

**Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure
Criteria and Procedures for
The Ohio State University
Department of Biomedical Engineering**

Approved by the Faculty: 11/21/25

Revision Approved by the Office of Academic
Affairs: 12/1/2025

Table of Contents

I. Preamble.....	4
II. Department Mission, Vision, and Values.....	4
III. Definitions	5
A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty	5
1. Tenure-track Faculty	5
2. Professional Practice Faculty.....	5
3. Research Faculty.....	5
4. Associated Faculty	6
B. Conflict of Interest.....	6
C. Minimum Composition	7
D. Appointments, Promotion and Tenure (AP&T) Committee.....	7
E. Quorum	7
F. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty.....	7
1. Appointment.....	7
2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure and Promotion.....	8
IV.Appointments	8
A. Criteria	8
1. Tenure-track Faculty.....	8
2. Professional Practice Faculty.....	9
3. Research Faculty.....	10
4. Associated Faculty.....	11
5. Regional Campus Faculty	12
6. Emeritus Faculty	12
7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty.....	12
B. Procedures.....	13
1. Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus	13
2. Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	14
3. Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus	14
4. Transfer from the Tenure-track.....	14
5. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	14
6. Regional Campus Faculty	15
7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty.....	15
V. Annual Performance and Merit Review	15
A. Process	16
B. Evaluation Criteria for Tenure-Track Faculty	18
C. Evaluation Criteria for New (within 3 years of appointment) Un-Tenured Faculty.....	19
D. Evaluation Criteria for Professional Practice Faculty	20
E. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty	21
1. Fourth-Year Review	21

2.	Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period.....	22
F.	Probationary Professional Practice Faculty.....	22
G.	Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	22
H.	Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	23
G.	Regional Campus Faculty.....	24
I.	Lectures.....	24
G.	Salary Recommendations.....	24
VI.	Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	25
A.	Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion	25
1.	<i>Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure</i>	26
a.	Teaching.....	26
b.	Scholarship	27
c.	Service.....	28
2.	<i>Promotion to Professor</i>	29
a.	Teaching.....	29
b.	Scholarship	30
c.	Service.....	31
3.	<i>Professional Practice Faculty</i>	31
4.	<i>Research Faculty</i>	32
5.	<i>Associated Faculty</i>	33
6.	<i>Regional Campus Faculty</i>	33
B.	Procedures.....	33
1.	Tenure-Track, Professional Practice, and Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus 33	
b.	Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities	36
c.	Eligible Faculty Responsibilities	37
d.	Department Chair Responsibilities	38
2.	Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	39
3.	Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty	39
4.	External Evaluations	39
VII.	Appeals.....	40
VIII.	Seventh-Year Reviews	41
IX.	Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching	41
A.	Student Evaluation of Teaching.....	41
B.	Peer Evaluation of Teaching	41
	Appendix A: Special Considerations for Reappointment for Professional Practice and Research Faculty	43
	Appendix B: BME Peer Teaching Evaluation Forms:	44

Appendix C: Timeline Guide:.....	45
Appendix D: Biomedical Engineering Course Roundup Template	47

I. 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 Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures 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 or within one year of the appointment or reappointment of the Department Chair.

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

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

II. Department Mission, Vision, and Values

Mission:

*Our mission is to promote learning and discovery
that integrate engineering and life sciences
for the advancement of human health.*

Vision:

The department of Biomedical Engineering at The Ohio State University will be nationally ranked and internationally recognized for:

- The distinctive educational opportunities for its students and the outstanding achievements of its alumni,
- Faculty and staff excellence and opportunities for continuing professional development,
- Collaborative research with global impact on improving human health, and
- Service to the field of biomedical engineering and the community.

BME Values:

In addition to the University and College of Engineering statements about shared values, we amplify and add emphasis with the following list of shared values in Biomedical Engineering:

- Collaboration, collegiality, and respect
- Discoveries and Innovations that improve human health
- Integrity and ethical behavior
- Lifelong learning

III. Definitions

A. 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.

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 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.

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.

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, 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, and all non-probationary professional practice associate professors and 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 nonprobationary professional practice professors.

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, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty, all professional practice 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 nonprobationary 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 nonprobationary research professors.

4. Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

Initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of associated faculty members follows a job posting in Workday (see Section IV.B), a formal search, and candidate interviews. The reappointment of associated faculty members is decided by the Department Chair in consultation with the Executive Committee.

Initial appointments at senior rank, which likewise follow a job posting in Workday, a formal search, and candidate interviews, 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.

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 III.A.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 III.A.1.

The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the Department Chair in consultation with the Executive Committee.

B. Conflict of Interest

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

C. Minimum Composition

The minimum composition of the committee is three eligible faculty members. If there are not three eligible faculty members with their TIU in Biomedical Engineering available, and in keeping with past policy, up to three eligible faculty members holding courtesy or joint appointments in the department will be appointed to undertake the reviews, as needed to reach the minimum composition of the committee. If none are available, the department chair will consult with the Dean to appoint one or more professors from other TIUs to serve on the BME committee to ensure the minimum composition of three professors for a review.

D. Appointments, Promotion and Tenure (AP&T) Committee

The BME department has an Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee (AP&T) that assists the eligible faculty in managing personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The committee must consist of at least 3 eligible faculty members and may include nonprobationary professional practice/research faculty. When considering promotion and tenure cases involving tenure track faculty, the AP&T committee will not include professional practice or research faculty. When considering cases involving professional practice faculty, the AP&T will not include research faculty. When considering cases involving research faculty, the AP&T will not include professional practice faculty.

The committee's chair and membership are appointed by the BME Department Chair and may be revised on a yearly basis.

E. 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.

F. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

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

1. Appointment

- A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive. Note this applies to candidates being considered for partial appointments in more than one department (i.e. partial FTEs) where the BME department is the primary TIU.
- In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment TIU prior to his/her/their appointment.

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. Note this applies to candidates who have a partial appointment in more than one department (i.e. partial FTEs) where the BME department is the primary TIU.
- In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment TIU prior to his/her/their reappointment, promotion and/or tenure.

IV. Appointments

A. Criteria

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

1. *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. If an instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment. (Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#)).

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 exclude time from the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor. There must be clear and convincing evidence that the offeree of an appointment as a tenure track assistant professor has, at a minimum an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study; a potential for excellence in teaching, as demonstrated by a record of quality teaching and/or excellence in verbal and written communication; a potential for excellence in scholarship as demonstrated by having produced a body of research, scholarly and creative work appropriate to the discipline of Biomedical Engineering; a potential to perform effective service, including a commitment to good citizenship and collegiality within the Department of Biomedical Engineering; strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the faculty ranks.

Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible

when the BME Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee (or the P&T committee of the primary TIU in the case of jointly appointed faculty) 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 exclude time from the probationary period.

Associate Professor. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor with or without tenure require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

There must be clear and convincing evidence that the offeree of an appointment as an associate professor with tenure has, at a minimum exceeded the College and Department of Biomedical Engineering (or the TIU of the primary appointment in the case of jointly appointed faculty) criteria for appointment as a tenure track assistant professor and met or exceeded the College and Department of Biomedical Engineering criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure. An offeree who has not held a faculty position will be determined to have met the criteria by evaluating their record over a similar period with consideration given to the fact that they may have exceptional strengths in certain areas (e.g. research innovation) with nontraditional experience in others (e.g. teaching/mentoring in nonacademic setting). Appointment at the rank of associate professor normally entails tenure, however a probationary appointment at senior rank may be appropriate under certain 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.

Professor. Appointment offers at the rank of professor with tenure require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Appointments at the rank of professor without tenure should not occur. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

There must be clear and convincing evidence that the offeree of an appointment as a professor with tenure has, at a minimum exceeded the College and Department of Biomedical Engineering (or the TIU of the primary appointment in the case of jointly appointed faculty) criteria for appointment as an associate professor with tenure and met or exceeded the College and Department of Biomedical Engineering (or the TIU of the primary appointment in the case of jointly appointed faculty) criteria for promotion to professor. An offeree who has not held a faculty position will be determined to have met the criteria by evaluating their record over their professional career with consideration given to the fact that they may have exceptional strengths in certain areas (e.g. research innovation) with nontraditional experience in others (e.g. teaching/mentoring in nonacademic setting).

2. Professional Practice Faculty

Professional Practice faculty in the Department of Biomedical Engineering will be referred to as “Professional Practice Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor.” Distinctions among ranks are based on the level of distinction attained by the candidate.

The initial contract is probationary and must be for a period of five years, 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.

These appointments have some expectations for scholarly promise and/or accomplishments, but with a greater emphasis on excellence in teaching and lesser emphasis on research publication and external research funding. Research per se is not acceptable as an evaluation criterion for hiring. Although an earned Ph.D. is normally required, exceptions can be made for extremely well qualified candidates. An M.S. degree is required, and significant industrial or governmental professional experience can be counted in place of a Ph.D.

Criteria and policies governing appointment of professional practice faculty must be consistent with Faculty Rule [3335-7](#). Reappointment is based on the candidate's performance and on the continued needs of the department.

Professional Practice Assistant Professor. There must be clear and convincing evidence that the offeree of an appointment as professional practice assistant professor has, at a minimum, experience and expertise in the area of Biomedical Engineering, the ability to effectively share and transfer knowledge to students and has an understanding of modern engineering teaching practices. Normally, the offeree will have an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field. Professional publications and actual teaching experience are helpful but not required.

Professional Practice Associate Professor in Biomedical Engineering. There must be clear and convincing evidence that the offeree of an appointment as a professional practice associate professor has, at a minimum, exceeded the College and Department of Biomedical Engineering criteria for appointment as a professional practice assistant professor and has met or exceeded the College and Department of Biomedical Engineering criteria for promotion to professional practice associate professor. An offeree will be determined to have met the same criteria defined for promotion to Professional Practice Associate Professor.

Professional Practice Professor. There must be clear and convincing evidence that the offeree of an appointment as a professional practice professor has, at a minimum exceeded the College and Department of Biomedical Engineering criteria for appointment as a professional practice associate professor and has met or exceeded the College and Department of Biomedical Engineering criteria for promotion to professional practice professor. An offeree will be determined to have met the same criteria defined for promotion to Professional Practice Professor.

