

**Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure
Criteria and Procedures for
The Ohio State University
DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL,
ENVIRONMENTAL
AND GEODETIC ENGINEERING**

Revision Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: October 16, 2025

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Criteria and Procedures
Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering, College of Engineering

Contents

I Preamble	3
II Department Mission.....	4
III Definitions	4
A Committee of the Eligible Faculty	4
1 Tenure Track Faculty	4
2 Faculty of Practice	5
3 Research Faculty	5
4 Associated Faculty.....	6
5 Conflict of Interest	6
6 Minimum Composition	7
B Promotion and Tenure Committee	7
C Quorum	7
D Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty	8
1 Appointment	8
2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal.....	9
IV Appointments.....	9
A APT Document.....	9
B APT Process	9
C Criteria	9
1 Tenure Track Faculty	10
2 Practice Faculty	11
3 Research Faculty	13
4 Associated Faculty.....	14
5 Emeritus Faculty.....	15
6 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	15
D Procedures	15
1 Tenure Track Faculty	16
2 Professional Practice Faculty	17
3 Research Faculty	18
4 Transfer from the Tenure track.....	18
5 Associated Faculty.....	19
6 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	19
V Annual Performance and Merit Review Procedures	19
A Documentation.....	20
B Probationary Tenure Track Faculty	21
1 Fourth-Year Review	22
2 Changes in Length of Probationary Period	23
C Tenured Faculty	23
D Professional Practice Faculty	24
1 Annual Performance and Merit Review for Probationary Practice Faculty	24
2 Appointment Renewal (Contract Renewal) for Practice Faculty	24

E Research Faculty	25
1 Annual Performance and Merit Review for Probationary Research Faculty.....	25
2 Appointment Renewal (Contract Renewal) for Research Faculty	26
F Associated Faculty.....	26
G Salary Recommendations.....	27
VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	27
A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion	28
1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	28
a Teaching	29
b Scholarship.....	30
c Service	32
2 Promotion to Professor	33
3 Practice Faculty.....	33
4 Research Faculty.....	35
5 Associated Faculty	35
B Procedures.....	36
1 Tenure-Track, Practice, and Research Faculty	36
a Candidate Responsibilities	36
b TIU Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities	39
c Committee of Eligible Faculty Responsibilities	40
d Department Chair Responsibilities	40
2 Procedures for Associated Faculty.....	41
3 External Evaluations – Tenure Track, Practice Faculty, Research Faculty and Associated Faculty..	41
VII Appeals	43
VIII Seventh-Year Reviews.....	43
IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	43
A Student Evaluation of Teaching	43
B Peer Evaluation of Teaching	43
 Appendix A Example Letter for Faculty Courtesy Appointment	 46
 Appendix B Peer Review of Teaching Forms	 47

I Preamble

The Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures (APT) document is a supplement to the College of Engineering Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures document. This Preamble sets forth the relationship of the College and the College APT document to the Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering tenure initiating unit (TIU).

Text that is shown in regular font directly reproduces College of Engineering policies as laid out in the [College APT](#) document. Text that is bolded and italicized details guidelines and procedures that are specific to the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering.

This document is a supplement to [Chapters 6](#) and [Chapter 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](#); the [University Policy on Faculty Appointments](#), and other policies and procedures of the university to which the college and its faculty are subject.

The Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering will follow the new rule and policy changes of the [College APT](#) document and those of OAA until such time as the department can update this document. This document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years on the appointment or reappointment of the Department Chair.

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

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

The Department Chair of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering is responsible for ensuring that this APT document is consistent with College of Engineering APT document and with the most current version [Rules of the University Faculty](#) and the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#) noted above, the University, College, and Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering missions; and other relevant policies, procedures, practices, and standards established by the College and the University.

II Department Mission

To create and disseminate civil, environmental and geodetic knowledge through innovative fundamental and applied research and instruction that are in service to society.

III Definitions

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

The Committee of Eligible Faculty is the body of faculty that provide votes for faculty candidate appointment, promotion and nonrenewal decisions. As such, the Committee of Eligible Faculty has a unique composition according to the candidate title and rank. In past, the Committee of Eligible Faculty has been described in colloquial conversation and in older Promotion and Tenure Committee reports as the "Voting Body". Jointly appointed faculty with primary appointments in the Department are members of the Committee of Eligible Faculty, as relevant to the candidate decision under consideration.

The composition of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Committee of Eligible Faculty is guided also by the criteria for evaluating potential conflicts of interest between their memberships and the candidate that is set out in section III.A.4. in this document and in the Office of Academic Affairs, Policies and Procedures Handbook: Volume 3, Section 3.9.1.

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

1 Tenure track Faculty

The Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering uses a vote of the Committee of Eligible Faculty to make appointment decisions for tenure track faculty.

