

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures for The Ohio State University Department of Aviation

Approved by the College of Engineering: 14 April 2026

Provisionally Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 24 April 2026

Table of Contents

1. PREAMBLE	4
2. DEPARTMENT MISSION AND VISION	4
3. DEFINITIONS	5
3.1 Committee of the Eligible Faculty	5
3.1.1 Tenure-track Faculty	5
3.1.2 Professional Practice Faculty	5
3.1.3 Research Faculty	5
3.1.4 Associated Faculty	6
3.1.5 Conflict of Interest	7
3.1.6 Minimum Composition	7
3.2 Promotion and Tenure Committee	7
3.3 Quorum.....	8
3.4 Recommendation from the Eligible Faculty	8
3.4.1 Appointment	8
3.4.2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion	8
4. APPOINTMENTS	8
4.1 Criteria.....	8
4.1.1 Tenure-track Faculty	9
4.1.2 Professional Practice Faculty	10
4.1.3 Research Faculty	11
4.1.4 Associated Faculty	12
4.1.5 Emeritus Faculty	12
4.1.6 Joint Appointments	13
4.1.7 Courtesy Appointments	13
4.2 Procedures	13
4.2.1 Tenure-track Faculty	14
4.2.2 Professional Practice Faculty	15
4.2.3 Research Faculty	15
4.2.4 Transfer Across Faculty Types	15
4.2.5 TIU Transfer	15
4.2.6 Associated Faculty	16
4.2.7 Joint Appointments	16
4.2.8 Courtesy Appointments	16
5. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW	17
5.1 Documentation	18
5.2 Assessment Scale and Criteria	18
5.3 Probationary Tenure-track Faculty.....	22
5.3.1 Fourth-Year Review.....	22
5.3.2 Extension of the Tenure Clock	23
5.4 Tenured Faculty.....	23
5.5 Professional Practice Faculty	24
5.6 Research Faculty	24
5.7 Associated Faculty	24
5.8 Salary Recommendations.....	25
6. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS.....	25
6.1 Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion	26
6.1.1 Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure.....	26
6.1.2 Criteria for Promotion to Professor.....	31
6.1.3 Criteria for Professional Practice Faculty	35

6.1.4	Research Faculty	42
6.1.5	Criteria for Associated Faculty	45
6.2	Procedures	46
6.2.1	Tenure-Track, Professional Practice, and Research Faculty	46
6.2.2	Procedures for Associated Faculty.....	52
6.2.3	External Evaluations	53
7.	PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS	55
8.	SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS.....	55
9.	PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING	55
9.1	Student Feedback on Teaching	55
9.2	Peer Evaluation of Teaching	55
	APPENDIX A: TEACHING: SUMMARY OF STUDENT COMMENTS.....	57
	APPENDIX B: PEER-REVIEW OF TEACHING FORM.....	59

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures for the Department of Aviation

1. PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the [Rules of the University Faculty](#); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Chapter 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs [Procedures and Guidelines Handbook](#); 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 department mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule [3335-6-01](#) 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](#) 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 employment opportunity](#).

2. DEPARTMENT MISSION AND VISION

Mission: The Department of Aviation promotes and advances aviation through education, research, and service.

We accomplish our mission by

1. Providing relevant instruction to promote future innovations in the aviation workforce (education).
2. Creating interdisciplinary solutions that support aviation modernization (research).
3. Increasing accessibility, awareness, and appreciation for the aviation community (service).

Vision: The Department of Aviation is a team of faculty and staff, practitioners and researchers, committed to

1. Producing early-career professionals who are prepared to enjoy productive and satisfying careers in the aviation industry.
2. Generating solutions to the challenges and leveraging opportunities in 21st Century aviation.

3. DEFINITIONS

3.1 COMMITTEE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY

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

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

3.1.1 TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring) review of an assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty in the department.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

3.1.2 PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE FACULTY

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a professional practice assistant professor, a professional practice associate professor, or a professional practice professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all professional practice faculty in the department.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all non-probationary professional practice faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

3.1.3 RESEARCH FACULTY

Initial Appointment Reviews

- **Appointment Review.** For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a research assistant professor, research associate professor, or research professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty, and all research faculty in the department.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested and all non-probationary research faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

3.1.4 ASSOCIATED FACULTY

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

- For the initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all professional practice faculty in the department. When the initial appointment is that of a lecturer, senior lecturers may participate as members of the eligible faculty.
- Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by the eligible faculty (all non-probationary professional practice faculty and tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college dean and the Office of Academic Affairs. When the initial appointment is that of a senior lecturer, the eligible faculty will include all senior lecturers.
- Reappointments will include a vote of the eligible faculty. The eligible faculty are all tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank than the candidate and all non-probationary professional practice faculty members of equal or higher rank than the candidate. When the reappointment is that of a lecturer or senior lecturer, the eligible faculty will include all senior lecturers. The chair makes the final decision on reappointment.

Promotion Reviews

- Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have adjunct titles, tenure-track titles with service at 49% FTE or below, and lecturer titles.
- For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Sections 3.1.1, 2 or 3 above.
- For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with tenure-track titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section 3.1.1.
- For the promotion review of a lecturer to senior lecturer, the eligible faculty shall be all tenure-track and non-probationary professional practice faculty at the rank of associate professor and professor, and all senior lecturers.

3.1.5 CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Search Committee Conflict of Interest

A member of a search committee must disclose to the committee and refrain from participating in any of the interviews, meetings, or votes that comprise the search process if the member:

- decides to apply for the position;
- is related to or has a close interpersonal relationship with a candidate;
- has substantive financial ties with the candidate;
- is dependent in some way on the candidate's services;
- has a close professional relationship with the candidate (e.g., dissertation advisor); or
- has collaborated extensively with the candidate or is currently collaborating with the candidate.

Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest

A member of the eligible faculty has a conflict of interest when they are or have been to the candidate:

- a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor;
- a co-author on more than 50% of the candidate's publications since appointment or last promotion, including pending publications and submissions;
- a collaborator on more than 25% of projects since appointment or last promotion, including current and planned collaborations;
- in a consulting/financial arrangement with the candidate since appointment or last promotion, including receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services) or is dependent in some way on the candidate's services; or
- in a family relationship such as a spouse, child, sibling, or parent, or other relationship, such as a close personal friendship, that might affect one's judgment or be seen as doing so by a reasonable person familiar with the relationship.

Such faculty members will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of that candidate.

3.1.6 MINIMUM COMPOSITION

In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the department chair, after consulting with the dean, will appoint a faculty member from another tenure-initiating unit within the college.

3.2 PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE

The department has a Promotion and Tenure Committee that assists the eligible faculty in managing the personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The committee will initially consist of three tenured professors. As the department approaches a normal distribution of faculty, the committee will consist of three professors and two associate professors. The committee's chair and membership are appointed by the department chair. The term of service is two years, with reappointment possible.

When considering cases involving professional practice faculty the Promotion and Tenure Committee may be augmented by two non-probationary professional practice faculty members at the rank of associate professor or professor, as appropriate to the case.

When considering cases involving research faculty the Promotion and Tenure Committee may be augmented by two non-probationary research faculty members at the rank of associate professor or professor, as appropriate to the case.

3.3 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. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. 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.

Faculty who did not attend the entire discussion of a particular case are not permitted to vote on that case. Faculty members who are not present cannot vote *in absentia* unless they participate by conference call or video link.

3.4 RECOMMENDATION FROM THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY

All votes are by secret ballot.

In all votes taken on personnel matters only “yes” and “no” votes are counted. Abstentions are not allowed for promotion and tenure reviews.

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted but participating fully in discussions and voting via remote two-way electronic connection are allowed.

3.4.1 APPOINTMENT

- A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast are positive.
- In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate’s joint-appointment department prior to their appointment.

3.4.2 REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE, AND PROMOTION

- A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast are positive.
- In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate’s joint-appointment department prior to their reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure.

4. APPOINTMENTS

4.1 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.

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, professional practice, research, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment (see Section IV.B below).

All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university's system of record for faculty and staff. A formal review and selection process, including interviews using pre-designed evaluation rubrics, is required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in [Workday](#) to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

Appropriate Aviation Credentials

Aviation is highly applied and inter-disciplinary, incorporating the disciplines of aviation, business, education, engineering, health sciences, law, physical sciences, social sciences, and technology.

The required degree for all tenure-track faculty and research faculty positions in the Department of Aviation is a doctoral degree. These include the doctor of philosophy (Ph.D.), doctor of aviation (Av.D.), doctor of engineering (D.Eng), doctor of education (Ed.D.), and juris doctor (J.D.) degrees.

For professional practice and associated faculty, the required degree is generally the master's degree. Additionally, there are professional certifications that when combined with experience may substitute for a traditional academic degree. These may include accredited airport executive (AAE), flight or ground instructor certification, airline transport/cargo transport pilot (ATP/CTP), lesser pilot certifications, air traffic controller certification, or aircraft dispatch certification.

As a default standard, newly appointed faculty must possess an academic degree in a field or subject area relevant to the courses they will teach and at least one level above the level at which they teach, except in programs for terminal degrees, when the accreditation standards of the profession require otherwise, or when equivalent experience is established.

The department must seek OAA approval when hiring faculty who hold an academic degree that is not above the level at which they teach but who possess a minimum threshold of special competence, experience, and expertise that uniquely qualifies the individual and is equivalent to the degree that is otherwise required for a faculty position, as documented through a review process as determined by the college.

A minimum of a bachelor's degree with clear professional experience is required for consideration.

4.1.1 TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Instructor. Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but requirements for the terminal degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. Procedures for appointment are identical to those for an assistant professor. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. Promotion to assistant professor occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year, or the appointment will not be renewed and the third year is the terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate since prior service credit cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor. An earned terminal degree is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the department and the profession is highly desirable. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the 7th year will be the final year of employment.

Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Promotion and Tenure Committee determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to extend the probationary period.

Associate Professor and Professor. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor with or without tenure, Professor with tenure, and offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

Appointment at the rank of associate professor normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at the rank of associate 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 (terminal) year of employment is offered.

Appointments at the rank of professor without tenure are not possible.

Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

4.1.2 PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE FACULTY

Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all other professional practice faculty members must be for a period of five years. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for professional practice assistant and associate professors must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for professional practice professors must be

for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. Tenure is not granted to professional practice faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance.