3. *Research Faculty*

Research faculty in the College of Engineering will be referred to as "Research Assistant, Associate, or Professor". Distinctions among ranks are based on the level of distinction attained by the candidate.

Criteria and policies associated with research faculty appointments must be consistent with Faculty Rule [3335-7](#).

Appointment of research faculty entails one- to five-year contracts. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to research faculty. There is also no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the department wishes to consider reappointment, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see Faculty Rule [3335-7](#).

Research Assistant Professor. There must be clear and convincing evidence that the offeree of an appointment as research assistant professor has, at a minimum, an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study, and a record of high-quality publications that strongly indicate the ability to sustain an independent, externally funded research program.

Research Associate Professor. There must be clear and convincing evidence that the offeree of an

appointment as a research associate professor has, at a minimum exceeded the College and Department of Biomedical Engineering criteria for appointment as a research assistant professor and met or exceeded the College and TIU criteria for promotion to research associate professor. An offeree will be determined to have met the same criteria defined for promotion to Research Associate Professor.

Research Professor. There must be clear and convincing evidence that the offeree of an appointment as a research professor has, at a minimum exceeded the College and Department of Biomedical Engineering criteria for appointment as a research associate professor and met or exceeded the College and Department of Biomedical Engineering criteria for promotion to research professor. An offeree will be determined to have met the same criteria defined for promotion to Research Professor.

4. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty are persons with adjunct titles, visiting titles, and lecturer titles. Professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors who serve on appointments totaling less than fifty per cent service to the university are also associated faculty members. Persons with tenure track, professional practice, or research faculty titles may not hold associated titles. Persons holding associated titles are not eligible for tenure and may not participate in the promotion and tenure reviews of tenure track, professional practice, or research faculty. Persons with associated titles are permitted to participate in college governance and Department of Biomedical Engineering governance where approved by a vote of at least a majority of all of its tenure track faculty. Associated faculty appointments may be made for a maximum of three consecutive years and may be renewed (Faculty Rule [3335-5-19](#)).

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as two 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 may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are appropriate only for individuals who provide substantial service to the academic or research mission of the appointing unit. The Biomedical Engineering department, along with the College, will establish guidelines for the circumstances in which such adjunct faculty may identify themselves as Ohio State faculty. Typically 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.

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. 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 should not exceed one year.

Subsequent appointments may be of longer duration.

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 should not exceed one year. Subsequent appointments may be of longer duration.

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.

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

5. Regional Campus Faculty

As the mission of the regional campuses emphasizes undergraduate instruction, regional campus criteria for appointment at the tenure-track ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor are similar to those for Columbus campus faculty but give relatively greater emphasis at each rank to teaching experience and quality. Nonetheless, candidates must be involved in recognized scholarly activity appropriate to the discipline in which appointment is being considered.

Regional campus criteria for the appointment of professional practice faculty, research faculty, and associated faculty are the same as those for Columbus campus faculty in each of these categories.

6. 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 (regional campus dean for associated faculty on regional campuses) 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 [3335-05-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered.

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

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

7. Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Occasionally the active academic involvement in this department by a tenure-track, professional practice

or research faculty member from another department at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in this department. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course from time to time, or a combination of these. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

B. 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](#). All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university's system of record for faculty and staff. Formal interviews are 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.

See the [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#) and the [Policy on Faculty Appointments](#) for information on the following topics:

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

1. Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

A national search is required to ensure a robust pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the College and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and must follow the [SHIFT Framework for faculty recruitment](#).

If the offer involves tenure or a senior/non-Assistant Professor rank, the eligible faculty at a higher or equivalent rank under consideration also vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. 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. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair.

A draft letter of offer to a tenure track faculty candidate, accompanied by the candidate's curriculum vitae and appropriate letters attesting to the candidate's qualifications, must be submitted to engineering administration for review and approval by the Dean. Engineering administration will review the draft letter of offer for consistency with the essential components required by the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) and by the College.

The required documentation for appointments at senior rank and junior appointments with prior service credit can be found in the [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

The department is advised to 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.

2. Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Creation of a professional practice faculty position requires the prior approval of the Dean. Approved positions must be posted in Workday. A national search is required to ensure a robust pool of highly qualified candidates unless an exception is approved by the Dean. The Department Chair will appoint a search committee and similar procedures for tenure track searches (see above) will be followed. A draft letter of offer to a professional practice faculty candidate, accompanied by the candidate's curriculum vitae and appropriate letters attesting to the candidate's qualifications, must be submitted to engineering administration for review and approval by the Dean. Engineering administration will review the draft letter of offer for consistency with the essential components required by the Office of Academic Affairs and by the College.

Appointments at the rank of professional practice associate professor or professional practice professor require approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. For such appointments, the Dean may consult with the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

3. Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Creation of a research faculty position requires prior approval of the Dean. Approved positions must be posted in Workday. A national search is required to ensure a robust pool of highly qualified candidates unless an exception is approved by the Dean. Searches generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that during the on-campus or virtual interview the candidate is not asked to teach a class. A draft letter of offer to a research faculty candidate, accompanied by the candidate's curriculum vitae and appropriate letters attesting to the candidate's qualifications, must be submitted to engineering administration for review and approval by the Dean. Engineering administration will review the draft letter of offer for consistency with the essential components required by the Office of Academic Affairs and by the College.

Appointments at the rank of research associate professor or research professor require approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. For such appointments, the Dean may consult with the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

4. Transfer from the Tenure-track

Tenure-track faculty may transfer to a professional practice or research appointment if appropriate circumstances exist. Tenure is lost upon transfer, and transfers must be approved by the Department Chair, the college Dean, and the executive vice president and provost. All such transfers are subject to the conditions specified in Faculty Rule [3335-7-09](#) and to the Department of Biomedical Engineering and College limits on the number of professional practice and research faculty.

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

5. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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), a formal search,

and candidate interviews. The appointment is then decided by the department chair in consultation with the Executive Committee. The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty are decided by the Department Chair in consultation with the department Executive Committee.

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 department Executive Committee.

Compensated associated appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances. Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three consecutive years.

Lecturer and senior lecturer appointments are usually made on a semester by semester or annual basis. 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.

6. *Regional Campus Faculty*

The regional campus has primary responsibility for determining the position description for a tenure-track faculty search, but the Dean/Director or designee consults with the Department Chair (or Chairs in the case of proposed jointly appointed faculty) to reach agreement on the description before the search begins. The regional campus search committee must include at least one representative from the department.

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus Dean, Department Chair, and regional campus search committee. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. A decision to make an offer requires agreement by the Department Chair and regional campus Dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the Department Chair(s) of all proposed TIU appointments and the regional campus Dean.

Searches for regional campus professional practice faculty and research faculty are the same as those described above for tenure-track faculty.

Associated faculty are appointed by the regional campus associate dean, in consultation with the dean/director, department chair, program coordinators, and other relevant faculty members.

7. *Courtesy Appointments for Faculty*

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a tenure-track, practice, or research faculty member from another Ohio State department. 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.

V. Annual Performance and Merit Review

The Department of Biomedical Engineering follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the [Policy on Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment](#), which stipulates that such reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting as well as a written assessment. The purpose of conducting annual reviews is to provide each compensated faculty member with feedback on their job performance, to set goals that will support the professional growth and development of each faculty member, and where necessary, to identify strategies for improving performance. It is the role of each unit's leader to conduct annual reviews in a manner that is supportive, productive, and honest. Conducting annual reviews for faculty members who meet or exceed expectations serves as an opportunity to recognize and challenge faculty to reach further and reflects a shared understanding of the faculty member's future professional goals. Providing annual reviews to faculty members who are not meeting expectations should work to achieve the same outcome as those meeting and exceeding expectations reflecting a shared understanding of the steps necessary to achieve professional goals and meet expectations in the future. The annual review for these faculty also provides another opportunity to identify potential resources that could be provided and barriers to be addressed. Such steps should be described in the annual review letter. Alongside promotion, tenure, and reappointment reviews, the annual review is one of the most powerful tools available to academic leaders for supporting faculty development and for setting the expectations to which the unit holds itself.

A. Process

Faculty member submits materials

- Each compensated faculty member (tenure track, clinical/teaching/practice, research, and associated) must complete and submit the Annual Professional Activities Summary document (see Appendix E) no later than the last day of February. For Biomedical Engineering, the annual review time frame is the calendar year (January to December). However, the professional activities summary includes multiple years of activities to calculate 3-year rolling averages. This documentation must include information on any area of work in which the faculty member had at least 5% effort allocated.
- All Assistant and Associate Professors must also submit an Office of Academic Affairs formatted dossier
- All faculty should also submit an updated CV.
- Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the annual performance and merit review, as such solicitation places its recipient in an awkward position and produces a result that is unlikely to be candid.
- Faculty with budgeted joint appointments must also include input from the joint appointment TIU head for every annual evaluation cycle. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on goals specific to the individual in the joint unit. Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.

TIU head or designee conducts review

The annual review of a faculty member is the responsibility of the department chair of the primary TIU. The TIU head may delegate responsibility for annual reviews to the associate chair of BME but in this case the TIU head is accountable for the process and should maintain regular oversight of the reviews. ALL written annual reviews must use the OAA Annual Review Template. In addition to a written assessment, annual reviews for all probationary faculty (tenure-track, clinical/teaching/practice, research, and associated) must include a face-to-face meeting with the TIU head or designee. The TIU head or associate chair (if the TIU head has delegate responsibilities of annual review) are to offer all other compensated faculty the opportunity for a face-to-face meeting. All face-to-face meetings should occur prior to the release of the final annual review and the commencement of the comments process. A preliminary annual review may be released to the faculty member prior to a meeting.

Criteria Evaluation: The written annual review must evaluate faculty according to standardized,

objective, and measurable performance metrics described in sections B, C, or D, depending on the appointment type. The written annual review must evaluate faculty in any area of work in which the faculty member had at least 5% effort allocated. Faculty will receive one of the following three evaluations “meeting expectations”, “not meeting expectations” and “exceeding expectations”. The expected standard for faculty performance is “meets expectations”.