Initial Appointment Reviews

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

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

2 Faculty of Practice

The Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering uses a vote of the Committee of Eligible Faculty to make appointment decisions for 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, professional practice associate professor, or professional practice professor, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty and all professional practice faculty in the department.
- **Rank Review.** A vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank must be cast by all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested, and all nonprobationary practice faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews

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

For considerations of reappointment and promotion of professional practice faculty, if the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering does not have a professional practice faculty member of rank higher than the candidate, the Department Chair may appoint a professional practice faculty representative from the broader college faculty to participate in the deliberations of the eligible faculty.

3 Research Faculty

The Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering uses a vote of the Committee of Eligible Faculty to make appointment decisions for 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 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 nonprobationary research faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment, Contract Renewal, and Promotion Reviews

- For the reappointment, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of 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, contract renewal, and promotion reviews of research associate professors and the reappointment and contract renewal reviews of research professors, the eligible faculty consists of all tenured professors and all nonprobationary research professors.

For considerations of reappointment and promotion of research faculty, if the department does not have a research faculty member of rank higher than the candidate, the Department Chair may appoint a research faculty representative from the broader college faculty to participate in the deliberations of the eligible faculty.

4 Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment, Reappointment, and Contract Renewal

Initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type), reappointment, and contract renewal of associated faculty members are decided by the department chair in consultation with the relevant advisory body. All appointments of associated faculty need to follow the same search process as those for long term faculty with job posting, using appropriate disposition codes, and collecting and preserving records of candidate pools.

Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by the eligible faculty (all nonprobationary 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, 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 above.

The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the department chair in consultation with the Committee of Eligible Faculty for clinical professors.

5 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 review of that candidate.

6 Minimum Composition

If the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the Department Chair, after consulting with Promotion and Tenure Committee, will appoint a faculty member or faculty members from another TIU within the college.

B. Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering has a Promotion and Tenure Committee that assists the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in managing personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The Promotion & Tenure committee is a standing committee with duties and composition described in the CEGE Pattern of Administration. The CEGE Promotion and Tenure committee consists of at least three tenured faculty with the rank of Professor. The committee's chair and membership are appointed by the Department Chair. The term of service is typically three years, with reappointment possible. If the Department does not have at least three faculty members at the rank of tenured Professor who can serve on the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department Chair, after consulting with the Dean, will appoint a faculty member from another department within the College.

A mentor of a candidate, if applicable, may be added as an ex officio member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee for the mentee's case. The mentor will act as a resource for the Promotion and Tenure Committee but will not be the primary author on any sections of the Promotion and Tenure Committee report.

The Department Chair, College Dean, College Associate and Assistant Deans, Vice Provosts, Executive Vice President and Provost, and President may not be members of the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Department Chair may attend meetings at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and may respond to questions, but may not vote.

When considering cases involving practice faculty, the Promotion and Tenure Committee may be expanded to include a nonprobationary practice faculty member at the rank above that of the candidate under consideration. If the Department does not have a practice faculty member of rank higher than the candidate, the Department Chair may appoint a practice faculty representative, after consultation with the Dean, from the broader college faculty to participate as member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The appointed individual is a de facto representative of the Committee of Eligible faculty to satisfy requirements of III.A.2.

The identical procedure as described for practice faculty will be followed for cases involving research faculty, except that the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Committee of Eligible faculty may in that case be augmented by a nonprobationary research faculty member at the rank above that of the candidate under consideration.

C. Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions in the CEGE Department is 60% of the eligible faculty for the candidate's case. The eligible faculty for each appointment and promotion type and rank are detailed in section III.A.

Eligible faculty includes those not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty on approved leave or Special Assignment are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance, in writing, their intent to

participate in all proceedings.

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

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

D. 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 deciding whether to abstain from a vote on a personnel matter.

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

1 Appointment

A positive recommendation is achieved when at least two-thirds of the “yes” and “no” votes cast are “yes” votes.

Voting is carried out on-line on an anonymous basis. All faculty members eligible to vote will receive an anonymous invitation to vote on-line. The first step of the on-line process involves indicating, on an honor basis, whether the eligible faculty member participated in the discussions, or reviewed all the evaluation related materials and notes resulting from the discussions. If the eligible faculty member responds in the affirmative, the faculty member will be able to proceed with casting a ballot.

If the faculty search extends into the summer term, then the Department Chair consults with the search committee and available faculty. In this case, if a special meeting of the faculty cannot be arranged, an anonymous on-line vote would be conducted with the eligible faculty.

A candidate’s rank is usually limited by the rank posted on the job ad. Only if the job ad was posted with an open rank, can the appropriateness of candidate rank be assessed through the following process. The rank of the candidate can be assessed in part through a request of evaluation of appropriateness of rank to external evaluators. Based on these evaluations and considering other factors, including rank in current position, the Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, in consultation with the Search Committee, and the Department Chair, makes an initial determination of rank. The Committee of Eligible Faculty assembled at the initial rank determination may vote to have a different rank evaluated. Two-thirds of these votes must be positive to have a different rank evaluated.