The department supports Professional Practice Faculty. These appointments exist for faculty members who focus principally on the education needs of students in the department or college. Professional Practice Faculty members are expected to contribute to the department's research and education mission as reflected in undergraduate and graduate program development and teaching. Professional Practice Faculty appointments are made in accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-7](#). Each new appointment must enhance, or have strong potential to enhance, the quality of the department.

- **Professional Practice Instructor.** Appointment is normally made at the rank of professional practice instructor when the appointee has not completed the degree requirements for appointment as professional practice assistant professor. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. As noted above, an appointment at the instructor level is limited to a three-year contract. In such cases, if the instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the penultimate year of the three-year contract period, a new contract will not be considered even if performance is otherwise adequate and the position itself will continue.
- **Professional Practice Assistant Professor.** An earned master's degree is generally the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of professional practice assistant professor. The department must seek OAA approval when hiring faculty who hold an academic degree that is not above the level at which they teach but who possess a minimum threshold of special competence, experience, and expertise that uniquely qualifies the individual and is equivalent to the degree that is otherwise required for a faculty position, as documented through a review process as determined by the college. A minimum of a bachelor's degree with clear professional experience is required for consideration. Evidence of ability to teach is highly desirable.
- **Professional Practice Associate Professor and Professional Practice Professor.** Appointment at the rank of professional practice associate professor, or professional practice professor requires that the individual have an earned master's degree (doctoral degree preferred) and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria—in teaching, professional practice and other service, and scholarship—for promotion to these ranks.

4.1.3 RESEARCH FACULTY

Appointment of research faculty entails one- to five-year appointments. The initial appointment is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to research faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent appointments will be offered, regardless of performance.

External appointees at the research associate professor or research professor level will demonstrate the same accomplishments in research and service as persons promoted within the department.

- **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.

4.1.4 ASSOCIATED FACULTY

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a few weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. Associated faculty may be reappointed.

- **Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor.** Adjunct appointments are uncompensated. Adjunct titles are used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty of equivalent rank. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give academic service to the department, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees, for which a faculty title is appropriate. The adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.
- **Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%.** Appointment at tenure-track titles is for individuals at 49% FTE or below, either compensated (1 – 49% FTE) or uncompensated (0% FTE). The rank of associated faculty with tenure-track titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.
- **Lecturer.** Appointment as lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a master's degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught. The department must seek OAA approval when hiring faculty who hold an academic degree that is not above the level at which they teach but who possess a minimum threshold of special competence, experience, and expertise that uniquely qualifies the individual and is equivalent to the degree that is otherwise required for a faculty position, as documented through a review process as determined by the college. A minimum of a bachelor's degree with clear professional experience is required for consideration. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is desirable. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure, but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for lecturers cannot exceed three years.
- **Senior Lecturer.** Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual have a terminal degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction; or a master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience with documentation of high quality. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The initial appointment for a senior lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for senior lecturers cannot exceed three years.
- **Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor.** Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for only three consecutive years.

4.1.5 EMERITUS FACULTY

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

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the department chair outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-4) will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair. The department chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered.

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

4.1.6 JOINT APPOINTMENTS

Joint appointments are created to leverage a faculty member's unique expertise to advance the mission areas of the academic units involved and promote cross-disciplinary collaboration. To establish a joint faculty appointment, a [memorandum of understanding \(MOU\)](#) is developed by all affected TIUs, centers, and/or institutes. The MOU will clearly define the distribution of the faculty member's time commitment to the different units. The MOU will also state the sources of compensation directed to the faculty member, distribution of resources, the planned acknowledgement of the academic units in publications, the manner in which credit for any grant funding will be attributed to the different units, and the distribution of grant funds among the appointing units. Unless other arrangements are specified in the MOU, the TIU in which the faculty member's FTE is greater than 50% will be considered that faculty member's TIU. Joint-appointed faculty may vote on promotion and tenure cases only in their TIU.

4.1.7 COURTESY APPOINTMENTS

Occasionally the active academic involvement in this department by a tenure-track, professional practice, research, or associated faculty member from another unit 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. Staff are not eligible for courtesy faculty appointments.

4.2 PROCEDURES

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, professional practice, research, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment.

The SHIFT (Strategic Hiring Initiative for Faculty Talent) Framework was designed to identify and recruit broad, qualified applicant pools of extraordinary scholars who are leaders in their respective fields. Deans, department chairs, and search committee members work in partnership with the Office of Faculty Affairs and other key stakeholders in adherence to this framework to ensure a thorough, fair, and consistent faculty search process. The framework consists of four distinct phases—each of which includes

a series of core requirements (must-do action steps) and optimal practices (aspirational action steps)—followed by a fifth phase focused on preboarding and onboarding.

This department adheres in every respect to the Framework requirements as detailed at [SHIFT](#).

All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university's system of record for faculty and staff. A formal review and selection process, including interviews using pre-designed evaluation rubrics, is required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in [Workday](#) to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

In addition, see the [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#) and the [Faculty Appointments, Faculty Workload, Tenure, and Retrenchment policy](#) for information on the following topics:

- recruitment of tenure-track, professional practice, research, and associated 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

4.2.1 TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

A national search is required to ensure a robust pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. This includes all external candidates for all faculty positions. The only exception is for dual career partners, as described in Chapter 5, section 4.1 of the [Procedures and Guidelines Handbook](#). Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

The dean 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.

Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo the trainings identified in the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment. In addition, all employees/faculty involved in the hiring and selection process must review and acknowledge the EEO Recruitment and Selection Guidelines in the BuckeyeLearn system.

If an offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If an 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. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor, with or without tenure, or professor, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

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.

The department will discuss potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status with the Office of International Affairs. An [MOU](#) must be signed by faculty eligible for tenured positions who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees.

4.2.2 PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE FACULTY

Searches for professional practice faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate's presentation during the interview is on professional practice rather than scholarship.

4.2.3 RESEARCH FACULTY

Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that during the interview the candidate is not asked to teach a class.

4.2.4 TRANSFER ACROSS FACULTY TYPES

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a professional practice or research appointment if appropriate circumstances exist. Tenure or tenure eligibility 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.

Transfers from a professional practice appointment, a research appointment, and associated faculty appointments to the tenure track are not permitted. Professional practice, research, and associated faculty members may apply for tenure-track positions and compete in regular national searches for such positions.

Transfers across the professional practice appointments, research appointments, and associated faculty appointments are permitted. Such transfers must follow the process delineated in [Chapter 5, Section 4](#) of the OAA [Procedures and Guidelines Handbook](#).

4.2.5 TIU TRANSFER

Following consultation with the TIU heads and college dean(s), a tenure-track faculty member may voluntarily move from one TIU to another upon approval of a simple majority of the eligible faculty in the receiving TIU. The eligible faculty in such cases are the tenure-track faculty eligible to vote on faculty appointments at the transferee's rank. See Section III.A.1 above.

The transfer must be approved by the Office of Academic Affairs and is dependent on the establishment of mutually agreed-upon arrangements among the affected TIU heads, college dean(s), and the faculty member. An MOU signed by all parties, including the Office of Academic Affairs, must describe in detail the arrangements of the transfer. Approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements for the change have been made. Since normally the transferring faculty member will fill an existing vacancy in the receiving unit, the MOU will describe the resources supporting the position, including salary, provided by the receiving unit.

The Office of Academic Affairs can provide guidance to non-tenure-track faculty about the process for transferring from one TIU to another.

4.2.6 ASSOCIATED FACULTY

The appointment of compensated associated faculty members follows a formal search following the [SHIFT](#) Framework, which includes a job posting in [Workday](#) (see Section IV.B above) and candidate interviews. The appointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair following a vote of the eligible faculty.

If an offer involves senior rank (e.g., senior lecturer), the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank as described in Section 3.1.4. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank to the department chair.

The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair following a vote of the eligible faculty as described in Section 3.1.4.

Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one to three years.

Appointment and reappointment of uncompensated adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department and are decided by the department chair in consultation with the faculty.

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

Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are made on an annual basis and rarely semester by semester. After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment may be offered.

All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued.

4.2.7 JOINT APPOINTMENTS

The department may propose a joint appointment for a faculty member from another OSU TIU as described in Section IV.A.7. The potential for a joint appointment is typically evaluated during the recruitment process and, as such, is subject to all criteria outlined above for each faculty category.

Approval of the joint appointment by the Office of Academic Affairs is dependent on establishing a mutually agreed-upon arrangement between the TIU heads, college dean(s), and the faculty member. An [MOU](#) signed by all parties, including the Office of Academic Affairs, must describe in detail the arrangements of the joint appointment. Administrative approval will be dependent on whether satisfactory fiscal arrangements have been made.

4.2.8 COURTESY APPOINTMENTS

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track, professional practice, research, or associated faculty member from another Ohio State tenure-initiating unit. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the eligible faculty, the department chair extends an offer of appointment. The department chair reviews all courtesy

appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

5. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

The department follows the requirements for the annual performance review as set forth in the [Policy on Faculty Annual Review, Post-Tenure Review, and Reappointment](#), which stipulates that such reviews must include a scheduled face-to-face meeting for all probationary faculty, an opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all other compensated faculty members, as well as a written assessment. According to the policy, the purposes of the review are to:

- Monitor and support progress toward tenure, promotion, reappointment, and ongoing outcomes;
- Be comprehensive and include standardized, objective, and measurable performance metrics;
- Assist faculty in improving professional productivity through candid and constructive feedback and through the establishment of professional development plans;
- Establish the goals against which a faculty member's performance will be assessed in the foreseeable future; and
- Document faculty performance in the achievement of stated goals in order to determine salary increases and other resource allocations, progress toward promotion, and, in the event of poor performance, the need for remedial steps up to and including a post-tenure review or other disciplinary action.

A post-tenure review, in accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-5-04.5](#), will be initiated if a tenured faculty member receives a “does not meet performance expectations” rating in the same evaluative category in at least two of the past three consecutive annual reviews. A faculty member who retains tenure following a post-tenure review will be subject to an additional post-tenure review if they receive a “does not meet performance expectations” rating in any area of their annual review in the two years subsequent to a post-tenure review.

The department chair may designate the responsibility for annual performance reviews to. Annual reviews may be delegated to the following individuals ONLY: associate chairs, vice chairs, or division chairs/directors/section heads. The designee or a subcommittee of the eligible faculty may provide a written assessment to the department chair. The chair or designee must schedule a face-to-face meeting with all probationary faculty as part of the review. An opportunity for a face-to-face meeting with the department chair or the chair's designee must be provided to all other faculty.

In all cases, accountability for the annual performance review process resides with the department chair.

- Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.
- The written annual review must include the faculty member's projected work effort distribution for the next year, be compliant with the university's [Faculty Workload Standards and Guidelines](#), and specify and justify any change in distribution from the year prior.
- Per Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#), the department chair is required to include a reminder in annual review letters that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#)) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file. Per the [Policy on Faculty Annual Review, Post-Tenure-Review, and Reappointment](#), the department chair must also describe the appeal procedure if the faculty member disagrees with the annual review.

- For faculty with joint appointments, the TIU heads or designees of the joint appointment units are responsible for completing the annual review. The TIU heads or designees of the joint appointment units must co-author the written evaluation.

Faculty annual reviews in the Department of Aviation are based upon the **previous calendar year**.

Each faculty member will be evaluated using the following standardized rating categories:

- **Exceeds Expectations:** Performance significantly surpasses the expected standards in one or more areas of responsibility (teaching, scholarship, service, administration), demonstrating exceptional impact, innovation, or leadership.
- **Meets Expectations:** Performance consistently fulfills the expected standards in all assigned areas of responsibility. This is the expected norm for faculty performance.
- **Does Not Meet Expectations:** Performance falls short of the expected standards in one or more areas of responsibility, requiring improvement or remediation.

5.1 DOCUMENTATION

For their annual performance review, compensated faculty members must submit the following documents to the department chair no later than **January 31st** of the following year:

- Office of Academic Affairs core [dossier outline](#) (*required for assistant and associate professors*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (*professors*).
- Updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)

Other documentation for the annual performance review will be the same as that for consideration for promotion and/or tenure. That documentation is described in Section 6 of this document.

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

5.2 ASSESSMENT SCALE AND CRITERIA

An annual review is based on expected performance in any area of work for which the faculty member is assigned 5% or greater workload, including (as applicable) teaching, research, service, administration, and any other categories set by the department chair and/or articulated in this APT document. Student evaluations must account for at least 25% of the teaching component where applicable.

The evaluation for each area must denote at minimum whether the faculty member exceeds, meets, or does not meet expectations for that area.

It is recognized that the annual accomplishments of faculty will vary between individuals, based upon their specific roles in the department, research areas, teaching assignments, administrative responsibilities, workload allocations, etc. Therefore, it is imprudent to impose one quantitative metric to everyone such as publishing two journal articles per year, teaching four courses per semester, etc.

The following rubrics are used to establish baseline metrics for the annual review and provide wide latitude for assessing achievements.

Note 1: Current faculty contracts, prior annual evaluations, administrative roles, existing MOUs, releases, and outside appointments (those who are not 100% FTE in the department) will be used to adjust the stated base expectations.

Research Rubric	Exceeds Expectations	Demonstrates evidence supporting 3-4 research promotion and/or tenure criteria for their respective rank
	Meets Expectations	Demonstrates evidence supporting 2 research promotion and/or tenure criteria for their respective rank
	Does Not Meet Expectations	Demonstrates evidence supporting 1 or 0 research promotion and/or tenure criteria for their respective rank

Service Rubric	Exceeds Expectations	<p>Meets at least 4 criteria from the bullet list below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engages in department assigned committee work • Holds an administrative role in the department, college, or university • Serves as chair or co-chair of department committee • Participates in 1 or more search committees • Participates in 1 or more college or university-level committees • Engages in 1 or more service roles outside of the university, including advisory boards • Receives service or leadership award <p>AND</p> <p>Participates in more than 2 department outreach events per year</p>
	Meets Expectations	<p>Meets all criteria below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engages in assigned department committee work • Engages in at least 1 service role outside of the department, including college, university, or external professional society service • Participates in at least 1 department outreach event
	Does Not Meet Expectations	<p>Does not engage in assigned department committee work</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Does not engage in any department outreach events. Not engaging in any department outreach event is grounds for this rating</p>

Teaching Rubrics

The teaching rubric is slightly more complex in order to ensure compliance with state law and consists of four different dimensions:

Dimension	percent allocation	dimension max points	weighted score
Course design and organization	0.25	3.00	0.75
Student teaching evaluations	0.25	3.00	0.75
Peer review	0.25	3.00	0.75
Other teaching criteria	0.25	3.00	0.75
total allocation	1.00	max weighted score	3.00

Teaching	Exceeds Expectations	Weighted score > 2.25
	Meets Expectations	1.5 < weighted score ≤ 2.25
	Does Not Meet Expectations	Weighted score < 1.5

Each dimension receives a rating of “does not meet expectations” (1 point), “meets expectations” (2 points), or “exceeds expectations” (3 points).

These ratings are based upon the following criteria for each dimension.

Dimension: Course Design & Organization

Source: Submit all syllabi with the annual review. Identify the syllabus to be used for assessment if you are submitting more than one syllabus.

Scoring: 12 total points are possible. NOTE: It is mandatory to include assessment criteria (exam1, exam 2, project, homework, etc.) in the syllabus. Syllabi without assessment information will be assessed as “does not meet expectations” regardless of other contents. This stipulation will be enforced beginning in Autumn 2026.

Syllabus component	Points
Course identity & logistics: title, number, section, meeting days & times	1
Prerequisites identified	1
Course description & objective	1
Instructional staff identified with contact info included	1
3-6 measurable student learning outcomes clearly stated & AABI applicability identified if appropriate	1
Instructional methods: pedagogical approach, engagement & attendance expectations, technology requirements	1
Semester schedule of topics clearly outlined	1
Course assessments clearly stated with percentage of total grade	1
Student policies & allowable resources clearly stated: Attendance, Use of technology (computers, calculators, etc.), academic integrity, late work & makeup policy, AI usage policy, SLDS and Student Advocacy	1
Required materials: textbooks, equipment, etc.	1
Grading scale & rubrics	1

Communications expectations & policy: email, Carmen announcements, guidelines for professional communication	1
--	---

Course Design & Organization	11-12 points	Exceeds Expectations	2 points
	6-10 points	Meets Expectations	1 point
	0-5 points	Does Not Meet Expectations	0 points

Dimension: Student Teaching Evaluations

Source: Survey of Student Learning and Engagement (SSLE). Faculty must submit all SSLE overview reports for the courses taught during the review period.

Scoring:

The last evaluation on the SSLE cumulative report reads

“On a scale of 1-10, how effective are the teaching methods of this faculty member? The scale of 1-10 ... measures the effectiveness of the faculty member with 1 being not effective at all and 10 being extremely effective.”

The overall score of this question will be averaged for all courses taught by the faculty member.

Student teaching evaluations	Score \geq 8.5 points	Exceeds Expectations	2 points
	$5.0 \leq$ Score < 8.5 points	Meets Expectations	1 point
	Score < 5.0 points	Does Not Meet Expectations	0 points

Dimension: Peer Review of Teaching

Source: Peer Review of Teaching Form

Scoring: As long as manageable, each faculty member will receive one peer review of teaching per year. All faculty members will conduct one peer review evaluation annually. The department will provide the review rotation at the beginning of the academic year. The score from this review will be entered into the scoring matrix.

Dimension: Other Teaching Criteria

Source: Core Dossier

Other Criteria	Exceeds Expectations	Demonstrates evidence supporting all teaching promotion and/or tenure criteria for their respective rank
	Meets Expectations	Demonstrates evidence supporting 1-2 teaching promotion and/or tenure criteria for their respective rank
	Does Not Meet Expectations	Demonstrates evidence supporting 0 teaching promotion and/or tenure criteria for their respective rank

In assessing the above areas, the reviewer(s) should distill the major accomplishments in these areas, address any opportunities for improvement, summarize goals and strategies, and provide focused action steps to meet future goals and expectations, including for promotion and/or reappointment.

5.3 PROBATIONARY TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the department chair or designee, who meets with the faculty member to discuss their performance, future plans, and goals; and prepares a written annual review using the OAA [Annual Review Template](#) that includes a determination of whether the faculty member at minimum exceeds expectations, meets expectations, or does not meet expectations, as well as a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee will also review probationary tenure-track faculty members within the department. They will consult with the department chair and recommend renewal or nonrenewal. The final decision for recommending renewal or nonrenewal rests with the department chair.

If the department chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The department chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The faculty member has the ability to appeal any of the rating decisions of the department chair or designee to the dean, and then to the executive vice president and provost. Upon full review of the written annual review, it, as well as any comments, appeals, and responses, becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure.

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

5.3.1 FOURTH-YEAR REVIEW

During the fourth year of the probationary period this mandatory review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exceptions that external evaluations are optional and the dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment. A separate annual review must also be completed following the procedures outlined in the [Faculty Annual Review, Post-Tenure-Review, and Reappointment policy](#).

External evaluations are solicited only 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 a written performance review to the department chair, who conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

If either the department chair or the dean recommends nonrenewal of a faculty member's probationary contract, the case will be referred to the college's Promotion and Tenure Committee, which will review the case, vote and make a recommendation to the dean. The dean makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

5.3.2 EXTENSION OF THE TENURE CLOCK

Faculty Rule [3335-6-03 \(D\)](#) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure track faculty member may extend the probationary period. Faculty Rule [3335-6-03 \(E\)](#) does likewise for reducing the probationary period. A faculty member remains on duty regardless of extensions or reductions to the probationary period, and annual reviews are conducted in every probationary year regardless of time extended or reduced. Approved extensions or reductions do not limit the department's right to recommend nonrenewal of an appointment during an annual review or a fourth-year review process.

5.4 TENURED FACULTY

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the department chair or designee, who conducts an independent assessment; may meet with the faculty member to discuss their performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written annual review using the OAA [Annual Review Template](#) that includes a determination of whether the faculty member at minimum exceeds expectations, meets expectations, or does not meet expectations in any area of work with 5% or greater workload allocation. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review and has the opportunity to appeal ratings to the dean and/or executive vice president and provost.

Professors are reviewed annually by the department chair or designee, who may meet with the faculty member to discuss their performance and future plans and goals. The department chair or designee is to prepare a written annual review using the OAA [Annual Review Template](#) that includes a determination of whether the faculty member at minimum exceeds expectations, meets expectations, or does not meet expectations in any area of work with 5% or greater workload allocation. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review and has the opportunity to appeal ratings to the dean and/or executive vice president and provost. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the department, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the college, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest-ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty.