Prioritization: When prioritizing annual reviews, it is important that faculty members approaching key decision points (e.g., fourth-year review, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review) receive their annual reviews promptly after submitting their review materials. Timely feedback ensures that they have sufficient opportunity to implement any recommended adjustments before their next review. Therefore, reviews will be staggered in the following order giving precedence to those listed first.

- Probationary faculty with a forthcoming mandatory review
- Assistant professors
- Any tenured faculty member who needs a post-tenure review
- Associate professors
- Professors, lecturers, senior lecturers

Given the time from the end of the review period to receipt of the annual review, it is critical to consider what changes a faculty member can make in the time remaining before the next review. For faculty approaching a decision point in their next review (e.g., fourth-year review, promotion with tenure review, promotion review, post-tenure review), receiving timely feedback after submitting their materials allows more opportunity to implement any recommended adjustments.

Joint Appointments: For faculty with a budgeted joint appointment, the TIU head or designee and the head of the joint appointment or designee are to co-author any sections of the annual review for which the faculty member has greater than 5% of their assigned appointment across units. It is the responsibility of the TIU head or designee to coordinate with the head of the joint appointment unit or designee.

Associated Faculty: As noted above, all compensated faculty are to receive an annual review. Associated faculty who work for the university in a part-time-limited capacity (e.g., teach one course in one semester; provide a time-limited service in a faculty role), and who are compensated by the university, **MUST ALSO** receive an annual review. If the work of the faculty member is limited to a single area (e.g., teaching), the TIU head or designee need only provide an evaluation and rating in that area.

Comment Process: A faculty member can provide comments to the TIU head or designee’s written annual review. The TIU head or designee may respond to comments and/or revise the written annual review before finalizing the review and forwarding it to the dean. Comments from the faculty member may include, but are not limited to, clarification of the record, corrections within the written annual review, and/or comments about agreement or disagreement with the TIU head’s or designee’s performance ratings. At a minimum, the TIU head or designee should acknowledge receipt of the comments, indicate any action to be taken based on the comments or that no action will be taken. At the conclusion of the comments cycle, the annual review and any comments will be forwarded to the dean

Dean Review

The dean must review and approve or disapprove of each rating for each area of work and any overall rating for ALL faculty annual reviews. If the dean approves all ratings, they are not required to provide additional feedback to the faculty member. If the dean disapproves of any rating, the dean may provide a rationale for the disagreement to be shared with the faculty member and the provost. Following the dean’s review, all annual reviews will be forwarded to the provost.

Provost Review

If the dean approves all ratings, the provost will only review. If the dean disapproves of any ratings, the provost will review and make a final decision on the disputed rating(s).

Appeal process

Under the Faculty Annual Review, Post-Tenure Review, and Reappointment policy, a faculty member

may appeal a rating decision in their annual review. Only rating decisions may be appealed. Should a faculty member wish to appeal a rating decision, they must demonstrate that the final evaluation contains a substantive factual error, inconsistently applies the established criteria of the TIU, or otherwise does not align with the criteria of the TIU. These criteria are outlined below under Criteria for Expectations. Assigned workload for the upcoming year is not appealable, as this falls under managerial discretion.

A faculty member who wishes to submit an appeal to the college dean must do so within 14 days of the conclusion of the comment cycle with the TIU head or designee (as described above). The appeal should include the rating decision(s) with which the faculty member disagrees, a rationale for the disagreement, as well as any additional information they would like to provide. The appeal is to be submitted to the college dean or their designee, who is to consider this information as they make their decision on each appealed rating. If the college dean or designee modifies any rating within the annual review, it will be automatically appealed to the provost for review and final determination. Should the faculty member wish to provide any information that has not already been shared in the process, they will have 14 days from the date of the dean or designee's decision to submit additional written materials to the provost. Any such additional written material must be in line with the categories for appeal noted above. If the dean or designee does not modify any rating, the annual review will be submitted to the provost for review only.

Per Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#), the department chair is required to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule [3335-5-04](#)) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

It is the expectation of the College that an annual review of a faculty member conducted by the Department of Biomedical Engineering will have been made consistent with other relevant policies, procedures, practices, and standards established by: (1) the College, (2) the Faculty Rules, (3) the Office of Academic Affairs, and (4) the Office of Human Resources.

B. Evaluation Criteria for Tenure-Track Faculty

Tenure-track faculty members are expected to contribute to the university's mission via teaching, scholarship, and service. When a faculty member's contributions decrease in one of these three areas, additional activity in one or both of the other areas is expected. The nominal workload distribution for tenure-track faculty is 45% teaching, 45% research/scholarship and 10% service and the standardized, objective, and measurable expectations for tenured or tenure-track faculty with this workload distribution is described below. Note, these expectations will shift accordingly for different workload distributions. In addition, all department leadership positions (except for the department chair) are categorized as service (department chair is the only administrative position).

- The annual teaching expectation is to meet two or more of the following criteria:
 1. For faculty providing 15% academic year salary support, teach 2 "regular" or "didactic" courses during the 9-month academic year, with a mix of undergraduate and graduate courses. This didactic teaching load expectation will vary based on higher or lower salary support from grants. Development of new courses will count towards the teaching load expectation.
 2. Evidence of effective teaching as demonstrated by an average instructor rating of ≥ 3.5 on one of the seven single-selection response questions in the Survey of Student Learning Experience (SSLE). Note the single-selection response questions uses a 5-point Likert scale: 5-strongly agree, 4-agree, 3-neutral, 2-disagree, 1-strongly disagree.
 3. Evidence of effective teaching as demonstrated by $>75\%$ positive student comments
 4. Evidence of effective teaching as demonstrated by positive peer review of instruction evaluations.
 5. Serving as the primary or co-primary advisor of either a PhD graduate student, MS graduate student or an undergraduate research student each year.
 6. On a rolling 3-year basis, have 1 publication/year with students as lead author and faculty as senior or corresponding author.
- The annual research/scholarship expectation is to meet two or more of the following criteria:

1. On a rolling 3-year basis, have 2 peer-reviewed publications/year (including peer-reviewed review articles and book chapters) in archival journals (non-conference). Note, non-peer reviewed journals like bioRxiv do not count as archival publications. However, awarded patents will count towards archival publications.
 2. On a rolling 3-year basis, have 1 peer-reviewed publications/year (including peer-reviewed review articles and book chapters) in archival journals (non-conference) as senior/lead/corresponding author. Note, awarded patents will count towards archival publications.
 3. On a rolling 3-year basis, have 1 conference abstract/year. Invention disclosures and provisional patents will count towards conference abstracts.
 4. A research program that supports 2 research personnel including graduate students, post-docs and/or research scientists.
 5. A research program that provides 15% of your annual salary (i.e. release time).
 6. Submission of 2 research grant proposals as PI or co-PI.
- The annual service expectation is to meet two or more of the following criteria:
 1. Attendance and participation at faculty meetings, seminars, and department functions including BME Grant Reviews
 2. Serving on 3 departmental committees. Serving as chair of departmental committees will count as serving on 2 committees. The department chair, associate chair and faculty with significant college/university level service will have a lower number of committees.
 3. Serving as a grant reviewer on a national or international grant review panel/study section
 4. Peer-reviewing 2-3 publications per year or being an editor/associate editor for an archival journal.
 5. Active service in professional societies as documented by committee membership or conference leadership
 6. Peer-reviewing teaching activities in the department when assigned

C. Evaluation Criteria for New (within 3 years of appointment) Un-Tenured Faculty

For new untenured faculty who are ramping to capacity in research and teaching, the expectations described in section B are modified for the 1st 3 years of the appointment and are provided below.

- Teaching Expectations during the 1st 3 years:
 1. Shadowing 1 course during the 1st year and teaching 1 course in each of their 2nd and 3rd years. The nominal load described above for established faculty will apply during the 4th and subsequent years.
 2. Evidence of effective teaching as demonstrated by one of the following
 - an average instructor rating of ≥ 3.5 on one of the seven single-selection response questions in the Survey of Student Learning Experience (SSLE). Note the single-selection response questions uses a 5-point Likert scale: 5-strongly agree, 4-agree, 3-neutral, 2-disagree, 1-strongly disagree.
 - >75% positive student comments
 - positive peer review of instruction evaluations
 3. After 1 complete year of employment, serving as the primary or co-primary advisor of either a PhD graduate student or an undergraduate research student each year.
 4. After 3 complete years of employment, have at least 1 publication with students as lead author and faculty as senior or corresponding author.
- Research/Scholarship Expectations during the 1st 3 years:
 1. After 2 complete years of employment, have 1 peer-reviewed publication (including peer-reviewed review articles) in archival journals (non-conference). Note, non-peer reviewed journals like bioRxiv do not count as archival publications. However, awarded patents will count towards archival publications. After 3 complete years of employment the expectation is to have at least 3 peer-reviewed publications/awarded patents.

2. After 1 complete year of employment, have 1 conference abstract and after 3 years of employment have an average of 2 conference abstracts/year. Invention disclosures and provisional patents will count towards conference abstracts/papers
 3. After 2 complete years of employment, have a research program that supports 2 research personnel including graduate students, post-docs and/or research scientists. This support may come from a combination of start-up funds and external/internal grants.
 4. After 2 complete years of employment, submitting an average of 2 research grant proposals as PI or co-PI per year is the expectation.
- Service Expectations during the 1st 3 years:
 1. Attendance and participation at faculty meetings, seminars, and department functions including BME Grant Reviews
 2. Serving on 1 departmental committee.
 3. One of the following
 - Serving as a grant reviewer on a national or international grant review panel/study section
 - Peer-reviewing 2 publications per year or being an editor/associate editor for an archival journal.
 - Active service in professional societies as documented by committee membership or conference leadership

D. Evaluation Criteria for Professional Practice Faculty

Professional practice faculty members are expected to contribute to the university's mission via teaching and service, and to a lesser extent scholarship. Service expectations are similar to those for tenure-track faculty. A summary of the expectations for professional practice faculty is provided below.