A positive recommendation from the Committee of Eligible Faculty for appointment at senior rank is secured when two-thirds of the “yes” and “no” votes cast are “yes” votes. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the Committee of Eligible Faculty vote on the appropriateness of such credit with a positive recommendation being secured when two-thirds of the “yes” and “no” votes cast are “yes” votes. Final appointment at rank and provision of prior service credit require review by the Office of Academic Affairs.

Note in the case of jointly appointed faculty: The [College APT](#) document stipulates that a separate vote

by the partnering department will be held. A positive recommendation is required from both TIUs, each following its respective voting procedures for faculty appointments, in order to proceed with a joint appointment.

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

A positive recommendation is secured when a simple majority of the “yes” and “no” votes cast are “yes” votes.

Participating eligible faculty will vote anonymously within the confines of an eligible faculty meeting. Ballots are counted by the P&T Chair and a member of the Eligible Faculty will certify the results of the vote.

Note in the case of jointly appointed faculty with a majority appointment in CEGE: The [College APT](#) document stipulates that a positive recommendation is determined by the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering according to the Department’s APT documents. A representative of the secondary appointment department may be present during the discussion by the Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering Committee of Eligible Faculty to serve as a resource to provide clarification on items such as: (i) aspects of the candidate’s dossier that may not conform to the Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering model, or (ii) elements of the hiring MOU that might concern the candidate’s responsibilities.

IV Appointments

A. APT Document

The purpose of this APT document is to set out expectations for each type of faculty appointment (tenure track, professional practice faculty, research faculty, associated faculty and courtesy appointed faculty), including (1) criteria for making such an appointment, (2) evidence to be provided in support of such an appointment, and (3) the Department’s procedures for making such an appointment.

B. APT Process

All appointment decisions in the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering will be carried out following procedures and policy that are consistent with the Departmental APT Document, and other relevant policies, procedures, practices, and standards established by: (1) the College of Engineering, (2) the Faculty Rules, (3) the Office of Academic Affairs, and (4) the Office of Human Resources.

C. Criteria

The Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering follows the Criteria for faculty appointments that are set out by the College of Engineering APT Document.

The Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering 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 institutional and professional 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.

A curriculum vitae for all faculty members, including associated faculty members, will be kept in the department.

1 Tenure Track Faculty

Instructor. Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but requirements for the terminal degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. The 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. When 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 departmental Committee of 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 in the relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience; 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 civil, environmental, or geodetic engineering disciplines; a potential to perform effective service, including a commitment to good citizenship and collegiality within the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic 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. For individuals not recommended for promotion and tenure after the mandatory review, the 7th year will be the final year of employment. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Promotion and Tenure Committee (or the TIU of the primary appointment 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 (OAA Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection), 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. 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 the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering criteria for appointment as a tenure track assistant professor, and met or exceeded the College and the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

The Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering may decide that a candidate who has not followed a traditional academic pathway may merit appointment as a tenured faculty member at a rank higher than Assistant Professor. Candidates from non-academic institutions, such as government agencies, public or private research organizations, or technical/fellow tracks within

industry organizations, shall be evaluated with consideration of activities in the candidate's current and prior institutions at the time of candidacy that have equivalency to typical activities of a tenure track faculty member. For example, evidence of teaching effectiveness may include extensive experience in administering short courses or professional training; evidence of scholarly activities may include pursuit of project funds within the agency or organization and publication of internal technical and research studies, and evidence of service may include committees relevant to the agency or organization. In consideration of the rank of Associate professor, greater weight will be ascribed to candidate's established record of external peer-reviewed publications, experience mentoring students and participation in conferences or disciplinary proceedings.

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.

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

Professor. 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 the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering criteria for appointment as an associate professor with tenure, and met or exceeded the College and Department criteria for promotion to professor.

A sustained record of accomplishments in research, teaching, and service is expected for appointment to the rank of Professor. Consideration for equivalency will be given to offerees from non-academic institutions as detailed above for Associate Professor appointments.

Appointments at the rank of professor without tenure should not occur.

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

2 Practice Faculty

Practice faculty in the Department will be referred to as "Professional Practice Instructor, Professional Practice Assistant Professor, Professional Practice Associate Professor, or Professional Practice Professor in the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering". Distinctions among ranks are based on the level of achievement attained by the candidate.

The Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering recognizes and values the contributions of faculty with practical experience in engineering analysis, planning, design, construction, management, and operations and industry contributions related to modern practice of civil, environmental or geodetic engineering. Such Professional Practice faculty members bring state-of-the-art tools, techniques, and expertise of engineering practice into the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering educational enterprise. Through their networks of practice, Professional Practice Faculty can facilitate professional opportunities for students and industrial collaborations for faculty members in the department, and they can serve as liaisons between the Department and practicing professional engineers. Further, Professional Practice Faculty are expected to stay up-to-date with trends and innovations in civil, environmental or geodetic engineering practice and provide service to the professional community. There is an expectation for participation in scholarly endeavors or other creative works appropriate for Professional Practice Faculty, taking in consideration teaching load and related to departmental endeavors.