If a faculty member has an administrative role that has 5% or greater workload assigned, the impact of that role and other assignments will be considered in the annual review. The department chair prepares a written evaluation of performance against these expectations. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

In accordance with Faculty Rule [3335-5-04.5](#), tenured faculty must undergo a post-tenure review if one of three conditions is met:

- A tenured faculty member receives a rating of "does not meet expectations" in the same area on their annual performance evaluation twice within any three-year period;

- A tenured faculty member receives a rating of “does not meet expectations” in any area on their annual performance evaluation within two years following the conclusion of a previous post-tenure review; or
- The department chair, dean or provost determines that the tenured faculty member has a documented and sustained record of significant underperformance outside of their annual review and unrelated to an allowable expression of academic freedom as defined by the university or Ohio law.

5.5 PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE FACULTY

The annual performance review process for professional practice probationary and non-probationary faculty is identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty respectively, except that non-probationary professional practice faculty may participate in the review of professional practice faculty of lower rank.

In the penultimate contract year of a professional practice faculty member's appointment, the department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed.

There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

5.6 RESEARCH FACULTY

The annual performance review process for research probationary and non-probationary faculty is identical to that for tenure-track probationary and tenured faculty, respectively, except that non-probationary research faculty may participate in the review of research faculty of lower rank.

In the penultimate contract year of a research faculty member's appointment, the department chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If it will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed.

There is no presumption of renewal of appointment.

5.7 ASSOCIATED FACULTY

Compensated associated faculty members are reviewed annually by the department chair or designee, who prepares a written annual review using the OAA [Annual Review Template](#) that includes a determination of whether the faculty member at minimum exceeds expectations, meets expectations, or does not meet expectations in any area of work with 5% or greater workload allocation. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review and has the opportunity to appeal ratings to the dean and/or executive vice president and provost.

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. If the position of a compensated associated faculty member will continue, the faculty member must undergo a formal reappointment review to determine whether it is appropriate to renew that individual's appointment to fill that position. The review generally proceeds in the same manner as the fourth-year review for tenure-track faculty. The department chair's decision on renewal of the appointment follows a vote by the eligible faculty. The chair's decision is final. If the decision is to renew, the chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

If the position of a compensated associated faculty member will not continue, the decision of the department chair to not renew the appointment is final, and a formal reappointment review is not required. Proper notice is to be given to the associated faculty member as set forth under the [Policy on Faculty Annual Review, Post-Tenure Review, and Reappointment](#).

Whether an associated faculty position will or will not continue is at the discretion of the department chair, and that decision is final.

5.8 SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS

The department chair makes annual salary recommendations to the dean, who may modify them. The recommendations are based on the current annual performance.

In formulating recommendations, the department chair consults with the department Executive Committee. The department chair should proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in the department. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

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.

Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation (see Section 5.A above) for an annual performance review at the required time will receive no salary increase in the year for which documentation was not provided, except in extenuating circumstances, and may not expect to recoup the foregone raise at a later time.

The annual unit-level review is complete when the following have occurred:

1. The faculty member's annual review materials have been reviewed by the department chair or designee;
2. The completed annual review template is shared with the faculty member;
3. The faculty member is given an opportunity to provide a response to the evaluation in writing and/or in a face-to-face discussion with the department chair or designee;
4. The department chair or designee is given an opportunity to respond to any written comments from and/or face-to-face discussion with the faculty member; and
5. The evaluation and any comments, as relevant, are sent to the dean.

6. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

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

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

continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

6.1 CRITERIA AND EVIDENCE THAT SUPPORT PROMOTION

Although institutional citizenship and collegiality are expected, they cannot be used as an independent criterion for promotion or tenure. The department recognizes, however, that these positive attributes define the ability of a faculty member to contribute effectively to exemplary teaching, scholarship, and service.

A commitment to these values and principles is demonstrated, for example, by participation in faculty governance and community outreach; activities related to the University's [Shared Values](#); adherence to principles of the responsible conduct of research; constructive conduct and ethical behavior during the discharge of responsibilities and authority; and the exercise of rights and privileges consistent with the [American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

This department is committed to assessing the practice of these values and principles as part of all performance evaluations.

6.1.1 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) provides the following general criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure:

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

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

The award of tenure is an acknowledgement of excellence and future potential for preeminence. It is therefore essential to evaluate and judge the probability that faculty, 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.

Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Above all, candidates are held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. For example, if a candidate's primary teaching role is and will continue to be undergraduate teaching, then excellence in undergraduate teaching is required. A mediocre performance in this area would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another aspect of teaching that is a significantly smaller part of the individual's responsibilities.

The content below is not meant to be exhaustive or applicable to all areas within the TIU but is provided to demonstrate the types of criteria and evidence that may support promotion to associate professor with tenure.

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

Department of Aviation Promotion and Tenure Considerations

As stated previously, aviation is highly applied and inter-disciplinary, incorporating the disciplines of aviation, business, education, engineering, health sciences, law, physical sciences, social sciences, and technology.

Candidates for tenure and promotion should clearly identify any intersections of these disciplines regarding their teaching and scholarship in their dossier narratives.

Graduate-level activities: In the absence of aviation specific graduate programs, tenure-track faculty should focus on developing a sustainable graduate curriculum and recruiting graduate research assistants from intersecting discipline areas to support their research agenda. Tenure track faculty are expected to support students by serving on thesis and dissertation committees in other departments when available.

Teaching	
Candidates must have demonstrated achievement of the following criteria. Candidates must submit evidence demonstrating their achievement of the criteria.	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Effectively teaching and developing as an instructor	<p>Strong student and peer evaluations or a clear trend of consistent improvement in classroom performance</p> <p>A record of teaching courses at the appropriate level</p> <p>Recognition through teaching awards for classroom instruction</p>
Effectively mentoring and advising students in the faculty member's area of expertise	<p>Advising activities for undergraduate student research including student group projects, capstones, student design competitions, honors theses, or individual studies</p> <p>Guidance to master's students for the completion of a thesis or culminating graduate project</p> <p>Service on thesis or examination committees for graduate students advised by other faculty members</p>

	Recognition of student achievement via student publications in significant publication venues, competitions, or notable awards.
Improving curriculum through revision or developing new courses and/or academic programs	<p>Leadership in teaching innovations or curriculum and course development, which goes beyond normal teaching and/or service expectations. This includes activities such as course-sequence development, certificate development, program development, etc.</p> <p>Introduction of new courses in the area of the candidate's research interests</p> <p>Enhancement or revision of undergraduate courses/laboratories as part of an overall plan of curriculum revision</p> <p>Assessment and revision of current coursework in support of program accreditation, course modernization, and relevance.</p>

Teaching innovations include development of different forms of educational interactions with students inside and outside the traditional classroom environment. The department expects that the candidate will exhibit high quality teaching or that the teaching quality shows a positive trajectory over time. Poor teaching evaluations punctuated by the occasional good, or even excellent, performance are not considered sufficient for promotion and tenure. This applies in similar fashion to the candidate's performance in student advising and mentoring.

Scholarship, Research, and Creative Works	
Candidates must have demonstrated achievement of the following criteria. Candidates must submit evidence demonstrating their achievement of the criteria.	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Establishing an original research identity	<p>Strong external reviews that can place the candidate's scholarship into the broader research community</p> <p>Research awards (both internal and external)</p> <p>Measures of research impact such as numbers of citations and h-indices</p>

<p>Demonstrating focused research, scholarship, and creative work that advances knowledge in the candidate's field and aligns with their scholarly agenda, the department's mission, and societal needs</p>	<p><u>Scholarly Publications and Creative Output (required)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A body of work in peer-reviewed journals and/or high-quality conferences that demonstrates an independent, thematically focused research program contributing substantively to the candidate's area of expertise. In Aviation, peer-reviewed conferences are equal in stature to peer-reviewed journals and are quality indicators of scholarly production. • A comprehensive publication record, which may include archival journal papers, refereed and non-refereed conference papers, and posters, monographs, books, book chapters, textbooks, magazine articles, online publications, patents, and invention disclosures • White papers with demonstrable influence on policy or practice <p><u>Recognition and Thought Leadership (required)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invited talks at symposia, conferences, other institutions, or other venues that reflect recognition of the candidate's thought leadership • Recognized aviation expertise through public and media forums for public benefit (e.g., media interviews, contributions to governmental policy, government, review panels, testimony before Congress, accident investigation expertise) <p><u>Innovation and Intellectual Property (if applicable)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development and protection of intellectual property, including patents, patent disclosures, and licensing of university-developed technologies • Commercialization of intellectual property through entrepreneurial activities such as entity creation • Design and/or creation of innovative products, such as flight training manuals, technology applications, aircraft architectures, business models, and human interfaces • Development of electronic tools and apps for modern aviation <p><u>Industry and Community Engagement (if applicable)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership and contributions to systems-related best practices in industry and government • Establishing reciprocal partnerships with the community, involving mutually beneficial exchanges of knowledge and delivery of educational materials addressing critical and emerging issues • Creation of online literature commons for high-quality, aviation-focused research publications
---	---

<p>Demonstrating the ability to mentor students as nascent researchers and guide them effectively</p>	<p>Publications (peer reviewed journal articles, conference abstracts, posters, etc.) that involve the faculty member and their students</p> <p>Research awards won by students (e.g., “best poster,” “young investigator,” etc.)</p> <p>External and internal fellowships won by students</p> <p>Placement of students upon graduation</p>
<p>Seeking and securing sufficient and reasonable external funding to advance the candidate’s research activities.*</p>	<p>Grants or contracts, when appropriate for the field, from sources including foundations, federal agencies, major industry, or private sector. May be as Primary Investigator or Co-Investigator with documented focused contribution on multiple grants or projects</p>

* The department recognizes that funding opportunities in the aviation disciplines may be more limited than elsewhere in the college. Nevertheless, all tenure-track faculty are required to actively seek funding in support of their scholarship goals.

<p style="text-align: center;">Service</p>	
<p>Candidates must have demonstrated achievement of the following criteria. Candidates must submit evidence demonstrating their achievement of the criteria.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Criteria</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met</p>
<p>Demonstrating excellence in service to the TIU</p>	<p>Contributions and quality indicators of the outcomes of the contributions</p> <p>Recognition (awards and prizes) for service to the department</p> <p>Annual evaluations that document excellent service to the department</p> <p>Appointment or election to department, college, and/or university committees</p>
<p>Demonstrating service on the national level with appropriate professional activities</p>	<p>Service as reviewer of conference abstracts or journal articles</p> <p>Service as reviewer for proposals submitted to federal funding agencies</p>

	Demonstrated participation with professional societies and/or their conferences (e.g., session chair, technical committee member)
--	---

6.1.2 CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) 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 specific criteria in teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national or international reputation in the field.