- The annual teaching expectation is to meet two or more of the following criteria:
 1. Teaching that is aligned with the university workload guideline (~6-7 courses/9 months academic year) as assigned by the BME Chair. Teaching activities in this workload include running lab sections, advising capstone teams, teaching standard didactic courses and developing new curriculum. The equivalent courses for these activities will be determined by the department chair.
 2. Evidence of effective teaching as demonstrated by an average instructor rating of ≥ 3.5 on one of the seven single-selection response questions in the Survey of Student Learning Experience (SSLE). Note the single-selection response questions uses a 5-point Likert scale: 5-strongly agree, 4-agree, 3-neutral, 2-disagree, 1-strongly disagree.
 3. Evidence of effective teaching as demonstrated by $>75\%$ positive student comments
 4. Evidence of effective teaching as demonstrated by positive peer review of instruction evaluations.
- The annual scholarship expectation is to meet one of the following criteria:
 1. 1 peer-reviewed publication in the engineering education or other archival literature. Awarded patents will count towards archival publications
 2. 1 conference presentation at education-related or other sessions at national scientific conferences. Invention disclosures and provisional patents will count towards conference abstracts/papers.
 3. Disseminating best practices to other faculty and staff within the department typically at faculty meetings and/or via online services.
- The annual service expectation is to meet one of the following criteria:
 1. Attendance and participation at faculty meetings, seminars, and department functions
 2. Serving on 3 departmental committees. Serving as chair of departmental committees will count as serving on 2 committees. The department chair, associate chair and faculty with significant college/university level service will have a lower number of committees.
 3. Peer-reviewing 2-3 publications per year or being an editor/associate editor for an archival journal.
 4. Active service in professional societies as documented by committee membership or conference leadership

5. Peer-reviewing teaching activities in the department when assigned

E. Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually and has a face-to-face meeting with the department chair or designee as described above. Based on this review, the Department Chair of the TIU holding the primary appointment may recommend renewal of the appointment and 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 as described above. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier for promotion and tenure (along with the faculty member's comments, if he or she chooses).

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.

1. Fourth-Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the 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.

Annually, the Dean will establish the latest date for the receipt by the College of dossiers from TIUs for candidates undergoing fourth year reviews. 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 department chair, in consultation with the department chairs or School Directors of the secondary appointment TIUs (if applicable), 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 or school review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)) is followed, and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the Department Chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

A review by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee is required unless the Department of Biomedical Engineering Department Chair and Dean agree to reappoint. The fourth-year review of a probationary faculty member shall not require the solicitation of external letters of evaluation except 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. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, the Department Chair or School Director of the secondary appointment TIU should be consulted as an additional source of evaluation in determining whether outside letters should be solicited.

The written evaluation from the Department of Biomedical Engineering Chair must clearly provide justification for the recommendation to the College. The Department of Biomedical Engineering Chair must clearly state in the review the expectations of specific achievements in teaching, research or creative work, scholarship and service that the faculty member needs to accomplish before being recommended for promotion to associate professor with tenure. For faculty with joint appointments within the college of engineering, this written evaluation should be prepared in consultation with Chairs or Directors of all TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed. If the secondary TIU is within the college of engineering, the letter must be signed by the Chairs or Directors of all TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed.

2. *Exclusion of Time from Probationary Period*

Faculty Rule [3335-6-03 \(D\)](#) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period. A faculty member remains on duty regardless of time excluded from the probationary period, and annual reviews are conducted in every probationary year regardless of time excluded. Approved exclusions do not limit the department's right to recommend nonrenewal of appointment during an annual review. Additional procedures and guidelines can be found in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

F. Probationary Professional Practice Faculty

For probationary professional practice faculty, a meeting with the Chair is required to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. The Department Chair must prepare a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the appointment. In the case of jointly appointed faculty within the college of engineering, this evaluation is to be prepared in consultation with Chairs or Directors of any secondary appointment TIUs, and is to be signed by all Directors and Chairs of TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed if within the College of Engineering.

If the Department Chair recommends renewal of a probationary professional practice faculty 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. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier (along with the faculty member's comments, if he or she chooses).

If the Department Chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)) 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.

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.

If the position will continue, procedures described in Appendix A will be followed. The Department of Biomedical Engineering may request additional evidence including from secondary appointment TIUs as applicable to characterize the performance of the faculty member during their contract period. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. There is no presumption of reappointment.

G. Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus

The annual review process for research faculty is identical to that for tenure track probationary faculty with evaluation criteria defined by appointment type (Assistant, Associate, Full Professor). The Department Chair's annual evaluation must include a recommendation on whether to renew the appointment. In the case of jointly appointed faculty within the college of engineering this evaluation is to be prepared in consultation with Chairs or Directors of any secondary appointment TIUs, and is to be signed by all Directors and Chairs of TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed if within the College of Engineering.

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. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier (along with the faculty member's comments, if he or she chooses).

If the Department Chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)) 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.

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 the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed.

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. For probationary faculty, a 4th year process will serve as the basis for evaluation while for non-probationary faculty, the normal annual review will serve as the basis for evaluation. The Department of Biomedical Engineering may request additional evidence including from secondary appointment TIUs as applicable to characterize the performance of the faculty member during their contract period. External letters of evaluation may be solicited, but are not required. There is no presumption of reappointment.

H. Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

The annual review process for associated faculty is identical to that for tenure track probationary faculty with evaluation criteria defined by appointment type (Assistant, Associate, Full Professor). The Department Chair's annual evaluation must include a recommendation on whether to renew the appointment. In the case of jointly appointed faculty within the college of engineering this evaluation is to be prepared in consultation with Chairs or Directors of any secondary appointment TIUs and is to be signed by all Directors and Chairs of TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed if within the College of Engineering.

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. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier (along with the faculty member's comments, if he or she chooses).

If the Department Chair recommends nonrenewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)) 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.

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 the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-08](#) must be observed.

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary in the penultimate contract year to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. For probationary faculty, a 4th year process will serve as the basis for evaluation while for non-probationary faculty, the normal annual review will serve as the basis for evaluation. The Department of Biomedical Engineering may request additional evidence including from secondary appointment TIUs as

applicable to characterize the performance of the faculty member during their contract period. External letters of evaluation may be solicited, but are not required. There is no presumption of reappointment.

G. Regional Campus Faculty

The annual performance and merit review of a probationary tenure-track or tenured faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then moves to the department and proceeds as described above for tenure-track and tenured faculty, respectively, on the Columbus campus. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the Department Chair discusses the matter with the regional campus Dean/Director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, these discussions are to include the TIU Chair or Directors or designees for all TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed.

The annual performance and merit review of regional campus professional practice faculty is conducted on the regional campus. The dean/director will provide the department chair a copy of a professional practice faculty member's annual performance and merit review letter.

The annual performance and merit review of regional campus research faculty is conducted by the department and proceeds as described above for Columbus campus research faculty. The department chair will provide the regional campus dean/director a copy of the faculty member's annual performance and merit review letter.

The annual performance and merit review of regional campus associated faculty is conducted entirely on the regional campus.

I. Lectures

The annual performance and merit review of part-time lectures is performed by the Department Chair with significant input from the Directors of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies. The review follows the process described above for Probationary Professional Practice faculty where only teaching criteria are evaluated. The Department Chair's annual evaluation will include a discussion of recommendations on if a similar part-time position will be available in the following academic year. However, a positive recommendation does not guarantee future employment as lectures are on a part-time, year-to-year basis and funding and other issues will determine how many lectures the department requires and can afford in any given year.

G. Salary Recommendations

Except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increase, all funds for annual salary increases are directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and assuring, to the extent possible given financial constraints, that salaries reflect the market and are internally equitable.

On occasion, one-time cash payments or other rewards are made to recognize non-continuing contributions that justify reward but do not justify permanent salary increases. Such payments/rewards are considered at the time of annual salary recommendations. Annual merit salary increases and off-cycle salary increases are subject to approval by the Dean.

The Department of Biomedical Engineering awards merit salary increases consistent with the results of the faculty member's annual review. Meritorious performance in teaching, research, creative work, scholarship, and service are assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions. Faculty with high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor and a pattern

of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation for an annual performance and merit review (see Section V.A above) 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.

Each year, the Dean will establish guidelines and notify the Department of Biomedical Engineering Department Chair of the schedule for awarding merit salary increases. Requests for off-cycle salary increases, accompanied by the rationale for the request, must be submitted by the appropriate Department Chair or School Director to the Dean and require Office of Academic Affairs approval.

The Department Chair recommends annual salary increases for faculty with primary TIU appointment in BME and other performance rewards to the Dean, who may modify these recommendations. The recommendations are based on the current annual performance and merit review as well as on the performance and merit reviews of the preceding 24 months. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the department chair divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory). Salary increases are made with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries that considers market, internal equity and performance issues as appropriate. The department chair should proactively engage in equity audits of faculty salary to ensure faculty salaries are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in the department.

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.

VI. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02\(D\)](#) 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.

The Biomedical Engineering department comprises a wide array of professional disciplines. In all instances, superior intellectual attainment and impact, in accordance with the criteria set forth below, is an essential qualification for. Insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for the maintenance and enhancement of the Biomedical Engineering department and the University as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge (Faculty Rule [3335-6-02\(D\)](#)).

1. 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. Accepting weakness in any aspect of performance in making a tenure decision is tantamount to deliberately handicapping the department's ability to perform and to progress academically. Above all, candidates are held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. 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.

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

The accomplishments listed below in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service are expected of faculty for promotion to associate professor with tenure. In the evaluation of untenured associate professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

a. Teaching

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have provided evidence of *all* of the following criteria:

- Provided up to date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge.
- Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm.
- Demonstrated appropriate use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment.
- Engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge creation process.
- Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process.
- Treated students with respect and courtesy.
- Improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs.

- Served as advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the department's graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise.
- Assisted graduate students in the production of high-quality published work.
- Engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching.

In general, each faculty member in Biomedical Engineering is expected to teach courses at either the undergraduate and/or graduate levels in consistence with their individual expertise and the needs of the departmental programs. 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. Therefore, the candidate's teaching record should exhibit variety subject to these constraints.

The assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in the key areas listed above comes from a variety of sources including student responses to the eSEI, the summary of student comments, peer assessment visits/reviews, materials provided during the BME end-of-term "Course Roundups," and from assessment during the annual reviews (including self-assessment and Chair assessment). (The format for peer assessments in Biomedical Engineering is included in Appendix B.) An analysis of the eSEI responses will be done in comparison to the statistics of other faculty in the College of Engineering. Conclusions about teaching effectiveness will be based on all sources listed above.

In addition to the assessment of teaching, the candidate is expected to show evidence of development as an effective mentor of graduate and undergraduate students in research. It is expected that there will be a transient period when the candidate establishes the necessary facilities to support his/her scholarship, establishes his/her identity among graduate students, and attracts student researchers. It is expected that the candidate would have guided several M.S. students to the completion of their theses, and that he/she would have either graduated Ph.D. students or have several Ph.D. students in later stages of their programs of study. It is also expected that the candidate would be serving, or have served in, a number of thesis/examination committees for graduate students advised by other faculty members, especially in the area of the candidate's research interest, and to have served several times as a Graduate Faculty Representative.

b. Scholarship

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have provided evidence of *all* of the following criteria:

- Produced coherent body of scholarship that has made a distinct contribution to the discipline, is gaining national or international recognition, and promises continued growth. Scholarship must always find a public venue. Collaborative work and research funding are also encouraged. The following attributes of the body of work are considered:
 - Quality, impact, quantity
 - Unique contribution to a line of inquiry
 - Rigor of the peer-review process and degree of dissemination
 - Collaborative work is strongly encouraged, and indeed is essential to most types of inquiry. In this case, the candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described to permit accurate assessment. In the assessment of collaborative work that has led to research productivity, there shall be no evaluative bias against the number of collaborators or co-authors of publications, proposals, projects or other tangible products of the work. Because of the synergism that often results from collaborative work and because of the unique capabilities that individual contributors bring to a team, an assessment of contribution based solely on a linear fractionation of contribution among collaborators can be

misleading and inappropriate, and a more holistic assessment that focuses on the candidate's contribution to the success and impact of the work must be made.

- A demonstrated ability to obtain and potential to sustain an externally funded research program. This typically requires obtaining multi-year, peer-reviewed federal funding that directly supports the candidate's research program.
- Research funding is a means to an end; funding that has not led to research productivity is a negative indicator. There shall be no evaluative bias against any particular source of research funding *if it has led to research productivity*.
- A developing national/international reputation in the candidate's field as evidenced by external evaluations, invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals, success securing peer-reviewed grants, and a beginning trend of positive citations in other researchers' publications. A reputation based on the quality of the research contribution is distinguished from one based mainly on familiarity through the faculty member's frequent attendance at national and international conferences.
- Demonstrated a vision for how their individual area of scholarly excellence contributes to advancing the research strategy of the Department of Biomedical Engineering, the college and the university.
- Demonstrated a high degree of ethics in scholarship including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators and in the dissemination of scholarship.

The quality and quantity of scientific publications in refereed archival journals will be considered in the evaluation. For a variety of reasons, it is difficult to define a specific number of expected archival publications that would be deemed satisfactory. It is both expected and appropriate that the candidate will include publications co-authored with the doctoral advisor. However, some of the archival publications should be authored by the candidate with his/her own research team members, including graduate students. Consistent with annual reviews in Biomedical Engineering, citation profiles (such as that obtained from Google Scholar) may be used to assess impact, but care must be taken to account for field specific norms and the trajectory of citations should carry more weight than the absolute number of citations.

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

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

c. Service

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- Contributed to the governance and advancement of the department/school in a collegial manner that facilitates positive contributions by others

- Made useful contributions to the College, the University, industry, and/or civic community.
- Made useful contributions to the profession.

2. 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.

For promotion to Professor, a faculty member is expected to be a role model for senior faculty, for students, and for the profession. Assessment takes place in relation to specific assigned responsibilities, with exceptional performance in these responsibilities required.

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.

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.

a. Teaching

The general aspects of teaching effectiveness, as well as measures for evaluation, are described previously. For promotion to Professor, the candidate should demonstrate excellence in teaching, as documented by student and peer evaluations. The candidate is expected to have a record commensurate with the duration of his/her employment, with emphasis on the preceding five years or time since last promotion, whichever is shorter. The candidate is expected to have:

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

- development and/or modifications of courses and labs.
- A record of meaningful and consistent involvement in graduate exams, theses, and dissertations, in a capacity other than that of advisor.

The assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in the key areas listed above comes from a variety of sources including student responses to the eSEI, the summary of student comments, peer assessment visits/reviews, materials provided during the BME end-of-term "Course Roundups," and from assessment during the annual reviews (including self-assessment and Chair assessment). (The format for peer assessments in Biomedical Engineering is included in Appendix B.) An analysis of the SEI responses will be done in comparison to the statistics of other faculty in the College of Engineering. Conclusions about teaching effectiveness are based on this comparison as well as the peer assessment and annual reviews.

b. Scholarship

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

- A record of acknowledged excellence in the conduct of scholarly research. The excellence of the candidate's research efforts and scholastic accomplishments must be recognized nationally and internationally by acknowledged scholars in his/her area. Such a record is usually accompanied by a coherent research program, which has produced important results relating to one or a few central research issues of acknowledged significance in the academic community. Furthermore, consistency of the research effort is important as well, where the candidate has maintained an active research program and has an active research program at the time of consideration for promotion. Importantly, the scholarship criteria may include generation of significant intellectual property, filing patents and/or associated commercialization activities.
- A record of consistency and excellence in contributions to the technical literature, especially during the preceding five years. The candidate shall have produced a significant body of publications in refereed journals, particularly in high quality archival journals appropriate to the research area, refereed conference proceedings, book chapters and other forms. Other measures of the quality, which may be used, include invited talks and research seminars given by the candidate. It is difficult to place absolute numerical requirements on the publication record, given the wide variability in acceptance rates, prestige and visibility within journals and other publications. However, it is essential that the publication record be commensurate with a sustained record of research, and dissemination of research results, over the duration of the candidate's research career. The publication record in archival journals is of primary importance for promotion to Professor. Consistent with annual reviews in Biomedical Engineering, citation profiles (such as that obtained from Google Scholar) may be used to assess impact, but care must be taken to account for field specific norms and the trajectory of citations should carry more weight than the absolute number of citations.
- A record of excellence involving graduate students in research. This aspect of research/scholarship overlaps with the mentoring aspect of the candidate's teaching performance, which has been described previously in this document. In addition to the comments relating to graduation of Ph.D. and M.S. students as part of such mentoring, it is expected that the candidate will have co-authored several publications with his/her graduate students, and that he/she will have facilitated research presentations by graduate students at technical conferences. Awards and honors secured by graduate students, such as best paper/presentation awards and university/national fellowships based on research progress and results, reflect positively upon the candidate's involvement of graduate students in research, and will be so treated. Honors and fellowships awarded to Ph.D. students after graduation and/or placement at prestigious institutions will be similarly treated.

- A record of sustained external funding at a level that can support the research activities of the candidate. Each faculty member is expected to create and maintain an externally supported research program. The funding history of the candidate, including the seeking of the funding, should be consistent with this requirement, especially for the preceding five years. This typically requires obtaining multi-year, peer-reviewed funding that directly supports the candidate's research program.
- In addition to demonstrating a record of excellence in the different areas of research/scholarship, the candidate should provide evidence of ongoing research activity in the form of papers in review for publication, continuing grants/contracts, submitted proposals, and Ph.D./M.S. students at different stages in their programs of study.

c. Service

For promotion to Professor, the candidate faculty member is expected to have compiled a record of effective service, as described below:

- A record of effective service to professional societies, and organizations such as funding agencies, often in leadership roles. Such service may take the form of editorships of prestigious journals, conference proceedings, and symposium proceedings; organization and/or chairing of sessions at technical conferences or workshops; committee Chairmanships in societies and federal agency committees; service as reviewer of proposals for governmental funding agencies; and as reviewer of conference and journal papers.
- A record of effective service to the Department, college, and university, again involving leadership roles. Service in Departmental committees in leadership roles is expected of the candidate. Service to the Department may also take the form of faculty advising of student groups and organizations by the candidate. It is expected and natural that candidates for promotion at this level would have had significantly more opportunities for service to the college and university and would have availed themselves of such opportunities.
 - Included as part of the service to be expected in the department are efforts to foster and lead the dedication, cooperation, professionalism, ethical behavior, a supportive environment for students, effective mentoring practices, and a collegial attitude of the faculty.

Documentation of growth of these activities are generally documented in the annual reviews, including their assessment (self-assessment and Chair assessment) and should be seen as being at least satisfactory.

3. Professional Practice Faculty

All professional practice faculty must:

- be engaged in teaching, the development of the departmental and College academic program, and the mentoring of students
- contribute to the scholarly mission of the Department of Biomedical Engineering, the College of Engineering, and University
- contribute to service in the Department of Biomedical Engineering, and are strongly encouraged to contribute to service to the College and the University, and at the national level in Biomedical Engineering

The criteria for professional practice faculty members primarily emphasize teaching in areas of the curriculum closely linked to fundamental skills, multi-disciplinary training and/or professional practice. The teaching activities of professional practice faculty must be consistent with the rationale for having professional practice faculty in the department; these consist of courses that involve both the fundamentals of engineering principles and the practice of engineering. The scholarly emphasis of professional practice faculty may include activities dealing with the state of the practice of biomedical

engineering. The venues appropriate for dissemination of such scholarly contributions therefore may be very different from those expected of tenure track faculty, with a strong emphasis on the creation of literature and materials to facilitate learning. Scholarly and professional service activities of professional practice faculty would be expected to emphasize outreach and interaction with constituencies beyond the research community, such as with industry, the broader educational community, and the broad community of practitioners.