Criteria and policies governing appointment of 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 faculty may participate with voting rights in matters of governance and committee service at the College and Department level, as detailed in the Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering Pattern of Administration. Professional Practice faculty that meet eligibility according to section III.A.2. of the Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering APT Document may vote on appointment and promotion decisions for practice faculty. Professional Practice faculty cannot participate or vote on appointment or promotion and tenure matters of tenure track faculty (Faculty Rule 3335-7-04(A)) or research faculty.

Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all other professional practice faculty members must be for a period of five years. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for professional practice assistant and associate professors must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for professional practice professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. Tenure is not granted to practice faculty members. In addition, there is no presumption that one or more subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the Department wishes to consider offering a contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see [Faculty Rule 3335-7](#).

Annual probationary reviews are conducted by the Department Chair.

Professional Practice Instructor. Appointment is normally made at the rank of professional practice instructor when the appointee has not completed the requirements for the terminal degree. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to a three-year contract. In such cases, if the instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the end of the penultimate year of the contract period, a new contract will not be considered even if performance is otherwise adequate and the position itself will continue.

A doctoral degree is considered the terminal degree for Professional Practice faculty positions in the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering. Appointment at the rank of Professional Practice Instructor is also made when the candidate has not obtained the required licensure/certification in his/her specialization at the time of appointment.

Professional Practice Assistant Professor. There must be clear and convincing evidence that the offeree of an appointment as assistant professor of practice has, at a minimum, strong capability in the offeree's area of specialization, experience in the practice of the discipline, attained professional accomplishment, and background and potential excellence in the ability to share and transfer knowledge to students. Normally, the offeree will have an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field. Professional and scholarly publications and teaching experience are helpful but not required.

The Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering requires an earned doctorate and the required licensure/certification in the candidate's specialization (or other exceptional qualifications). Evidence of ability to teach is highly desirable.

Professional Practice Associate Professor. There must be clear and convincing evidence that the offeree of an appointment as an associate professor of practice has, at a minimum, exceeded the College and the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering criteria for appointment as a professional

practice assistant professor, and met or exceeded the College and Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering criteria for promotion to professional practice associate professor.

An earned doctorate and the required licensure/certification in his/her specialty (or other exceptional qualifications) are required. Demonstrated experience and excellence in teaching are required and may include instruction at a post-secondary institution, or significant short-course and/or professional training of practitioners. Professional service activities are expected to emphasize outreach and interaction with constituencies beyond the research community, such as with industry, government agencies, the broader educational community, technical societies (e.g., ASCE), accreditation boards (e.g., ABET) and the broad community of practitioners. There is an expectation for participation in scholarly endeavors or other creative works appropriate for Professional Practice Faculty, taking in consideration the candidate's teaching load and related to departmental endeavors.

Professional Practice Professor. There must be clear and convincing evidence that the offeree of an appointment as a professor of practice has, at a minimum, exceeded the College and the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering criteria for appointment as a professional practice associate professor, and met or exceeded the College and the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering criteria for promotion to professional practice professor.

Sustained record of accomplishments in teaching, professional service, and scholarly activities is warranted for appointment to the rank of Professional Practice Professor.

3 Research faculty

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

Research faculty may participate with voting rights in matters of governance and committee service at the College and Department level, as detailed in the Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering Pattern of Administration. Research faculty that meet eligibility according to section III.A.3. of the Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering APT Document may vote on appointment and promotion decisions for research faculty. Research faculty cannot participate or vote on appointment or promotion and tenure matters of tenure track faculty (Faculty Rule 3335-7-04(A)) or practice faculty.

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 members. In addition, there is also no presumption that one or more subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the Department wishes to consider offering a contract renewal, a formal review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. For more information see [Faculty Rule 3335-7](#).

Annual probationary reviews are conducted by the Department Chair.

Research Assistant Professor. There must be clear and convincing evidence that the offeree of an appointment as research assistant professor has, at a minimum, 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 the

Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering criteria for appointment as a research assistant professor, and met or exceeded the College and Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering criteria for promotion to research associate professor.

Criteria for promotion are detailed in section VI with the recognition that candidates for promotion or appointment to Research Associate Professor will have a record of accomplishments in high quality research and scholarship and in professional service.

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 Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering criteria for appointment as a research associate professor, and met or exceeded the College and Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering criteria for promotion to research professor.

Criteria for promotion are detailed in section VI with the recognition that candidates for promotion or appointment to Research Professor will have a sustained record of accomplishments in high quality research and professional service is expected for appointment to the rank of Professor.

4 Associated Faculty

The Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering has at times employed associated faculty who hold the title Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, tenure track faculty who have <50% appointments, adjunct faculty, and Visiting Professors. The Departmental Pattern of Administration details the extent to which such faculty can participate in departmental governance. Generally, associated faculty may participate in faculty meetings and discussions of policies and motions of relevance to their appointments, such as curricular matters; however, associated faculty are not permitted to participate in any discussions or votes pertaining to personnel issues.