When assessing a candidate’s national and international reputation in the field, a national and international reputation for the scholarship of teaching may be counted as either teaching or scholarship.

A unique mix of leadership in the discipline and significant aviation experience and FAA certifications must also be considered with traditional teaching, research, and service criteria for promotion to Professor.

In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#), assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another. Promotion should reflect the reality that (a) not all faculty members have the same distribution of assignments (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence equally in all evaluation dimensions; and (c) there is a multi-faceted institutional responsibility that must be achieved by the skills of the faculty collectively. Promotion to professor should be awarded not only to those faculty who have demonstrated impact in their scholarship of research and creative inquiry, teaching and learning, and service, but also to those who have exhibited excellence in leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the department, college and university.

The content below is provided to demonstrate the types of criteria and evidence that support promotion to professor with tenure.

Teaching	
Candidates must have demonstrated achievement of the following criteria. Candidates must submit evidence demonstrating their achievement of the criteria.	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Sustaining an effective record of classroom teaching, with particular emphasis on the preceding five years	

	<p>Strong student and peer evaluations and/or a clear trend of consistent improvement and excellence in classroom performance</p> <p>A sustained record of teaching courses at the appropriate level</p> <p>Recognition through teaching awards for classroom instruction</p>
Achieving a sustained record of effective mentoring of students in research	<p>A record of meaningful and consistent involvement in graduate exams, theses, and dissertations, in a capacity other than that of advisor, when applicable</p> <p>Publications (peer reviewed journal articles, conference abstracts, posters, etc.) that involve the faculty member and their students</p> <p>Research or design awards won by students (e.g., “best poster,” “young investigator,” etc.)</p> <p>External and internal fellowships won by students</p>
Achieving a sustained record of significant contributions in the area of curriculum development	<p>Leadership in teaching innovations or curriculum and course development, which goes beyond normal teaching and/or service expectations. This includes activities such as course-sequence development, certificate development, program development, etc.</p> <p>Introduction of new courses in the area of the candidate’s research interests</p> <p>Enhancement or revision of undergraduate courses/laboratories as part of an overall plan of curriculum revision</p> <p>Assessment and revision of current coursework in support of program accreditation, course modernization, and relevance.</p>

Scholarship, Research, and Creative Works	
Candidates must have demonstrated achievement of the following criteria. Candidates must submit evidence demonstrating their achievement of the criteria.	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met

<p>Sustaining excellence in the conduct of scholarship, creative work, or research</p>	<p>Research efforts and scholastic accomplishments must be recognized nationally or internationally. Such recognition is demonstrated via the external review letters</p> <p>Research awards (internal and external)</p> <p>Measures of research impact such as numbers of citations and h-indices</p>
<p>Demonstrating a sustained record of focused research, scholarship, and creative work that advances knowledge in the candidate's field and aligns with their scholarly agenda, the department's mission, and societal needs</p>	<p><u>Scholarly Publications and Creative Output (required)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sustained body of work in peer-reviewed journals and/or high-quality conferences that demonstrates an independent, thematically focused research program contributing substantively to knowledge in the candidate's area of expertise. In Aviation, peer-reviewed conferences are equal in stature to peer-reviewed journals and are quality indicators of scholarly production. • A comprehensive publication record, which may include archival journal papers, refereed and non-refereed conference papers, and posters, monographs, books, book chapters, textbooks, magazine articles, online publications, patents, and invention disclosures • White papers with demonstrable influence on policy or practice <p><u>Recognition and Thought Leadership (required)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keynote presentations at national and international conferences • Invited talks at symposia, conferences, and other venues that reflect recognition of the candidate's thought leadership • Recognized aviation expertise through public and media forums for public benefit (e.g., media interviews, contributions to governmental policy, government, review panels, testimony before Congress, accident investigation expertise) • Invited membership on governmental review panels to include accident investigation boards <p><u>Innovation and Intellectual Property (if applicable)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development and protection of intellectual property, including patents, patent disclosures, and licensing of university-developed technologies • Commercialization of intellectual property through entrepreneurial activities such as entity creation • Design and/or creation of innovative products, such as flight training manuals, technology applications, aircraft architectures, business models, and human interfaces

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of electronic tools and apps for modern aviation <p><u>Industry and Community Engagement (if applicable)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership and contributions to systems-related best practices in industry and government • Establishing reciprocal partnerships with the community, involving mutually beneficial exchanges of knowledge and delivery of educational materials addressing critical and emerging issues • Creation of online literature commons for high-quality, aviation-focused research publications
Demonstrating a sustained ability to mentor students as nascent researchers and guide them effectively	<p>Publications (peer reviewed journal articles, conference abstracts, posters, etc.) that involve the faculty member and their graduate students</p> <p>Research awards won by graduate students (e.g., “best poster”, “young investigator”)</p> <p>External and internal fellowships won by graduate students</p> <p>Placement of graduate students upon graduation</p>
A record of sustained funding at a reasonable level to support the research activities of the candidate, especially for the period since the last promotion*	Sustained grants and contracts, when appropriate for the field, including foundations, federal agencies, major industry, or private sector. May be as Primary Investigator or Co-Investigator with documented focused contribution on multiple grants or projects

* The department recognizes that funding opportunities in the aviation disciplines may be more limited than elsewhere in the college. Nevertheless, all tenure-track faculty are required to actively seek funding in support of their scholarship goals.

Service	
Candidates must have demonstrated achievement of the following criteria. Candidates must submit evidence demonstrating their achievement of the criteria.	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Demonstrating a sustained record of effective service to the department, particularly involving leadership	Chair or other service on departmental committees in leadership roles

	<p>Development or editing appointment, promotion, and tenure documents and other administrative documents for a department</p> <p>Advising of student groups, organizations, or project teams</p>
<p>Demonstrating a sustained record of effective service to professional societies, or other organizations such as funding agencies, often in leadership roles</p>	<p>Editorships of prestigious journals, conference proceedings, and symposium proceedings</p> <p>Organization and/or chair of sessions at technical conferences or workshops</p> <p>Committee chairmanships in societies</p> <p>Reviewer of technical proposals for governmental funding agencies</p> <p>Reviewer of conference and journal papers</p> <p>Recognition through fellowships or other honors by professional or technical societies</p>

6.1.3 CRITERIA FOR PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE FACULTY

6.1.3.1 General Teaching Criteria for Professional Practice Faculty

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

The successful professional practice faculty candidate for promotion is expected to demonstrate excellence and leadership as a teacher in terms of:

- Teaching of undergraduate and graduate courses in their areas of expertise, and
- Curriculum development, including course and lab development.

6.1.3.2 General Research/Scholarship Criteria for Professional Practice Faculty

The notion of scholarship is more broadly defined for evaluating this aspect of the performance of professional practice faculty. For faculty in this role, scholarship is defined to include the application and advancement of a body of knowledge via activities in addition to those noted elsewhere for tenure track and research faculty. To assist in the definition and understanding of these activities, two potential pathways for developing an impactful and cohesive scholarship portfolio for professional practice faculty are outlined following. The purpose of the outlined pathways is to provide a framework to assist professional practice faculty in developing a meaningful, impactful, coherent, and holistic portfolio of practice and support them in their professional development and promotion pathway.

A professional practice faculty member may identify more strongly with one of the following pathways to demonstrate a cohesive impactful portfolio of engagement and achievement for promotion or review. Additionally, engagement and achievement in a combination of activities from both areas, while not required, would also be favorably considered. Professional practice faculty should be able to describe their contributions within the context of one or both pathways through the presentation of an integrated and cohesive philosophy as to the way in which they are making a meaningful impact on the discipline that is also visible to the engineering and/or engineering education communities outside the department.

The degree of scholarship required should be evaluated in relation to the differing workload percentages between faculty types.

The two pathways are the Educator Pathway and the Practitioner Pathway.

Educator Pathway	Practitioner Pathway
<p>The Educator Pathway reflects pedagogical excellence in the practice of teaching, which may involve dissemination, outreach, mentorship, and related activity or service, including consideration of the activities' broader application, impact, and adoption.</p>	<p>The Practitioner Pathway reflects disciplinary excellence in the practice of aviation, aerospace, or defense, which may involve dissemination, outreach, mentorship, or related activity and service, including consideration of the activities' broader application, impact, and adoption, as well as their relevance to teaching and learning.</p>
<p><u>Pedagogical Practice</u>: Individuals may engage at the forefront of pedagogical techniques.</p> <p>Demonstration of this may include engagement in ongoing professional development (especially resulting in certification); pedagogical leadership; implementation of best practices from discipline-based education research (DBER) and the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL), designing courses or curricula based on DBER and SoTL; leadership and impactful engagement in internal or external pedagogical research or studies as a practitioner, for example, at the course or cohort level, or researcher (PI, Co-PI).</p> <p><u>Pedagogical Dissemination</u>: Individuals may engage in the dissemination of applicable pedagogical innovation internally and externally.</p> <p>Demonstration of this may include authorship of traditional scholarly publications, and relevant academic, industry, or trade publications. It may include contribution to or supervision of student theses (or dissertations). It may include hosting or participating in conference presentations, workshops, seminars, or panels.</p>	<p><u>Disciplinary Practice</u>: Individuals may engage in applied aviation activities.</p> <p>Demonstration of this may include engaging in on-going professional development (especially resulting in certification); technical leadership; engagement in aviation, aerospace, or defense, applied (or translational) research programs, projects, or activities; participating in external reviews, consulting activities; developing policy, standards, or reports, etc.; engaging in internal or external discipline-related research or studies as a practitioner, for example, at the course or cohort level, or researcher (PI, Co-PI).</p> <p><u>Disciplinary Dissemination</u>: Individuals may engage in the dissemination of engineering best practices, methods, techniques, discoveries, or innovations externally or internally, as well as expert witness testimony.</p> <p>Demonstration of this may include traditional scholarly publications, and relevant academic, industry, or trade publications. It may include the preparation of technical reports related to expert witness testimony, as well as that testimony itself. It may include student theses (or dissertations). It</p>

