made by a vote of the eligible faculty whether to recommend a faculty member for the final stage of the departmental P & T review (i.e. whether to seek external letters of evaluation). It is the obligation of the eligible faculty to participate in this process. Absentee ballots and E-mail votes are not allowed, but a conference call resulting in a vote is permitted. The promotion and tenure committee chair tallies the votes recording the number of votes in favor of recommending promotion and tenure, the number not in favor and the number of abstentions. A positive recommendation requires a simple majority (yes votes) of all votes cast (yes and no votes). The outcome of the preliminary evaluation is communicated to the faculty member by the department chair by **April 30th**.

Faculty members invited for the final stage of evaluation must submit their dossier to the department chair the end of Spring semester. The faculty member is responsible for assembling the materials and following the most recent guidelines from the Office of Academic Affairs and the department. The department P&T Committee reviews the dossier and meets with the candidate if necessary to seek clarification and amplification where necessary. The P&T Committee assists the candidate in finalizing the dossier. The finalized dossier and a list of names (addresses, phone and fax numbers, institution and relationship to the candidate, if any) of at least 6 potential external evaluators along with a completed External Evaluator Form for each must be provided to the P&T Committee by the end of Spring semester.

The committee independently prepares a list of at least 6 external evaluators for each non-mandatory faculty member. The list is shown to the faculty member to provide him/her an opportunity to reject up to two names from the committee's list. The committee provides a new name for each name rejected by the candidate.

The department chair seeks letters of evaluation from at least 9 external evaluators (less than half of them will be from the candidate's list) by the end of Spring semester. Letters of evaluation are also sought by the department chair by the end of Spring semester from units within OSU in which a faculty member holds salaried joint appointments such as centers or other departments. Once the dossier is complete (i.e., it contains at least six external letters of evaluation), the promotion and tenure committee, in a series of meetings, evaluates the candidate's performance using the criteria described above.

In a final meeting (to be held in the first week of Autumn semester), the P&T chair presents the dossier to the P&T committee for a final vote, which is conducted according to procedures described in section III.D.

The P&T chair reports the results of the faculty evaluation including the numerical outcome of the faculty vote in writing to the department chair for inclusion in the dossier by **October 1**. The department chair independently evaluates each case and makes a written recommendation to the dean. In the event that the department chair's evaluation deviates from the faculty recommendation, the department chair so informs the eligible faculty in a meeting and invites comments and discussion before the chair's recommendation to the dean is finalized.

The department chair notifies the candidate in writing of the availability of the two letters of recommendation (one by the department chair the other from the P&T chair) by **October 10**. The candidate may provide written comments on the departmental review for inclusion in the dossier within 10 calendar days of being notified. The committee and the department chair may provide written responses to the candidate's comments. The department chair delivers an appropriate number of copies of the completed dossier to the dean of the College of Engineering by the due date (**November 1**). The department's process with major milestones is summarized in the table presented in Appendix A.

Procedure for Regular Clinical Track Faculty

The review procedure for the promotion or reappointment of the clinical-track faculty is similar to the tenure-track faculty review except that the tenure decision is not involved. Any clinical track faculty member may request promotion or reappointment. The P&T committee may also recommend any clinical track faculty member for promotion or reappointment.

The clinical track faculty members must submit their dossier to the department chair the end of Spring semester. The dossier would include his or her CV, faculty activity report for the prior year, and any other reports deemed necessary by the P&T committee. The faculty member is responsible for assembling the materials and submitting it to the P&T committee.

The P&T committee consisting of eligible faculty of the department reviews the dossier and meets with the candidate if necessary to seek clarification and amplification. All eligible faculty votes on the case according to the procedures described in section III.D. It is the obligation of the eligible faculty to participate in this process. Absentee ballots or Email vote are not allowed, but a conference call resulting in a vote is permitted. The P&T chair tallies the votes recording the number of votes in favor of recommending promotion, the number not in favor and the number of abstentions. A positive recommendation requires a simple majority (yes votes) of all votes cast (yes and no votes).