Lecturer. An appointment as lecturer requires that the individual has, 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. Exceptions to lecturer and senior lecturer appointment requirements may be granted by review and approval of the college and OAA. Subsequent appointments may be of longer duration.

Senior Lecturer. Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual has 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 documented 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. Exceptions to senior lecturer appointment requirements may be granted by review and approval of the college and OAA.

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.

Adjunct Faculty. Adjunct faculty appointments may be either compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty provide significant service to the instructional and/or research program of the Department. Titles may be granted as adjunct instructor, adjunct assistant professor, adjunct associate professor, or adjunct

professor. Typically, the adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure track faculty though the criteria for appointment of practice or research faculty may be applied, if 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, practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

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

5 Emeritus Faculty

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

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the department chair outlining academic performance and citizenship. The faculty eligible to conduct promotion reviews within the requestor's appointment type (see Section III.A.1-4) will review the application and make a recommendation to the department chair. The 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.

6 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Occasionally the active academic involvement in the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering by a tenure track, practice, or research faculty member from another TIU at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment. 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 activities. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

D Procedures

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

- recruitment of tenure track, practice, research, and associated faculty
- appointments at senior rank or with prior service credit

- hiring faculty from other institutions after April 30
- appointment of foreign nationals
- letters of offer

1 Tenure track Faculty

A national search is required to ensure a deep 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 (OAA) in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA policy on [Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#) and other university and college policies and practices set forth in the most recent updates of the College of Engineering Guide to Effective Searches (see Carmen resource module managed by Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs).

Searches for tenure track faculty proceed as follows:

The Dean of the College provides approval for the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering to commence a search process. This approval may or may not be accompanied by constraints about salary, rank, and field of expertise, and may or may not include guidance on faculty with the potential for appointments to more than one TIU.

The Department Chair appoints a search committee consisting of three or more faculty members who reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search, as well as other fields within the department. A minimum of four faculty members will be appointed to the search committee with at least two faculty holding a rank of either Associate Professor or Professor. Although professional practice faculty and research faculty cannot vote on tenure-track faculty appointments, the appointment of a faculty member with such a title to a Search Committee may contribute expertise that is critical to a successful hire. Search committees for professional practice (research) faculty will have a minimum of one professional practice (research) faculty as appointed members.

Note in the case of searches that target jointly appointed faculty: The College APT document indicates that if the candidate's primary appointment is in Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering, the Department Chair shall include a representative from the secondary TIU on the search committee. Likewise, a representative of the Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering Department will be appointed by the primary TIU in cases that the Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering Department is the secondary TIU in a joint hire.

The search committee will follow the [Strategic Hiring Initiative for Faculty Talent \(SHIFT\) framework](#) with an emphasis on attracting and engaging a qualified and broad applicant pool that are extraordinary scholars and leaders in their respective fields.

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty members vote also 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. The eligible faculty reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the Department Chair. Appointment offers at the rank of associate professor or professor, with or without tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

If more than one candidate achieves the level of support required to extend an offer, the Department Chair of the primary appointment TIU decides which candidate to approach first. The details of the offer, including compensation, are determined by the Department Chair of the primary appointment TIU.

The following must be submitted to the CoE as part of the offer package for tenure-track faculty for approval by the dean:

1. A draft letter of offer
2. CoE New Faculty Finance and Responsibilities to a tenure-track faculty candidate
3. Candidate's curriculum vitae
4. Candidate's teaching statement
5. Candidate's research statement
6. A signed Start-Up Commitment Worksheet (if there is start-up)
7. Appropriate letters attesting to the candidate's qualifications
8. A search committee report noting the process of the search and reasons other candidates were not considered
9. Other items as noted on the college's current offer package checklist. For example, joint appointments require a fully executed MOU to accompany these materials.

Engineering Administration will review the offer package for consistency with the essential components required by OAA and 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 will discuss potential appointment of a candidate requiring sponsorship for permanent residence or nonimmigrant work-authorized status with the Office of International Affairs. An [MOU](#) must be signed by faculty eligible for tenured positions who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees.

2 Professional Practice Faculty

Creation of a professional practice faculty position requires the prior approval of the Dean. Approved positions must be posted in the current university-approved venue through the Office of Human Resources. A national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates unless an exception is approved by the Dean.

The following must be submitted to the CoE as part of the offer package for professional practice faculty for approval by the dean:

1. A draft letter of offer
2. CoE New Faculty Finance and Responsibilities to a professional practice faculty candidate
3. Candidate's curriculum vitae
4. Candidate's teaching statement
5. A signed Start-Up Commitment Worksheet (if there is start-up)
6. Appropriate letters attesting to the candidate's qualifications
7. A search committee report noting the process of the search and reasons other candidates were not considered
8. Other items as noted on the college's current offer package checklist. For example, joint appointments require a fully executed MOU to accompany these materials.

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.