Educator Pathway	Practitioner Pathway
<p><u>Pedagogical Outreach</u>: Individuals may engage with STEM stakeholders in ways that support enhanced academic outcomes and future engagement in the engineering discipline. Demonstration of this may include work with K-12 outreach, bridge programs, and mentorship at K-12, undergraduate, or graduate levels. This may also include supporting the development of courses, workshops, or other curricula that support enhanced academic progression toward future engagement with the discipline.</p> <p><u>Student Mentorship</u>: Individuals may engage in student mentorship at different levels.</p> <p>Demonstration of this may include mentoring or advising students or extracurricular student groups, serving as a technical advisor to capstone groups in a capacity other than that of course instructor, serving on theses and dissertation committees, etc.</p> <p><u>Related Service</u>: Individuals may engage or lead in departmental, college, or university-level service.</p> <p>Demonstration of this may include engagement and leadership in curricular, pedagogy, policy, governance, or accreditation activities that impact teaching, learning, scholarship, matriculation into the discipline, or high-level academic administration. The individual must show documentable impact (i.e., minutes, reports, presentations, official recommendations, letter from leadership documenting, etc.).</p> <p><u>Other Activities</u>: There can be valuable activities that may not fit into the above criteria that fit within this pathway.</p>	<p>includes hosting or participating in conference presentations, workshops, seminars, or panels.</p> <p><u>Disciplinary Outreach</u>: Individuals may engage in professional societies or associations in various ways that support or promote engagement with the practice of, or application of the discipline. Demonstration of this may include engagement in aviation-related society leadership at the local chapter, section, division, interest group, regional, or national levels. Engagement may also include developing policies, standards, reports, or other impactful leadership activities.</p> <p><u>Student Mentorship</u>: Individuals may engage in student mentorship at different levels.</p> <p>Demonstration of this may include mentoring or advising students or extracurricular student groups, serving as a technical advisor to capstone groups in a capacity other than that of course instructor, serving on theses and dissertation committees, etc.</p> <p><u>Related Service</u>: Individuals may engage or lead in departmental, college, or university-level service.</p> <p>Demonstration of this may include engagement and leadership in curricular, pedagogy, policy, governance, or accreditation activities that impact teaching, learning, scholarship, matriculation into the discipline, or high-level academic administration. The individual must show documentable impact (i.e., minutes, reports, presentations, official recommendations, letter from leadership documenting, etc.)</p> <p><u>Other Activities</u>: There can be valuable activities that may not fit into the above criteria that fit within this pathway.</p>

Professional practice faculty will work with the Department Chair at the annual reviews to identify additional contributions to the department and ways stay current with their chosen discipline. By their nature, these measures will not apply to all professional practice faculty, nor are professional practice faculty expected to address every item described in different pathways described above. The impact of

their contributions to the department and to the discipline is of upmost importance rather than a number of activities that yield little impact.

6.1.3.3 General Service Criteria for Professional Practice Faculty

The successful professional practice faculty candidate for promotion is expected to demonstrate a history of effective service that is synergistic with their chosen pathway, which, in addition to service to the Department, may include:

- The college, and university communities,
- Student groups and organizations,
- Professional societies, and organizations such as funding agencies, and
- Other public and private entities beyond the University.

Appropriate documentation of service activities is required, using the measures described in this document. The faculty candidate’s attitude and professional conduct in the discharge of their duties is of importance and demonstrates a commitment to citizenship and collegiality. A commitment to these values and principles is demonstrated, for example, by participation in faculty governance and community outreach; activities related to the University’s [Shared Values](#); adherence to principles of the responsible conduct of research; constructive conduct and ethical behavior during the discharge of responsibilities and authority; and the exercise of rights and privileges consistent with the [American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

6.1.3.4 Criteria for Promotion to Professional Practice Associate Professor.

For promotion to professional practice associate professor, a faculty member must show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service; must have a documented high level of competence in professional practice; and must display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of this department. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to professional practice associate professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Teaching	
Candidates must have demonstrated achievement of the following criteria. Candidates must submit evidence demonstrating their achievement of the criteria.	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Effectively teaching and developing as an instructor	<p>Good student/peer evaluations and/or a clear trend of consistent improvements in classroom performance</p> <p>Teaching courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels</p> <p>Teaching awards for classroom instruction</p>
If consistent with their chosen pathway, developing as an effective	

<p>advisor of graduate and undergraduate students in research</p>	<p>Record of mentoring undergraduate and graduate students in research</p> <p>Placement of graduate students upon graduation</p> <p>A record of meaningful and consistent involvement in graduate exams, theses, and dissertations, in a capacity other than that of advisor</p>
<p>Improving curriculum through revision or developing new courses and/or academic programs</p>	<p>Introduction/modification of courses in the area of the candidate's interests</p> <p>Enhancement/revisions of undergraduate courses/laboratories as part of an overall plan of curriculum revision.</p>

<p>Scholarship, Research, and Creative Works</p>	
<p>Candidates must have demonstrated achievement of the following criteria. Candidates must submit evidence demonstrating their achievement of the criteria.</p>	
<p>Criteria</p>	<p>Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met</p>
<p>Disseminating pedagogical or disciplinary scholarship</p>	<p>Examples are provided for the different pathways in the table in Section 6.1.3.2</p>
<p>Pedagogical or disciplinary outreach</p>	<p>Examples are provided for the different pathways in the table in Section 6.1.3.2</p>

<p>Service</p>	
<p>Candidates must have demonstrated achievement of the following criteria. Candidates must submit evidence demonstrating their achievement of the criteria.</p>	
<p>Criteria</p>	<p>Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met</p>
<p>Demonstrating excellence in service to the department</p>	<p>Contributions and quality indicators of the outcomes of the contributions</p> <p>Recognition (awards and prizes) for service to the department</p>

	Annual evaluations document excellent service to the department
Actively serving on the national level with appropriate professional activities that are consistent with their chosen pathway	<p>Serving as reviewer of conference abstracts or journal articles</p> <p>Serving as reviewer for proposals submitted to federal funding agencies</p> <p>Demonstrated participation with professional societies and/or their conferences (e.g., session chair, technical committee member)</p>

6.1.3.5 Promotion to Professional Practice Professor.

For promotion to professional practice professor, a faculty member must have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching and professional practice; leadership in service to this department and to the profession; and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Teaching	
Candidates must have demonstrated achievement of the following criteria. Candidates must submit evidence demonstrating their achievement of the criteria.	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Sustaining a record of consistently effective teaching of undergraduate and/or graduate courses, with particular emphasis on the preceding five years	<p>Good student and/or peer evaluations of instruction</p> <p>A variety of courses taught at the undergraduate and graduate levels</p> <p>Teaching awards for classroom instruction</p>
If consistent with their chosen pathway, developing as an effective advisor of graduate and undergraduate students in research	<p>Record of mentoring undergraduate and graduate students in research</p> <p>Placement of graduate students upon graduation</p> <p>A record of meaningful and consistent involvement in graduate exams, theses, and dissertations, in a capacity other than that of advisor</p>

Significantly contributing in the area of curriculum development	<p>Introduction/modification of courses in the area of the candidate's research interests</p> <p>Development and/or modifications of courses and labs</p> <p>Enhancement/revisions of undergraduate courses/laboratories as part of an overall plan of curriculum revision</p>
--	--

Scholarship, Research, and Creative Works	
Candidates must have demonstrated achievement of the following criteria. Candidates must submit evidence demonstrating their achievement of the criteria.	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Consistently excelling in scholarship, practice, and/or outreach effort over the evaluative period	Candidate maintains an active program at the time of consideration for promotion
Disseminating pedagogical or disciplinary scholarship	Examples are provided for the different pathways in the table provided in Section 6.1.3.2
Actively participating in pedagogical or disciplinary outreach	Examples are provided for the different pathways in the table provided in Section 6.1.3.2

Service	
Candidates must have demonstrated achievement of the following criteria. Candidates must submit evidence demonstrating their achievement of the criteria.	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Sustaining a record of effective service to the department, particularly involving leadership	<p>Service on departmental committees in leadership roles</p> <p>Advising of student groups, organizations, or project teams</p>
Sustaining a record of effective service to professional societies, and organizations such as funding agencies, often in leadership roles.	Editorships of prestigious journals, conference proceedings, and symposium proceedings

Such service should be synergistic with their chosen pathway.	<p>Organization and/or chairing of sessions at technical conferences or workshops</p> <p>Technical committee chairmanships in societies Service as reviewer of technical proposals for governmental funding agencies</p> <p>Reviewer of conference and journal papers</p> <p>External consulting activities</p> <p>Demonstration of engineering practice through summer faculty fellowship programs or other experiences with industry or national labs</p>
---	---

6.1.4 RESEARCH FACULTY

6.1.4.1 Criteria for Research Faculty

Teaching for research faculty is more narrowly considered as the following two criteria:

- Engagement and advising (as primary advisor) of graduate and undergraduate students in research,
- Involvement in graduate exams, theses, and dissertations, in a capacity other than that of primary advisor.

6.1.4.2 General Research/Scholarship Criteria for Research Faculty

The successful research faculty candidate for promotion is expected to:

- conduct scholarly research,
- disseminate the research findings and knowledge produced, by contributing to the technical literature, filing patents and commercializing inventions
- acquire or transfer (in the case of appointment from a previous similar position) external funding to support the conduct of the research, and
- involve graduate students in the research activities, including the mentoring of graduate students toward the completion of their dissertations and post-graduate placement

Candidates for promotion at either level must provide clear and compelling evidence that they are building and/or maintaining an active, productive research program, and can be expected to continue to do so. The conduct of the research may involve the candidate and their graduate students primarily, or significant collaboration with other researchers. In either case, the record must clearly indicate the nature of the research contributions and scholastic identity of the candidate and their graduate advisees.

Evidence of accomplishments must be presented which demonstrates the candidate's development of a national/international stature in their area of research and their ability to engage and train graduate and undergraduate students in their research activities. Evaluation of the candidate's research/scholarship accomplishments will primarily be based on their publication and funding records, including generation of intellectual property, and the external peer evaluation letters.

6.1.4.3 General Service Criteria for Research Faculty

The successful research faculty candidate for promotion is expected to demonstrate a history of effective service, which may include:

- Professional societies, and organizations such as funding agencies, and
- Other public and private entities beyond the University.

Due to the nature of the position and the need to source their own salary, the expectations for internal service are minimal.

Appropriate documentation of service activities is required, using the measures described in this document. The faculty candidate’s attitude and professional conduct in the discharge of their duties is of importance and demonstrates a commitment to citizenship and collegiality. A commitment to these values and principles is demonstrated, for example, by participation in faculty governance and community outreach; activities related to the University’s [Shared Values](#); adherence to principles of the responsible conduct of research; constructive conduct and ethical behavior during the discharge of responsibilities and authority; and the exercise of rights and privileges consistent with the [American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

6.1.4.4 Criteria for 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 solely to research. 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 extramural and/or commercial funding is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Teaching	
Candidates must have demonstrated achievement of the following criteria. Candidates must submit evidence demonstrating their achievement of the criteria.	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Developing as an effective advisor of graduate and undergraduate students in research	Following a transient period when the candidate establishes the necessary facilities to support their research, the candidate will Have guided several master’s students to the completion of their theses If applicable, have some doctoral students well along in their programs of study Have served on a number of thesis or examination committees for graduate students advised by other faculty members
Scholarship, Research, and Creative Works	
Candidates must have demonstrated achievement of the criteria required for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Candidates must submit evidence demonstrating their achievement of the criteria.	