Promotion to Professional Practice Assistant Professor. For promotion to professional practice assistant professor, a faculty member must complete his/her doctoral degree and be performing satisfactorily in teaching, professional practice and service. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

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 associate professor of practice are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure. In addition, the candidate should have a record of scholarly activity that contributes to the mission of the department. Scholarship activity may include but is not limited to production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy, professional practice, and/or best practices for student support and success. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

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 may include but is not limited to pertinent pedagogy, professional practice, and/or best practices for student support and success. Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

4. Research Faculty

All research faculty must:

- be engaged in the mentoring of students, particularly graduate students.
- develop a record of scholarship.
- contribute to service and thereby demonstrate a commitment to citizenship and collegiality.

Classroom teaching is not required of research faculty (Faculty Rule [3335-7-32](#)). However, research faculty members are expected to be engaged in those teaching activities that develop the research capabilities of graduate students. The preponderance of the effort of research faculty is expected to be devoted to scholarship activities. Professional service activities are expected of research faculty, while administrative service activities would be expected to focus on tasks consistent with the candidate's scholarly expertise.

It is recognized that research faculty may emphasize research that applies and transitions technologies into practice as opposed to more fundamental investigations. The importance of maintaining full salary coverage is also recognized. The department takes these factors into account in evaluating research faculty candidates for promotion.

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 funding is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation.

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 funding is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding.

5. 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. Regional Campus Faculty

The primary function of the regional campuses is to provide high-quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities. With this consideration in mind, in evaluating regional campus faculty for promotion and tenure or promotion, the department will give greater emphasis to the quality of teaching and service relative to scholarship. Recognizing that the character and quantity of scholarship by regional campus faculty may differ from that of Columbus campus faculty, due to the weight of other responsibilities and lack of access to comparable resources, the department nevertheless expects regional campus faculty to establish a program of high-quality scholarly activity.

In evaluating regional campus professional practice faculty, research faculty, and associated faculty for promotion, the department will use the same criteria as described above for the promotion of faculty in each of these categories.

B. Procedures

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). The following sections, which state the responsibilities of each party to the review process, apply to all faculty members in the department.

1. Tenure-Track, Professional Practice, and Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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 departmental guidelines. Each of these elements is described in detail below.

a. Candidate Responsibilities

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

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

Dossier

Every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs [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 Appointments, 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 him/her/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 nonprobationary faculty it is the date of last promotion 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 if it believes such information would be relevant to the review. Any such material should be clearly indicated.

Examples of teaching documentation:

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

- other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.

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 (for tenured or nonprobationary faculty) 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.

Examples of scholarship documentation:

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

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

Examples of service documentation:

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

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 departmental review only, unless reviewers at the college and university levels specifically request it.

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 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

Candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the Department Chair and the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The Department Chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

b. Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

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

- 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 CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
 - A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) for one year. Faculty Rules [3335-7-08](#) and [3335-7-36](#) make the same provision for nonprobationary 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 in the Office of Academic Affairs [annual procedural guidelines](#).
 - **Late Spring:** Suggest names of external evaluators to the Department Chair and coordinate solicitation of review letters from external evaluators. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section VI.B.4). 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 to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
 - Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.
 - 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 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.
- Provide an objective assessment of candidates' progress based on information provided by all TIUs to which the candidate has been appointed, taking into consideration any MOU concerning a jointly hired candidate's expectations for performance.
 - Ensure that the AP&T Committee explains and addresses dissenting votes in their report on the candidate, as well as summarizing and addressing all eligible faculty comments.
 - Transmit the completed dossier to Engineering Administration.

c. Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

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

- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at

which the candidate's case will be discussed.

- To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.

d. Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the Department Chair are as follows:

- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- 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 department 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 Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee, the chair and the candidate. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To solicit an evaluation from a TIU head of any TIU in which the candidate has a joint appointment. This evaluation should be shared at the departmental level of the review and incorporated with the review by the department chair.
- 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 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
 - Of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the Department Chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the Department Chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline
- To receive the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the Department Chair of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.

The general guidelines, above, are supplemented in Appendix C which provides a timeline guide for

implementation of the process in Biomedical Engineering.

2. Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Adjunct faculty and associated faculty with tenure-track titles for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed in Section VI.B 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.

3. Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

Regional campus tenure-track faculty are first reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus Dean/Director. The regional campus review focuses on teaching and service. The regional campus Dean/Director forwards the written evaluation and recommendation of the regional campus review to the Department Chair, from which point the review follows the procedures described for the Columbus campus faculty. A request to promote requires agreement by the dean/director and the department chair.

Regional campus professional practice faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. Following the review, the dean/director consults with the department chair. A request to promote follows the same procedures as tenure-track faculty except that external letters are not needed unless scholarship is a component of the assigned role.

The review of regional campus research faculty takes place on the Columbus campus and follows the same procedures as those described above for Columbus campus research faculty. Following the review, the department chair will consult with the regional campus dean/director. A request to promote requires agreement by the regional campus dean/director and the department chair.

Associated faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. The decision of the regional campus dean/director is final.

4. External Evaluations

This department will seek external evaluations predominately from evaluators in the peer programs in Biomedical Engineering (or related) disciplines at: University of Illinois; University of Michigan; Pennsylvania State University; University of Minnesota; Case Western Reserve University; University of California; University of Virginia; University of Texas; Columbia University; and University of Washington, as well as in the aspirational programs in Biomedical Engineering (or related) disciplines from: Georgia Institute of Technology/Emory University; University of Pennsylvania; Johns Hopkins University; Washington University at St Louis; Stanford University; Duke University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Boston University; Harvard University; and Rice University. Justification will be provided in each case when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists.

External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are obtained for all promotion reviews in which scholarship must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews and all research reappointments and 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 will be made by the Department

Chair after consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee.

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who can give an “arms’ length” evaluation of the research record and is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will only solicit evaluations from professors 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 June 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 Appointments, 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 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.

VII. Appeals

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.

VIII. 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.

IX. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (eSEI) is required in every course offered in this department as are the BME department's course evaluation results. Faculty members should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if s/he is going to provide in-class time for students 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.

At the end of each semester, faculty are required to complete the template and attend the "Course Roundup" retreat (see Appendix D) that includes discussion of the syllabus, areas of concern, ideas for addressing areas of concern, and the outcome of interventions that have been implemented. Further, content appropriate for Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) assessment and accreditation are discussed, and attention to issues for the overall undergraduate and graduate curricula are discussed.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process.

Annually the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee 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 and professional practice faculty at least once per year during the first two years of service, and at least twice more during the remainder of the probationary period, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.
- To review the teaching of tenured associate professors and non-probationary professional practice associate professors with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a three-year period and of having at least two 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 two years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to

- which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review.
- To review, upon the Department Chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review.
 - 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 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 Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee chair, copied to the candidate. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if he/she wishes. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

Reviewers will have the option to submit peer-evaluations via an online Qualtrics survey or by submitting a completed version of the appropriate forms in Appendix B below. However, online submission is strongly encouraged to facilitate management of the large number of peer evaluations in each semester.

Appendix A: Special Considerations for Reappointment for Professional Practice and Research Faculty

Annual Reappointment for Probationary Professional Practice and Research Faculty. The initial appointment of all professional practice and research faculty is probationary, and as with all probationary faculty, the faculty member must be reappointed each year. Positive decisions by the Department Chair are final. The annual letter must state the outcome of the review, and be forwarded to the college of engineering by *May 15* annually, along with comments from the faculty member, if any.

A recommendation for non-renewal of an annual probationary professional practice or research appointment requires the approval of both the Department Chair and the college Dean as well as the submission of the [Nonrenewal of Probationary Appointment or Denial of Tenure Form](#). If the faculty member will not be renewed, he or she should be so informed, subject to the relevant standards of notice set forth in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-08](#).

Appointment Renewal for Probationary Professional Practice and Research Faculty. The faculty member must undergo a review no later than the beginning of the penultimate year of his or her contract or during the initial appointment for 1-year research faculty contracts so the unit may determine whether it is appropriate to renew that faculty member's appointment for a new term. The review will follow the same procedures as for an appointment renewal for tenure track faculty, i.e.: a fourth year review process on the same timeline as tenure track faculty undergoing a fourth year review. The college Dean has the final approval on the reappointment of a probationary professional practice or research faculty member. Positive decisions will be approved by OAA without a review, and this decision is communicated to OAA using only the [Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank/Tenure/Reappointment Form](#) with no attachments. The Board of Trustees (BOT) has final approval, after which the faculty member is no longer probationary. After a recommendation to renew has been approved, the reappointment should be completed no later than *October 1* in the final year of the contract.

If the faculty member will not be renewed he or she should be so informed, subject to the relevant standards of notice set forth in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-08](#).

Appointment Renewal for NonProbationary Professional Practice and Research Faculty. Professional practice and research faculty in their second or subsequent term must be informed as to whether the new appointment will be extended by the *end* of the penultimate year of the contract. An initial decision from the Department Chair to reappoint is final, and the annual review is the basis for this decision. An initial decision not to reappoint requires a review by the eligible faculty or a standing committee of the faculty, as determined by and as set forth by the College of Engineering. All reappointment decisions are at the discretion of the Dean. After a recommendation to renew has been approved, the reappointment should be completed no later than *October 1* in the final year of the contract.

Promotion Procedures for Professional Practice and Research Faculty. Professional practice and research faculty members are eligible for promotion under Rules of the University Faculty. However, they do not undergo mandatory reviews for promotion (just for reappointment). Their promotion review can occur concurrently with reappointment or on another timeline.

Procedures for promotion of professional practice and research faculty are substantially similar to those for promotion of candidates on the tenure track. Candidates are subject to full College and OAA review, and complete dossiers following OAA format and standards are required. This includes the requirement that their material be in dossier format. External letters of evaluation are to be collected and included in the dossier for professional practice and research promotion candidates in the department. The timeline for dossier submission, evaluation and decision notification is identical to that for tenure track candidates and will be distributed before the beginning of the Autumn semester.

Appendix B: BME Peer Teaching Evaluation Forms:

The current form of the BME Peer Teachingj Evaluation Form can be found [here](#).

Appendix C: Timeline Guide:

This is a guideline based on the College of Engineering's Promotion and Tenure Schedule for Sixth-Year Probationary Faculty Reviews, Early Promotion Reviews, Other Promotion Reviews. Please note this is a guideline only as the CoE schedule is subject to change.