Searches for practice faculty will follow the same procedures as detailed for tenure track faculty.

Candidates for a practice faculty position will provide a guest course lecture in lieu of a research seminar. The Search Committee will determine if, in addition to the guest course lecture, a conventional research presentation should also be required. The Search Committee will also determine the regularly-scheduled CIVENG or ENVENG undergraduate course in which the candidate's guest lecture will be given. Candidate may choose to present goals and background on teaching, service, and research briefly at the beginning of the guest lecture.

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

Creation of a research faculty position requires prior approval of the Dean. Approved positions must be posted in the University Personnel Postings through the Office of Human Resources. A national search is required to ensure a pool of highly qualified candidates unless an exception is approved by the Dean.

The following must be submitted to the CoE as part of the offer package for research faculty for approval by the dean:

1. A draft letter of offer
2. CoE New Faculty Finance and Responsibilities to a research faculty candidate
3. Candidate's curriculum vitae
4. Candidate's research statement
5. A signed Start-Up Commitment Worksheet (if there is start-up)
6. Appropriate letters attesting to the candidate's qualifications
7. A search committee report noting the process of the search and reasons other candidates were not considered
8. Other items as noted on the college's current offer package checklist. For example, joint appointments require a fully executed MOU to accompany these materials.

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. Searches for research faculty will follow the same procedures as detailed for tenure track faculty.

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 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 3335-7-38](#) and to the Department and College limits on the number of 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 practice appointment and from a research appointment to the tenure track are not

permitted. Practice faculty members and research faculty members may apply for tenure track positions and compete in national searches for such positions.

5 Associated Faculty

The appointment, review, and reappointment of all compensated associated faculty are decided by the Department Chair in consultation with the faculty members of the department and following the procedures for appointment of Professional Practice Faculty.

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

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

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

6 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 or unit. A statement of purpose that describes the uncompensated academic service to the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering justifying the appointment is considered at a faculty meeting. If the purpose is approved by the eligible faculty, the Department Chair extends an offer of appointment. A copy of a letter of offer of a courtesy appointment for faculty, accompanied by the candidate's curriculum vitae, must be submitted to engineering administration at the time an offer is made. The Department Chair reviews all courtesy appointments at least every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for renewal or nonrenewal before the faculty members for a vote at a regular meeting.

Prior to the vote of the Committee of Eligible Faculty, the candidate for the courtesy appointment is required to offer a briefing on their expertise to the faculty members of the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering to demonstrate how their research or teaching expertise fits into and expands the department's mission.

A sample offer letter is provided in Appendix A of this document.

Courtesy appointments will be discontinued when expectations are not met, when a faculty member retires, or when a faculty member leaves the University.

V Annual Performance and Merit Review Procedures

The Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering follows the requirements for annual performance and merit 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. According to the policy, the purposes of the review are to:

- Assist faculty in improving professional productivity through candid and constructive feedback and through the establishment of professional development plans;
- Establish the goals against which a faculty member's performance will be assessed in the foreseeable future; and
- Document faculty performance in the achievement of stated goals in order to determine salary increases and other resource allocations, progress toward promotion, and, in the event of poor performance, the need for remedial steps.

Depending on their appointment type, the annual performance and merit review of faculty members is based on expected performance in teaching, research, creative work and scholarship, and service as set forth in College and TIU guidelines on faculty duties and responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; on progress toward promotion where relevant; and activities that enhance the culture of the college and department, in keeping with the values of the university and college. Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.

The annual performance and merit review of a faculty member is the responsibility of the Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering Department Chair for faculty who hold primary appointments in the Department. Annual reviews are expected to provide a written objective assessment of the candidate's progress in teaching, scholarship and service, and for jointly appointed faculty, to evaluate progress relative to the expectations of each TIU to which the faculty member is appointed. 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. These procedures should include mechanisms for a face-to-face meeting as well as a written evaluation. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, the face-to-face meeting is to include the TIU Chairs or Directors and/or designees for all the TIUs to which the faculty member is appointed, while the written evaluation is to be prepared by the primary TIU Chair or Director or designee and signed by all of the TIU Chairs or Directors or designees present at the meeting.

Annual performance and merit reviews in the Department will be conducted in accordance with the relevant policies, procedures, practices and standards established by: (1) the department APT document, (2) the College, (3) the Faculty Rules, (4) the Office of Academic Affairs, and the (5) Office of Human Resources.

Annual reviews in CEGE are conducted on an academic year basis from May 1 of the preceding calendar year to April 30 of the current year of the Annual Review.

A. Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, faculty members must submit the following documents to the department chair no later than the final day of summer semester classes:

- Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), Volume 3 (*required for probationary faculty*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (*nonprobationary faculty*)
- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place (*all faculty*)
- ***CEGE "Self-Evaluation of Recent Accomplishments – NAME" including details of the faculty member's three-year vision for teaching, research, and service***
- ***CEGE "Faculty Data Sheet AY24-25 NAME" that is a numeric tally of CV and dossier items.***

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

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

Additional details on annual and promotion reviews for faculty hired under the Discovery Theme initiative are provided in the appointment MOU.