The P&T chair reports the results of the P&T committee evaluation including the numerical outcome of the faculty vote in writing to the department chair for inclusion in the dossier by **October 1**. The department chair independently evaluates each case and makes a written recommendation to the dean. The department chair delivers an appropriate number of copies of the completed dossier to the dean of the College of Engineering by the due date (**November 1**)

Procedure for Regular Research Track Faculty

The review procedure for the promotion or reappointment of the research-track is similar to the tenure-track faculty review except that the tenure decision is not involved. Any research track faculty member may request promotion or reappointment. The P&T committee may also recommend any research track faculty member for promotion or reappointment.

The research track faculty members must submit their dossier to the department chair the end of Spring semester. The dossier would include his or her CV, faculty activity report for the prior year, and any other reports deemed necessary by the P&T committee. The faculty member is responsible for assembling the materials and submitting it to the P&T committee.

The P&T committee consisting of eligible faculty of the department reviews the dossier and meets with the candidate if necessary to seek clarification and amplification. All eligible faculty votes on the case according to procedures described in section III.D.

The P&T chair reports the results of the P&T committee evaluation including the numerical outcome of the faculty vote in writing to the department chair for inclusion in the dossier by **October 1**. The department chair independently evaluates each case and makes a written recommendation to the dean. The department chair delivers an appropriate number of copies of the completed dossier to the dean of the College of Engineering by the due date (**November 1**).

2. Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

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

- To review this document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. Those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
 - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
 - A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) for one year. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
 - Consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policy, only faculty members who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non-mandatory tenure review. The committee must confirm with the department chair that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident (has a "green card"). Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.
- A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.

- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
 - **Late Spring:** Select from among its members a Procedures Oversight Designee who will serve in this role for the following year. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described in the Office of Academic Affairs annual procedural guidelines.
 - **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair.
 - **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
 - Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
 - Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.
 - Revise the draft analysis of each case following the faculty meeting, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
 - Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
 - Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure initiating unit is another department. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure initiating unit substantially earlier than the Committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

3. Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

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

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

4. Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- Where relevant, to verify the prospective candidate's residency status. Faculty members who are neither citizens nor permanent residents of the United States may not undergo a non-mandatory review for tenure, and tenure is not awarded as the result of a mandatory review until permanent residency status is established. Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.
- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the chair and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To make adequate copies of each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
 - of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair
 - of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair
 - Of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline, except in the case of auxiliary faculty for whom the department chair recommends against promotion. A negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases.

- To receive the Promotion and Tenure Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the department chair of the other tenure initiating unit by the date requested.

5. External Evaluations

The candidate and P&T Committee, in consultation with the department faculty, each suggests at least six names for external evaluators for each candidate. A current evaluator report form with biographical information and a description of the qualifications will be prepared by the candidate for each external evaluator suggested by the candidate. The external reviewer should not have any conflict of interest with the candidate. A total of at least nine evaluators will be selected with less than half from the list provided by the candidate. It is expected that the complete list includes distinguished academics and highly qualified practitioners who are in a position to evaluate the quality, relevance and impact of the candidate's work. The department chair is responsible for contacting the evaluators and obtaining the letters of evaluation.

The evaluators will be provided with a copy of the dossier and copies of documentation of three to five most significant contributions produced by the candidate. The candidate is responsible for selecting and providing this documentation to the chair of P&T Committee. The evaluators are asked to comment on:

- * the impact the candidate is having on the field through his/her program of scholarship,
- * the significance of the overall program of scholarship,
- * the originality and quality of the candidate's scholarship, and
- * comparison of the candidate with others in the field at approximately the same stage of career development.

Requests for evaluation are made not later than the end of Spring semester with responses due in mid-September. The promotion and tenure committee and the department chair must consider all responses from the evaluators when evaluating the candidate. All responses must be included in the dossier.

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews, all regular research track contract renewal and promotion reviews, and all adjunct faculty promotion reviews. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for faculty members on the regular clinical track unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations for a faculty member on the clinical track will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the eligible faculty.

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will only solicit evaluations from full professors at institutions comparable to Ohio State. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.

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

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

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the P&T Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format, provided at <http://oaa.osu.edu/sampledocuments.html>, for letters requesting external evaluations.