--

Service	
Candidates must have demonstrated achievement of the following criteria. Candidates must submit evidence demonstrating their achievement of the criteria.	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Involvement with service on the national level with appropriate professional activities	<p>Serving as reviewer of conference abstracts or journal articles</p> <p>Serving as reviewer for proposals submitted to federal funding agencies</p> <p>Demonstrated participation with professional societies and/or their conferences (e.g., session chair, technical committee member)</p>

6.1.4.5 Promotion to Research Professor.

For promotion to research professor, a faculty member must have a national or international reputation built on an extensive body of high-quality publications and with demonstrated impact on the field. A record of continuous peer-reviewed extramural and/or commercial funding is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Teaching	
Candidates must have demonstrated achievement of the following criteria. Candidates must submit evidence demonstrating their achievement of the criteria.	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
A record of effective mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students in research	<p>Graduated master's students and, if applicable, some doctoral students</p> <p>Demonstrated consistency in student advising over the period of interest (i.e., a steady stream of students being indicative of a continuing and sustained effort)</p> <p>Mentoring these students to successful post-graduation placement</p>

	A record of meaningful and consistent involvement in graduate exams, theses, and dissertations, in a capacity other than that of advisor.
--	---

Scholarship, Research, and Creative Works

Candidates must have demonstrated achievement of the criteria required for promotion to full professor with tenure. Candidates must submit evidence demonstrating their achievement of the criteria.

Service

Candidates must have demonstrated achievement of the following criteria. Candidates must submit evidence demonstrating their achievement of the criteria.

Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Achievement and Impact
<p>A record of effective service to professional societies, and organizations such as funding agencies, often in leadership roles</p>	<p>Editorships of prestigious journals, conference proceedings, and symposium proceedings</p> <p>Organization and/or chairing of sessions at technical conferences or workshops</p> <p>Technical committee chairmanships in societies</p> <p>Service as reviewer of technical proposals for governmental funding agencies</p> <p>Reviewer of conference and journal papers</p> <p>External consulting activities</p> <p>Demonstration of engineering practice through summer faculty fellowship programs or other experiences with industry or national labs</p> <p>Recognition through fellowships or other honors by professional or technical societies</p>

6.1.5 CRITERIA FOR ASSOCIATED FACULTY

Promotion to Adjunct Associate Professor and Adjunct Professor. The relevant criteria for the promotion of adjunct faculty members shall be the same as those for the promotion of tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, above.

Promotion to Associate Professor and Professor with FTE below 50%. The relevant criteria for the promotion of associated faculty members with tenure-track titles are those for the promotion of tenure-track faculty above.

Promotion to Senior Lecturer. Lecturers may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank as described in Section IV.A.4.

Promotion of Visiting Faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for promotion.

6.2 PROCEDURES

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) for tenure-track faculty, [3335-7-05](#) for professional practice faculty, and [3335-7-32](#) for research faculty, and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Chapter 3 of the [Procedures and Guidelines Handbook](#).

6.2.1 TENURE-TRACK, PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE, AND RESEARCH FACULTY

6.2.1.1 Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier and providing a copy of the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed, if other than the department's current document. If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators compiled for their case according to department guidelines. Each of these elements is described in detail below.

- **Dossier**

Every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs core [dossier outline](#). Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs [Candidate Checklist](#) without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirements set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline including, but not limited to, those highlighted on the checklist.

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 them.

The time period for teaching documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty, it is the date of last promotion, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

For scholarship documentation, a full history of publications and creative work should be included, as this information provides context to the more recent and relevant research record and/or demonstrates scholarly independence. Information about scholarship produced prior to the start date (for probationary

faculty) or date of last promotion or reappointment may be provided. Any such material should be clearly indicated. However, it is the scholarship performance since the start date or date of last promotion that is to be the focus of the evaluating parties.

The time period for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or non-probationary faculty it is the date of last promotion, reappointment, or the last five years, whichever is more recent, to present. The eligible faculty may allow a candidate to include information prior to the date of last promotion or reappointment if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

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

The dossier should contain the following types of documentation.

The Core Dossier. This should be submitted as a single document into Interfolio. The candidate should compile all the evidence describing how they meet the criteria for promotion and/or tenure.

Updated Curriculum Vitae.

Teaching: Student Evaluations of Classroom Instruction

Student evaluation of classroom instruction is one measure of the quality of teaching performance of tenure track and professional practice faculty. A mandatory component of such student evaluation is the use of the Survey of Student Learning Experience (SSLE) questionnaire administered on-line by the Office of the Registrar, for each course taught by the candidate faculty member. In considering the student evaluation information, student responses to different questions and the pattern of their responses over all the courses taught by the candidate should be examined, rather than reducing the information to a single number and judging the quality/effectiveness of teaching by that number.

Teaching: Summary of Student Comments

This document will highlight the overarching positive and negative comments of courses taught during the evaluation period. Appendix A contains the template with example comments.

Teaching: Evaluations by Peers and Others

Peer evaluation of classroom instruction, and of other aspects of teaching by the candidate faculty member, is mandatory. Candidates will submit all peer reviews since their probationary appointment, last reappointment, or last promotion. Details of the department's peer review of teaching process appear in Section 9.2. Appendix B contains the Peer-Review of Teaching Form.

The variety of courses (e.g., enrollment, graduate/undergraduate, lab/lecture, etc.) taught by the candidate will also be taken into account in this evaluation. Furthermore, successful use of innovative educational techniques to improve teaching effectiveness will be recognized. Peer evaluation of the quality of the candidate's contributions in the following areas of teaching shall also be performed, where appropriate for the faculty track:

- Academic advising of graduate and undergraduate students in research.
- Curriculum development, including course and lab development. Examples of contributions in this area are the introduction of graduate courses, significant revision and updating of the undergraduate and

graduate curricula, upgrading of laboratory component of courses, and updating of graduate courses by incorporation of research results.

- Involvement in graduate exams, theses, and dissertations, in capacity other than that of advisor. Meaningful involvement implies that the candidate provides appropriate guidance to the graduate students involved, by sharing their expertise and perspective.

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

- Authorship of textbooks, wide use of such texts implying a significant measure of positive peer recognition.
- Teaching awards for classroom instruction.
- Grants for teaching and course development, especially if they involve significant peer evaluation.
- Refereed publications in journals dedicated to engineering education.
- Successful and properly documented use of classroom visits by colleagues, or other parties such as the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning, to improve teaching effectiveness.

Criteria Assessment Narrative:

The candidate must provide an assessment narrative outlining their achievements with respect to the criteria evaluated for promotion and/or tenure. The assessment narrative must include the following sections:

- Biographical Statement (same as in core dossier)
- Detailed Assessment: Teaching Criteria
- Detailed Assessment: Scholarship, Research, and Creative Works Criteria
- Detailed Assessment: Service Criteria
- Scholarship and Research Plans
- Teaching Agenda Plans

Candidate Publication Record:

The successful tenure track and research faculty candidate's publication record should document consistency of scholarly endeavor. While a publication record appropriately consists of several components apart from archival literature, refereed journal papers and refereed conference papers typically serve as the foundation on which the remainder of the record should be built and evaluated. Thus, a reasonable representation of the candidate's work is required to appear in the reputable journals or refereed conference proceedings in their research area.

Collaborative research efforts are encouraged where appropriate. When work is co-authored, the faculty member must be able to indicate what their contribution to the work was in terms of both effort and substance.

In addition, developing and securing intellectual property such as patents, patent disclosures, licensing of university-developed intellectual property and revenue generated from licenses may also be counted as evidence of scholarship, but not in lieu of the types of publications listed above.

Service

Service to the department, college, and university takes the form of participation in committees at these various levels, the significance of the service being greater if the candidate assumes a leadership role. Faculty advising of student groups and organizations by the tenure track and professional practice faculty

candidate is also a significant form of service, especially if such advising is shown to contribute to improved effectiveness of operation of these groups.

Ours is a complex endeavor that requires of all of us, hard work, cooperation, professionalism, ethical behavior, and a collegial attitude. It is therefore entirely appropriate to consider the candidate's professional conduct in the discharge of her or his department (and other university-related) responsibilities as part of the evaluation. The successful candidate in this area will

- Demonstrate prompt and consistent attendance at assigned committee and other departmental meetings, as well as effective and efficient completion of the work external to the meetings necessary for the committee, or other body, to fulfill its responsibilities.
- Satisfy the need of the department to participate in activities that reach beyond the department, such as faculty governance, outreach, and service.
- Treat departmental staff, and faculty with professionalism and respect.
- Treat students with professionalism and respect both in the classroom, and individually.
- Be available for a reasonable period of time each week to meet with students.
- Make good use of departmental resources, and practice fiscal integrity in all interactions with funding agencies/sponsors and other external customers.
- Treat members of the public with whom he/she interacts as a representative of the university, professionally and with respect.
- Contribute to the community within the department, college, and university in accordance with the university's shared values.

Measures of service to professional societies and organizations include, but are not restricted to, the following:

- Editorships of journals, conference proceedings, and symposium proceedings,
 - Organization and/or chairing of sessions at technical conferences or workshops,
 - Leadership roles in societies, including technical committee memberships,
 - Service as reviewer of conference and journal papers, and
 - Service as reviewer of technical proposals.
- Measures of service to other public and private entities beyond the university include, but are not restricted to, the following:
- Service on panels and commissions
 - Professional consultation to governmental and educational organizations.
 - Providing expert witness testimony

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document

Candidates must indicate the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. A candidate may be reviewed using the department's current APT document, or they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion (or last reappointment in the case of professional practice and research faculty), whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, for tenure track faculty the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year.

If a candidate wishes to be reviewed under an APT other than the current approved version available [here](#), a copy of the APT document under which the candidate has elected to be reviewed must be submitted when the dossier is submitted to the department.

External Evaluations (see also External Evaluations below)

If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed according to department guidelines. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names. The department chair decides whether removal is justified.