B. Probationary Tenure Track Faculty

Every probationary tenure track faculty member is reviewed annually by the Chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals; and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. A face to face meeting of the candidate with the Department Chair to discuss the annual review is required. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, the Department Chairs or School Directors of all TIUs within the College to which the faculty member has been appointed must meet simultaneously with the faculty member in this meeting. The meeting must also include some discussion of the relative requirements and progress for each TIU relative to the percent appointment to the TIU.

If the Department Chair recommends renewal of the appointment of a faculty member holding a primary appointment in the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering, 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. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, this letter should include input from all the appointed TIUs. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, this evaluation is to be signed by all Directors and Chairs of TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed if within the College. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The Department Chair letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the Dean of the college. 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.

Third Year Promotion and Tenure Committee Feedback

The Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering provides feedback to probationary faculty at the beginning of their third year using a modified version of the fourth-year review process. The purpose of this added review is to provide probationary faculty with substantive feedback at an earlier stage in career progression so that candidates are positioned more strongly for the mandatory fourth-year review. The third-year feedback process will occur in the early fall semester timeframe to allow one full year plus one-half before the mandatory fourth-year review. This timing also ensures that the Department Chair's Annual Review process has been completed. The third-year evaluation also serves as an opportunity to introduce candidates to the internal promotion and tenure review process.

Candidates submit a complete OAA dossier (OAA supported faculty information system) to the Promotion and Tenure Committee for review. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will review the dossier and discuss the candidate's progress toward promotion with the candidate and the candidate's mentor in a brief (e.g., 30 minute) meeting. Such a meeting will enable the mentor to help address candidate's needs in preparing for the mandatory fourth year review and subsequent promotion. A note-taker will be identified at this meeting to record the Promotion and Tenure Committee's discussion of the candidate's case as meeting minutes that are advisory to the Department Chair. The candidate is requested to prepare a reflective summary of the meeting for further discussion with their mentor. A meeting of the Committee of Eligible Faculty will not occur during the third-year review of a candidate; there will be no vote.

Clarification of roles: The role of the Promotion and Tenure Committee is evaluative. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will provide feedback on the candidate's progress toward promotion as is appropriate to the end of the second year of appointment, according to the perspective of building toward a dossier for promotion at the date for mandatory promotion review. The role of the mentor in this process is not evaluative. The mentor can provide clarification of details of the candidate's dossier during the meeting with the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The mentor will help the candidate to translate contents of the Promotion and Tenure Committee meeting letter into strategies that continue to build the candidate's dossier toward promotion at the date of the mandatory promotion review.

Notes: The content of the third-year feedback is not forwarded from the Department to the College or to the Office of Academic Affairs. Renewal decisions of probationary faculty appointments are governed by Section V.B.

Timeline:

Aug. 15 *P&T Committee requests dossier from candidates who are starting their third year of a faculty appointment*

Oct. 15 *P&T Committee submits advisory minutes to the Department Chair*

1 Fourth-Year Review

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

External evaluations may be requested by the CEGE Promotion and Tenure Committee if a credible evaluation of the candidate's scholarship or professional service record cannot be performed without them. With this one exception, the Promotion and Tenure Committee follows the Procedures for preparing a written report of the Committee's assessment of the candidate's accomplishments as detailed in section VI(C).

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 eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the Department Chair, who conducts an independent assessment of candidates with a primary appointment in the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, this assessment is undertaken in consultation with the Department Chair or School

Director of the secondary TIU At the conclusion of the Department review, the formal comments process (per [Faculty Rule 3335-6-04](#)) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the Department Chair of the primary appointment TIU recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

The Department Promotion and Tenure Committee is responsible for recording the results of the vote of the Committee of Eligible Faculty as part of the written evaluation and for providing a summary of the consensus and any minority and dissenting views of the Committee of Eligible Faculty, according to the procedures detailed in section VII (C).

A review by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee is required unless the Chair of the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering 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 Chair must clearly provide justification for the recommendation to the College. For jointly appointed faculty, the written evaluation should be prepared by the Department Chair in the primary TIU in consultation with Chairs or Directors of all TIUs to which the candidate has been appointed. The Department 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.

2 Changes in Length of 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. [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 \(F\)](#) does likewise for extensions of the probationary period. A faculty member remains on duty regardless of time excluded from or extended to the probationary period, and annual reviews are conducted in every probationary year regardless of time excluded or extended. Approved exclusions or extensions do not limit the TIU'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](#).

C. Tenured Faculty

Annual performance and merit reviews of tenured faculty members are expected to include a written objective assessment of the candidate's progress in teaching, scholarship and service.

In the case of an Associate Professor, this assessment gauges progress to promotion to Professor.

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

In the case of a Professor this assessment is gauged towards contributions to the TIU, the University, and the discipline. The annual review of professors, conducted by the Department Chair, is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the tenure initiating unit, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their

scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be rolemodels in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest-ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty.