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

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

C. Documentation

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

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

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

- Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

1. Teaching

For the time period since the last promotion or the last five years, whichever is less:

- cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class
- peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in the Appendix to this document)
- Copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.
- teaching activities as listed in the core dossier including
 - involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research
 - mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers
 - extension and continuing education instruction
 - involvement in curriculum development
 - awards and formal recognition of teaching
 - presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences
 - adoption of teaching materials at other colleges or universities
- other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate

2. Scholarship

For the time period since the last promotion:

- Copies of all books, articles, and scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed.
- documentation of grants and contracts received
- other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted)
- scholarship activities as listed in the core dossier including
 - documentation of creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus including artwork, choreography, collections, compositions, curated exhibits, moving images, multimedia, performances, radio, recitals, recordings, television, and websites
 - documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options and commercial licenses
 - list of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work

3. Service

For the time period since the last promotion:

- service activities as listed in the core dossier including
 - involvement with professional journals and professional societies

- consultation activity with industry, education, or government
- clinical services
- administrative service to department
- administrative service to college
- administrative service to university and Student Life
- advising to student groups and organizations
- awards and prizes for service to profession, university, or department
- any available documentation (e.g. letters from committee chairs) of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier

VIII. Appeals

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

Disagreement with a negative decision is not grounds for appeal. In pursuing an appeal, the faculty member is required to document the failure of one or more parties to the review process to follow written policies and procedures.

IX. Seventh-Year Reviews

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a Seventh Year Review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year (mandatory tenure) review.

X. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the university's on-line Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) form is required in every course offered in this department. The instructor should encourage a high completion rate by explaining to the class the significance of the evaluation. When a small proportion of the class completes the evaluation, the resulting information has little value either for improving instruction or for performance evaluation.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The department chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process through the Peer Review of Teaching Committee.

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

- to review the teaching of probationary tenure track and regular clinical track faculty once per semester during the first two years of service, and at least once per year during the remainder of the probationary period, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned in the course of each probationary year
- to review the teaching of tenured associate professors and non-probationary associate professors of professional practice at least once per year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a three year period

- to review the teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary professors of professional practice at least once every four years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review
- To review, upon the department chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.
- To review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the University Center for the Advancement of Teaching (www.ucat.osu.edu).

Reviews conducted upon the request of the department chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the chair or faculty member.

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations (the first three situations listed above) are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instruction materials. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, the class visitation is conducted by one or more senior peers whom the P&T Committee has identified in consultation with the candidate. The peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to establish a time for the visit and to understand the goals of the course and the candidate's teaching philosophy. If possible, the peer reviewer should attend two different class sessions over the course of the semester.

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

Appendix A. Review Process Timetable*

First week of January	Call from the Chair for preparation of Activity reports.
First week of January	Department Chair informs mandatory faculty members
March 1	Annual activity reports and current C.V. are due in the department office for all regular and auxiliary faculty.
March 31	P&T committee reviews annual activity reports for all Associate and Assistant Professors and generates written letters to each summarizing the prospects for promotion and/or tenure.
By the end of April	Performance review of all faculty members by the department chair with an independent letter summarizing prospects for P and/or T.
By May 15	Performance review results reported to individual faculty by the Department Chair, initiation of seventh year reviews (if any).
May 15	Draft-dossiers of all P & T candidates due to the Department Chairperson
May 15 to May 30	P & T meeting to discuss tenure and promotion cases of regular faculty
May 15 to May 30	Department Chair recommendations regarding Auxiliary Faculty and Faculty vote on renewals.
June 30	Department Chair informs Auxiliary Faculty of renewal
June 30	Finished dossiers of all P & T candidates due to the P & T Committee chair.
June 30	Department Chair requests letters from outside evaluators for all candidates for promotion and tenure
August 15	Outside evaluation letters due to the Department Chair
September 15	Final voting by the P&T committee on all candidates
October 1	Written evaluations of all candidates by the P & T Committee due to the Department Chair
October 10	Department Chair communicates to the candidates the review letters.
October 20	Written responses from the candidates on their review letters due to the Department Chair.
November 1 (or College deadline)	All recommendations for tenure and/or promotion submitted to the college by the department chair according to college and university timetable.
January 1	Dossiers due for fourth year reviews
February 28	Fourth year reviews completed.

*If these dates differ from those provided by OAA and the college, then those issued by OAA and the college will take precedence.