- March* *TIU confirms with faculty member intention for promotion and/or tenure for upcoming cycle. March 30 (by April 1) = Last day for extension requests to be sent to OAA for approval if mandatory review year.*
- April-May* *1. TIU provides name(s) of candidate(s) to college.
2. College creates case(s) in Interfolio.
3. College notifies candidate via Interfolio that their case is ready.
4. Candidate uploads external review material into Scholarship area in Interfolio and submits that section for the POD and case manager to access.*
- May-June* *Via Interfolio, department requests external reviews*
- June-August* *1. POD and P&T Chair review dossier prior to upload into Interfolio.
2. Candidate edits dossier based upon feedback from POD and P&T Chair.
3. Candidate uploads and submits final version of dossier into Interfolio.
4. Unit collects and uploads internal section information in Interfolio.
5. Unit adds/updates POD, TIU Head, and Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF) / Faculty Deliberative Body for each case.*
- August 14* *Once all information has been entered, POD certifies candidate's and internal sections and sends case to TIU Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF) / Faculty Deliberative Body via Interfolio. (Candidate Materials available to CEF at least one week prior to vote.)*
- Aug -Sept* *CEF / Faculty Deliberative Body reviews case documents via Interfolio.*
- September* *CEF / Faculty Deliberative Body votes.*
- September* *POD certifies TIU vote via Interfolio, uploads CEF / Faculty Deliberative Body report and sends case to TIU Head.*
- October* *TIU head reviews case via Interfolio, writes review, and enters review into Interfolio.*
- October* *Candidate submits written comment / no comment via Interfolio.*
- October 17*** ***TIU Head sends P&T case to Associate Dean for review. (Hard Deadline)***
- January* *Dean's Review Complete.*
- January-Feb* *Candidate receives College review via Interfolio. (Candidate has 10 calendar days to respond.)*
- February* *Candidate submits written comment / no comment via Interfolio.*
- Feb 14*** ***College submits case to OAA via Interfolio. (Hard Deadline)***

May OAA reviews cases.

This is a guideline based on the College of Engineering's Promotion and Tenure Schedule for Fourth-year Reviews, Probationary Clinical/Teaching/Practice and Research Contract Reviews. Please note this is a guideline only as the CoE schedule is subject to change.

March TIU confirms with faculty member intention for promotion and/or tenure for upcoming cycle. March 30 (by April 1) = Last day for extension requests to be sent to OAA for approval if mandatory review year.

October/November 1. TIU provides name(s) of candidate(s) to college.
2. College creates case(s) in Interfolio.
3. College notifies candidate via Interfolio that their case is ready.

December 1. POD and P&T Chair review dossier prior to upload into Interfolio.
2. Candidate edits dossier based upon feedback from POD and P&T Chair.
3. Candidate uploads and submits final version of dossier into Interfolio.
4. Unit collects and uploads internal section information in Interfolio.
5. Unit adds/updates POD, TIU Head, and Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF) / Faculty Deliberative Body for each case.

January Once all information has been entered, POD certifies candidate's and internal sections and sends case to TIU Committee of Eligible Faculty (CEF) / Faculty Deliberative Body via Interfolio. (Candidate Materials available to CEF at least one week prior to vote.)

January CEF / Faculty Deliberative Body reviews case documents via Interfolio.
January CEF / Faculty Deliberative Body votes.
By January 31 POD certifies TIU vote via Interfolio, uploads CEF / Faculty Deliberative Body report and sends case to TIU Head.

February TIU head reviews case via Interfolio, writes review, and enters review into Interfolio.

February Candidate receives unit review via Interfolio. (Candidate has at least 10 calendar days to respond.)

February Candidate submits written comment / no comment via Interfolio.
February 27 TIU Head sends P&T case to Associate Dean for review. (Hard Deadline)

April Dean's Review Complete.

April Candidate receives College review via Interfolio. (Candidate has 10 calendar days to respond.)

April Candidate submits written comment / no comment via Interfolio.

May 8 College submits case to OAA via Interfolio. (Hard Deadline)

May OAA reviews cases.

Appendix D: Biomedical Engineering Course Roundup Template

Each faculty member who taught a level-one (2xxx-4xxx) course in xxx semester is asked to complete the following:

1. In addition to this completed document (prepared as a Word doc), please upload your **course syllabus** and **copies of the graded student work associated with the ABET criteria** being measured in your course to the [appropriate course folder](#). Additional details on the graded work requirements are [referenced here](#).
2. Please complete the following CQI (Continuous Quality Improvement) chart for your course, including changes you are proposing for next time. **This is a travel-log with previous issues, changes, and effects spanning many previous semesters.**

Course: BME xxxx

Semester	Issue or Problem	Proposed change or improvement	Effect of change next time taught

3. A short summary of **course content modifications since the last offering**:
4. Any **global/broad curricular issues** that you would like to address?
For example, are there topics or techniques that you expected to build upon, those that were missing, those that you hope will be picked up? Specific pre-requisite material that you thought was needed that the students didn't have?
5. If this was an undergrad class (2xxx through 4xxx), did you have a GTA, Undergrad-TA(UTA), and/or undergrad grader? How did that go? New For future planning purposes, what teaching support is necessary/preferred for this course moving forward? Do you need or prefer a UTA(s) or undergrad grader(s) vs. GTA, a certain combination, etc.? Please explain.

Specific ABET outcome measures: you should have measurable objectives (e.g., “students will be able to derive the Navier-Stokes equations”) that you have measured and retained (e.g., question 3 on the 2nd exam asks students to derive the Navier-Stokes equations).

- a. Student performance on the assessment related to the course objectives.

Objective	Assessment tool	Max/Min Score: Scale	Avg \pm STD

Student ABET Outcome Reflections:

- a. Any specific "wins" from the course? Student outcomes beyond the expected? How did or would you document this?
- b. Any disappointments in the course? Student outcomes less than satisfactory? Did the students generally learn what you had envisioned? How did or would you document this?
- c. Each instructor will have a **2-minute "report-out"** session of their course on xx/xx/xx. Please locate your course [in this slide deck](#), and add instructor name(s) for xxx. Review your CQI table from the past 6 years. Include one major piece of feedback you received for the course (issue/problem) during this time, the change you made, and the effect of that change during the next offering(s). **Please choose to share a change from which you've been able to directly measure its impact, if possible** (e.g. through improvement of student project or exam scores, etc.). If this is your first time teaching the course, you can include a plan for how you will directly measure impact of a proposed change in the next offering.

Optional reflection questions: USC will review and follow up with instructors as needed

1. Any specific challenges for which you want to solicit suggestions or schedule a consultation?
2. Did you and the students enjoy the course -- why and/or why not?
3. Thoughts on need for, experience with, and/or potential for increasing student involvement and active learning during class?
4. Other comments?

Appendix E: Annual Professional Activities Summary

Note: This is a template and the updated version will be posted online prior to December 31st each year.

Annual Professional Activities Summary

2025 Annual Report

Due 2/28/26

Faculty member (name, title, rank):

Track and pathway (If applicable):

Department/school:

College:

Campus:

Hiring date:

Date of Tenure or Tenure review:

***Paid** Appointment details, e.g., 50% BME, 50% cardiology, or 100% BME, etc:*

Current contract dates (for non-tenure track faculty only):

Workload Allocation:

Please enter percentages for each category. Total must equal 100%. Note Extension refers to volunteer non-paid time in community centers (schools, senior centers, etc.) and Administration/leadership refers to serving as department chair, school director, center director or associate dean. These percentages should agree with the percentages noted in your last annual review.

Teaching	Research and Creative Activities	University and Professional Service/Extension	Administration/leadership	Total

Scholarship/Research

1. Peer-reviewed **archival** publications, published in calendar years 2023-2025: Please **bold the names of your trainees (post-docs, PhD students, MS students, undergrads)** for whom you were the primary advisor. Please denote current impact factor and/or journal rank in field for each publication.

2025:

2024:

2023:

2. Peer-reviewed **archival** publications already published in **2026**, manuscripts in press, accepted, submitted:

2026:

3. Peer-reviewed **conference abstracts** published/presented in calendar years 2023-2025: Please **bold the names of your trainees (post-docs, PhD students, MS students, undergrads)** for whom you were the primary advisor.

2025:

2024:

2023:

4. *CV and/or Vita: For the annual review please provide a pdf version of your CV.*

5. *Attach a copy of your **Google Scholar “citation report”** (generated from <https://scholar.google.com> showing bar charts with published items, citations per year, and h-index (starting with the year of your first publication). Please also provide a link to your Google Scholar page.*

Make sure the citation report shows:

- Bar graph with publications and citations (if you click on the small graph, it will expand...)
- Your top 5 cited manuscripts (numbers of citations).
- h-index:

Total number of citations in:

2023:

2024:

2025:

6. *Intellectual Property developed in calendar years 2023-2025:*

Disclosures filed (these will be given ~weight of a conference abstract):

Name of the disclosure, inventors, date

Provisional Patents (these will be given ~weight of a conference publication):

Name of the patent, inventors, date

Patents Awarded (these will be given ~weight of an archival publication):

Name of the patent, inventors, date

7. *Elected Fellows and Awards (duplicate sections below as needed, for multiple fellowships):*

If you have been elected as a fellow of a professional society or have received significant awards for your research please indicate:

8a. *Current Research Funding (add rows as needed): If you have lab space in both Fontana Labs and elsewhere on campus – please indicate the % of the award activity that is conducted in Fontana Labs only. If you don't have lab space in Fontana just indicate 0%.*

	AGENCY	Title	Role (please indicate PI, MPI co-PI or co-I)	Total Costs	% of Award to your lab (Fontana Labs only)	% Release time provided in 2025*	Duration of the grant, e.g. 9/22-8/26
1							
2							
3							
4							
	TOTALS						

*Note that for faculty here for 3 years or longer, if you did not bring in at least 15% total AY release time you will not be permitted to take summer salary in summer in 2025.