6.2.1.2 Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

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

- To review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
 - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's core dossier, 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 be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04A\(3\)](#) only once. Faculty Rules [3335-7-08](#) and [3335-7-36](#) make the same provision for non-probationary professional practice and research faculty, respectively. 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.
 - 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 [here](#).
 - **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the department chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section VI.B.4 below). Justification will be provided in cases when a

suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.

- **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 provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on their 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.
- Consider the interdisciplinary work of a candidate across multiple units as part of the whole work, especially if the candidate has a joint appointment in another unit.
- Revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of the full eligible faculty, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
- Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit. 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.

6.2.1.3 Eligible Faculty Committee Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the members of the Eligible Faculty Committee 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.

6.2.1.4 Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. For tenure-track assistant professors, the chair will confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be

required to sign an [MOU](#) at the time of promotion with tenure.

- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this department. The department chair will seek a letter of evaluation from the TIU head of the joint appointment unit. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.
- To make 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 charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- 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. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of the committee.
- To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the 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; and
 - of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten calendar 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 they will submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline.
- 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 head of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

6.2.2 PROCEDURES FOR ASSOCIATED FACULTY

Adjunct faculty and associated faculty with tenure-track titles for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed in Section 6.2 above, with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is negative (a negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases), and does not proceed to the executive vice president and provost if the dean's recommendation is negative.

6.2.3 EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS

This Department of Aviation will seek external evaluations from appropriate faculty in aviation programs of the following institutions:

- Purdue University ([School of Aviation and Transportation Technology](#))
- Auburn University ([School of Aviation](#))
- Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University – Daytona Campus ([College of Aviation](#))
- Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University – Prescott Campus ([College of Aviation](#))
- Florida Institute of Technology ([College of Aeronautics](#))
- Kent State University ([School of Aeronautics](#))
- Liberty University ([School of Aeronautics](#))
- Middle Tennessee State University ([Department of Aerospace](#))
- University of North Dakota ([John D Odegard School of Aerospace Sciences](#))
- University of Oklahoma ([School of Aviation](#))

Justification will be provided in each case when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on this list.

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track faculty promotion and tenure or promotion reviews and all research faculty promotion reviews. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for professional practice or associated faculty unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations for a professional practice or associated faculty member based on scholarship will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Evaluations that assess the quality and impact of the teaching and service of professional practice faculty candidates under consideration for promotion are to be obtained. The source and content of evaluations for professional practice faculty promotion candidates should reflect the contributions expected of professional practice faculty members. Evaluations should address the extent and quality of teaching as characterized by internal and external evaluations of instruction and the quality of contributions through outreach and engagement with industry, the educational community, and the broad community of practitioners as appropriate for the individual under review. Evaluations should also address the extent and quality of professional service to the department, College, and University. Evaluations of professional practice faculty should derive from external authoritative and reputable sources qualified to comment substantively on the contributions and accomplishments of the faculty member.

A conflict of interest for external reviewers exists if the reviewer is or has been to the candidate: a) a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor; b) a research collaborator, which includes someone who has been a coauthor on a publication within the past 3 years, including pending publications and submissions; c) a collaborator on a project within the past 3 years, including current and planned collaborations; d) in a consulting/financial arrangement with the candidate within the past 3 years, including receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services); e) a relative or close

personal friend; or f) in any relationship, personal or professional, that could reduce the reviewer's objectivity. Also excluded are reviewers from the same institution, or those who had previous employment in the same institution within the past 12 months, or those who are being considered for employment at that institution.

A minimum of three 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, former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate, or someone who has collaborated extensively with the candidate or is currently collaborating with the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will solicit evaluations only from professors with institutional affiliations predominately in the programs listed above. In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

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

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the 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](#) 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 for letters requesting external evaluations. A sample letter for tenure-track and research faculty can be found [here](#). A sample letter for professional practice faculty can be found [here](#).

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.

7. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND REAPPOINTMENT APPEALS

Only the candidate can appeal a negative tenure, promotion, or reappointment decision.

Faculty members who believe they have been evaluated improperly for tenure, promotion, or reappointment may appeal a negative decision to the University Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

Only the candidate may appeal a negative tenure, promotion, or reappointment decision.

Performance that is adequate for annual reappointment may not be adequate for the granting of promotion or tenure with promotion for faculty on the tenure track or, in the case of professional practice or research faculty, for securing a reappointment.

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions.

Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule [3335-5-05](#).

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.

8. SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) 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.

9. PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

9.1 STUDENT FEEDBACK ON TEACHING

Use of the Student Survey of Learning Experience (SSLE), formerly known as the Student Evaluation of Instruction, is required in every course offered in this department. Faculty members should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if students will be asked to complete the evaluation using a mobile application. The faculty member must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation. The faculty member should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and to provide feedback that can be taken into account in future teaching.

9.2 PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The department chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process.

Annually the department chair appoints a Peer Review of Teaching Committee of a size judged sufficient to meet the volume of peer review activity expected that year, without overburdening any of the members. The term of service is one year, with reappointment possible. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the tenured faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the department. Although there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible.

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

- to review the teaching of probationary tenure-track, professional practice, and all associated faculty with multiple year appointments at least once per year with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.
- to review the teaching of tenured associate professors and non-probationary professional practice assistant professors, and non-probationary professional practice associate professors at least once every other year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a six-year period and of having at least four peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion review.
- to review the teaching of tenured professors and non-probationary professional practice professors at least once every other year 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 [Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#).

Reviews conducted upon the request of the department chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the department chair or faculty member and may or may not include class visitations.

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 promotion and tenure chair 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 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 desired. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

Appendix B provides the department's peer review of teaching evaluation form.

APPENDIX A: TEACHING: SUMMARY OF STUDENT COMMENTS

Candidate: Name
Summary prepared by: Preparer
Role/Title of Preparer(s): Self / Evaluator

Summary overview of comments for all courses:

Overall Assessment: Candidate is consistently rated as an excellent instructor by his students. His teaching is marked by strong engagement, clarity, preparedness, and a genuine passion for aviation. Students appreciate his visual teaching style, particularly his aircraft drawings, and his ability to connect real-world aviation experience to course content.

Prevailing Positives:

Visual aids and drawings are repeatedly praised for enhancing understanding.
Real-world aviation experience adds depth to instruction.
Approachability and supportiveness in helping students grasp complex topics.
Humor and storytelling make the class engaging and relatable.

Prevailing Negatives:

Presentation-heavy format in AVIATN XXXX was noted as monotonous by some students.
Suggestions for more varied instructional methods (videos, group discussions, guest speakers).
Minor course structural issues in AVIATN XXXX due to its newness.

Course Name: AVIATN XXXX: Course Name
Semester: Autumn/Spring 20XX
Responses/Enrollment (25/40)

Overall Assessment: Positive with high marks for interest in teaching and knowledge of topics.

Prevailing Positives:

Homework and exams lauded for being conceptually rich and case-based.
Students appreciated visual learning aids, especially drawings.
Recognized as an expert in aviation, with effective use of personal experience.
Students felt motivated and intellectually stimulated.

Prevailing Negatives:

Some course continuity issues, attributed to covering such a wide array of topics.
Desire for deeper dives into topics and expanded content.

Course Name: AVIATN XXXX: Course Name
Semester: Autumn/Spring 20XX
Responses/Enrollment (25/40)

Overall Rating: Overwhelmingly positive with constructive comments for improvement

Prevailing Positives:

Exceptional clarity

Strong rapport with students; described as funny, enthusiastic, and a great mentor.

Effective use of aviation stories and drawings to explain concepts.

Students felt comfortable and supported, regardless of prior aviation knowledge.

Prevailing Negatives:

Student presentations were seen as repetitive and boring.

Suggestions included more videos or multimedia, group discussions to replace some presentations, incorporating guest speakers, and slide design improvements for student presentations (e.g., image-only slides to encourage more student engagement)

APPENDIX B: PEER-REVIEW OF TEACHING FORM

Instructor:

Evaluator:

Date & Time of Observation:

Course Number & Title:

Course total enrollment:

Attendance observed in the class:

Type of instruction observed (lecture, activity, lab, etc.):

Peer Review Purpose:

- Constructive peer review of teaching provides faculty with collegial, formative feedback.
- The peer-review process enhances instructional practices and supports professional growth by encouraging reflection, sharing effective strategies, and fostering a culture of continuous improvement.
- Students make significant financial investment in their education, and we owe them the highest quality instruction possible.
- All faculty will participate in this process as both a reviewer and reviewee.

Instructions:

- The instructor shall provide a copy of their syllabus to the evaluator in advance of class.
- The evaluator will select a date to attend class that is convenient for their schedule.
- Evaluators shall review the instructor using all criteria below. The expectation is 1-2 sentences per question at a minimum.
- Evaluator comments shall always be constructive.
- The evaluator will email this form to the Chair once completed.
- Evaluators will schedule an in-person debrief with the instructor within two weeks of the class observation.

Course Content

1. What are the learning objectives for the course?
2. How is the course structured?
3. What are some of the key assignments and assessment mechanisms for the course?
4. What skills or knowledge are these assignments and assessment mechanisms designed to assess?

Course Content Section Evaluation (place an X in the corresponding box)

Needs Improvement	Effective	Highly Effective

Lesson Knowledge

1. What was the topic of the day?
2. Did the topic match the syllabus?
3. Did the instructor present confidence with the material they taught?
4. When considering the level of the course, was the observed content of an appropriate depth and breadth?
5. Was the instructor able to answer questions?
6. Did you observe the limit of the instructor's knowledge on a topic? If so, were they comfortable showing those limits to the class?
7. Were examples used to facilitate student understanding?

Lesson Knowledge Section Evaluation

Needs Improvement	Effective	Highly Effective

Presentation

1. What presentation materials were used and was technology effectively used to communicate ideas and concepts?
2. Would a person sitting at the back of the room be able to clearly read any on-screen materials and/or hear the instructor?
3. Did the instructor foster an environment that promoted questioning, dialogue, reflection, and/or critical thinking?

Presentation Section Evaluation

Needs Improvement	Effective	Highly Effective

Professionalism & Classroom management

1. Was the class time managed effectively?
2. Did the instructor show respect to the students and create an atmosphere conducive to learning?
3. Did the students demonstrate an appropriate level of respect toward the instructor?

Professionalism & Classroom Management Section Evaluation

Needs Improvement	Effective	Highly Effective

Summary

1. What would you consider are strengths of the instructor based on the observation?
2. What recommendations do you have that could help the instructor improve?
3. What was your overall impression of the instructors teaching?

Overall Evaluation

Needs Improvement	Effective	Highly Effective