8b. Proposals Submitted in 2025 (add rows as needed):

	AGENCY	Date Submitted	Title	Role (please indicate PI, MPI or co-I)	Direct Costs	% Direct costs to your lab (Fontana Labs only)	% Effort for release time	Duration
1								
2								
3								
4								
			TOTALS					

Didactic Teaching

1. Please complete the table below for didactic teaching in Spring 2025 and Fall 2025.

Term	Course Number	Course Name	Enrollment
Spring 2025			
Fall 2025			

2. Have you uploaded your full course roundup materials (syllabus, CQI table) for:

Spring 2025: Yes No
Fall 2025: Yes No

3. Please attach copy of your cumulative SEI teaching evaluations, as well as the more detailed SSLE or eSEI results for course taught since last year's review This can be accessed via the following website:
<https://my-osu.blueria.com/>

4. If your courses had any peer-reviews, please include an electronic copy.

5. Names of Graduate Students & Post-docs/research personnel mentored in 2025.

AY 2025

Name:

Title:

Primary source of funding (Tuition, Stipend):

Primary Work Location:

6. Names and thesis/dissertation titles for Graduate Students you mentored, and graduation dates during 2025:

Name:

Thesis title:

Type (i.e. MS, PhD, etc)

Advisors:

7. Names of Undergraduate research students you mentored in 2025:

Name:
Project title:
Type (i.e. senior honors thesis, summer REU, etc)
Advisors:
Primary Work Location:

Service

1. Please describe your local, national, and international service activities in 2025.

Department Service:
College Level Service:
University Level Service:
National/International Service:
Journal Editor:
Journal Board:
Society Officer:
Society Member:
Other:

2. Seminar attendance: Please note which seminars you attend regularly (defined as attending 75% of more of the scheduled seminars). Note that all faculty members are expected to attend the departmental seminar series. Please also list here your attendance and/or presenting at the BME Grant Reviews.

3. Graduate School Faculty Representative for the past 18 months:
Graduate Faculty Service: Name, Department, Date

4. Peer Evaluation of Teaching conducted in 2025:
Evaluated Course, Evaluated Faculty Member, Date/Semester

5. Peer Review of Scientific Manuscripts conducted in 2025:
Journal Name, Date of Evaluation

Expectations:

Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty:

Tenure-track faculty members are expected to contribute to the university's mission via teaching, scholarship, and service. When a faculty member's contributions decrease in one of these three areas, additional activity in one or both of the other areas is expected. The nominal workload distribution for tenure-track faculty is 45% teaching, 45% research/scholarship and 10% service and the standardized, objective, and measurable expectations for tenured or tenure-track faculty with this workload distribution is described below. Note, these expectations will shift accordingly for different workload distributions. In addition, all department leadership positions (except for the department chair) are categorized as service (department chair is the only administrative position).

- The annual teaching expectation is to meet two or more of the following criteria:
 1. For faculty providing 15% academic year salary support, teach 2 "regular" or "didactic" courses during the 9-month academic year, with a mix of undergraduate and graduate courses. This didactic teaching load expectation will vary based on higher or lower salary support from grants. Development of new courses will count towards the teaching load expectation.
 2. Evidence of effective teaching as demonstrated by an average instructor rating of ≥ 3.5 on one of the seven single-selection response questions in the Survey of Student Learning Experience (SSLE). Note the single-

- selection response questions uses a 5-point Likert scale: 5-strongly agree, 4-agree, 3-neutral, 2-disagree, 1-strongly disagree.
3. Evidence of effective teaching as demonstrated by >75% positive student comments
 4. Evidence of effective teaching as demonstrated by positive peer review of instruction evaluations.
 5. Serving as the primary or co-primary advisor of either a PhD graduate student, MS graduate student or an undergraduate research student each year.
 6. On a rolling 3-year basis, have 1 publication/year with students as lead author and faculty as senior or corresponding author.
- The annual research/scholarship expectation is to meet two or more of the following criteria:
 1. On a rolling 3-year basis, have 2 peer-reviewed publications/year (including peer-reviewed review articles and book chapters) in archival journals (non-conference). Note, non-peer reviewed journals like bioRxiv do not count as archival publications. However, awarded patents will count towards archival publications.
 2. On a rolling 3-year basis, have 1 peer-reviewed publications/year (including peer-reviewed review articles and book chapters) in archival journals (non-conference) as senior/lead/corresponding author. Note, awarded patents will count towards archival publications.
 3. On a rolling 3-year basis, have 1 conference abstract/year. Invention disclosures and provisional patents will count towards conference abstracts.
 4. A research program that supports 2 research personnel including graduate students, post-docs and/or research scientists.
 5. A research program that provides 15% of your annual salary (i.e. release time).
 6. Submission of 2 research grant proposals as PI or co-PI.
 - The annual service expectation is to meet two or more of the following criteria:
 1. Attendance and participation at faculty meetings, seminars, and department functions including BME Grant Reviews
 2. Serving on 3 departmental committees. Serving as chair of departmental committees will count as serving on 2 committees. The department chair, associate chair and faculty with significant college/university level service will have a lower number of committees.
 3. Serving as a grant reviewer on a national or international grant review panel/study section
 4. Peer-reviewing 2-3 publications per year or being an editor/associate editor for an archival journal.
 5. Active service in professional societies as documented by committee membership or conference leadership
 6. Peer-reviewing teaching activities in the department when assigned

New Untenured Faculty

For new untenured faculty who are ramping to capacity in research and teaching, the expectations described above are modified for the 1st 3 years of the appointment and are provided below.

- Teaching Expectations during the 1st 3 years:
 1. Shadowing 1 course during the 1st year and teaching 1 course in each of their 2nd and 3rd years. The nominal load described above for established faculty will apply during the 4th and subsequent years.
 2. Evidence of effective teaching as demonstrated by one of the following
 - an average instructor rating of ≥ 3.5 on one of the seven single-selection response questions in the Survey of Student Learning Experience (SSLE). Note the single-selection response questions uses a 5-point Likert scale: 5-strongly agree, 4-agree, 3-neutral, 2-disagree, 1-strongly disagree.
 - >75% positive student comments
 - positive peer review of instruction evaluations
 3. After 1 complete year of employment, serving as the primary or co-primary advisor of either a PhD graduate student or an undergraduate research student each year.
 4. After 3 complete years of employment, have at least 1 publication with students as lead author and faculty as senior or corresponding author.
- Research/Scholarship Expectations during the 1st 3 years:

1. After 2 complete years of employment, have 1 peer-reviewed publication (including peer-reviewed review articles) in archival journals (non-conference). Note, non-peer reviewed journals like bioRxiv do not count as archival publications. However, awarded patents will count towards archival publications. After 3 complete years of employment the expectation is to have at least 3 peer-reviewed publications/awarded patents.
 2. After 1 complete year of employment, have 1 conference abstract and after 3 years of employment have an average of 2 conference abstracts/year. Invention disclosures and provisional patents will count towards conference abstracts/papers
 3. After 2 complete years of employment, have a research program that supports 2 research personnel including graduate students, post-docs and/or research scientists. This support may come from a combination of start-up funds and external/internal grants.
 4. After 2 complete years of employment, submitting an average of 2 research grant proposals as PI or co-PI per year is the expectation.
- Service Expectations during the 1st 3 years:
 1. Attendance and participation at faculty meetings, seminars, and department functions including BME Grant Reviews
 2. Serving on 1 departmental committee.
 3. One of the following
 - Serving as a grant reviewer on a national or international grant review panel/study section
 - Peer-reviewing 2 publications per year or being an editor/associate editor for an archival journal.
 - Active service in professional societies as documented by committee membership or conference leadership

Professional Practice Faculty

Professional practice faculty members are expected to contribute to the university's mission via teaching and service, and to a lesser extent scholarship. Service expectations are similar to those for tenure-track faculty. A summary of the expectations for professional practice faculty is provided below.

- The annual teaching expectation is to meet two or more of the following criteria:
 1. Teaching that is aligned with the university workload guideline (~6-7 courses/9 months academic year) as assigned by the BME Chair. Teaching activities in this workload include running lab sections, advising capstone teams, teaching standard didactic courses and developing new curriculum. The equivalent courses for these activities will be determined by the department chair.
 2. Evidence of effective teaching as demonstrated by an average instructor rating of ≥ 3.5 on one of the seven single-selection response questions in the Survey of Student Learning Experience (SSLE). Note the single-selection response questions uses a 5-point Likert scale: 5-strongly agree, 4-agree, 3-neutral, 2-disagree, 1-strongly disagree.
 3. Evidence of effective teaching as demonstrated by $>75\%$ positive student comments
 4. Evidence of effective teaching as demonstrated by positive peer review of instruction evaluations.
- The annual scholarship expectation is to meet one of the following criteria:
 1. 1 peer-reviewed publication in the engineering education or other archival literature. Awarded patents will count towards archival publications
 2. 1 conference presentation at education-related or other sessions at national scientific conferences. Invention disclosures and provisional patents will count towards conference abstracts/papers.
 3. Disseminating best practices to other faculty and staff within the department typically at faculty meetings and/or via online services.
- The annual service expectation is to meet one of the following criteria:
 1. Attendance and participation at faculty meetings, seminars, and department functions
 2. Serving on 3 departmental committees. Serving as chair of departmental committees will count as serving on 2 committees. The department chair, associate chair and faculty with significant college/university level service will have a lower number of committees.
 3. Peer-reviewing 2-3 publications per year or being an editor/associate editor for an archival journal.

4. Active service in professional societies as documented by committee membership or conference leadership
5. Peer-reviewing teaching activities in the department when assigned

Goal Setting

The goal of this section is to provide an opportunity for self-reflection, planning for the upcoming year, and discussion of your future plans.

Specific Plans for the Coming Year:

Grant Proposals (please list planned grant submissions and co-investigators)

Manuscripts and Conferences (include IP) (please list planned submissions with authors)

Teaching (please list planned didactic courses and other planned teaching activities)

Service (please list planned service activities)

And any other sections that you want to include

Plans for Promotion and Tenure.

Please indicate any plans you have regarding promotion and tenure.

Finally, please include these attachments.

1. PDF of Vita and/or CV
2. Google citation report
3. SEI reports
4. Peer evaluation of teaching, peer evaluation of teaching materials, if available