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

In the case of jointly appointed faculty, these reviews should include assessments from all TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed within the College.

D. Professional Practice Faculty

The annual performance and merit review process for professional practice probationary and nonprobationary faculty is identical to that for tenure track probationary and tenured faculty respectively, including guidance for jointly appointed faculty, except that nonprobationary practice faculty may participate in the review of practice faculty of lower rank.

1 Annual Performance and Merit Review for Probationary Practice Faculty

For probationary practice faculty, a meeting with the primary appointment Chair is required to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. The primary appointment Department Chair must prepare a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew if the appointment. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, 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.

If the primary appointment Department Chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The Department Chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The primary appointment Department Chair letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the Dean of the college. 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 primary appointment 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.

2 Appointment Renewal (Contract Renewal) for Practice Faculty

In the penultimate contract year of a practice faculty member's appointment, the primary appointment Department Chair must determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. If the position will not continue, the faculty member is informed that the final contract year will be a terminal year of employment. The standards of notice set forth in [Faculty Rule 3335-6-08](#) must be observed. There is no presumption of contract renewal.

Probationary practice faculty must undergo a review no later than the beginning of the penultimate year of his or her contract so the unit may determine whether it is appropriate to renew that individual'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. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. The college dean has the final approval on the reappointment. 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.

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

Nonprobationary practice faculty must be informed as to whether the new appointment will be extended by the end of the penultimate year of the contract. The normal annual review will serve as the basis for evaluation. The primary appointment TIUs may request additional evidence to characterize the performance of the faculty member during their contract period, including from secondary appointment TIUs as applicable. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. An initial decision from the TIU head to reappoint is final. An initial decision not to reappoint requires a review by a TIU standing committee and requires the concurrence of the Dean. All reappointment decisions are at the discretion of the Dean. There is no presumption of contract renewal.

The Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee provides feedback to professional practice faculty at the beginning of the third year of a probationary appointment, as detailed for tenure track faculty in Section V (A).

E Research Faculty

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

1 Annual Performance and Merit Review for Probationary Research Faculty

For probationary research faculty, a meeting with the primary appointment 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 if the appointment. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, 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.

If the primary appointment Department Chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The TIU Chair or Director's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The Department Chair letter (along with the faculty member's comments, if received) is forwarded to the Dean of the college. In addition, the annual review letter becomes part of the cumulative dossier (along with the faculty member's comments, if he or she chooses).

A recommendation for nonrenewal requires the approval of both the primary appointment TIU Head and the Dean of the College. The Dean makes the final decision.

2 Appointment Renewal (Contract Renewal) for Research Faculty

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. There is no presumption of contract renewal.

Probationary research faculty must undergo a review no later than the beginning of the penultimate year of his or her contract so the unit may determine whether it is appropriate to renew that individual'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 concurrently with the probationary tenure track faculty. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. The college dean has the final approval on the reappointment. 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.

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

Nonprobationary research faculty must be informed as to whether the new appointment will be extended by the end of the penultimate year of the contract. The normal annual review will serve as the basis for evaluation. The primary appointment TIUs may request additional evidence to characterize the performance of the faculty member during their contract period, including from secondary appointment TIUs as applicable. External letters of evaluation are not solicited. An initial decision from the TIU head to reappoint is final. An initial decision not to reappoint requires a vote from a TIU standing committee and requires the concurrence of the Dean. All reappointment decisions are at the discretion of the Dean. There is no presumption of contract renewal.

The Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee provides feedback to research faculty at the beginning of the third year of a probationary appointment, as detailed for tenure track faculty in Section V(B).

F. Associated Faculty

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. There is no presumption of reappointment at the end of a contract period. If the position will not continue, the Department Chair will inform the faculty member that there will be a non-renewal of employment.

If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract.

Lecturers. The primary criteria for reappointment of Lecturers is teaching performance using a combination of Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) scores and comments and peer-reviews of teaching. The teaching of lecturers is reviewed at least once per year during the first two years of service, at least once every second year during the next five years of service, and at least once every four years for the remaining years of service. Teaching should be assessed at all levels of instruction to which the lecturer is assigned with the goal of having at least one review per contract appointment

1 *period.*

2
3 *The teaching of other Adjunct Faculty members is reviewed at least once during the first two years of*
4 *service, and at least once per three course offerings for the remaining years of service.*

5
6 The Department Chair prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or
7 her performance, plans, and goals. The Department Chair's recommendation on renewal of the
8 appointment is final. If the recommendation is to renew, the Department Chair may extend a multiple year
9 appointment subject to the limitations discussed in Section IV.C.4.

10 Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment are reviewed annually by the
11 Department Chair. The Department Chair, or designee prepares a written evaluation and meets with the
12 faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. No later than October 15 of the
13 final year of the appointment, the Department Chair will decide whether or not to reappoint. The
14 Department Chair's recommendation on reappointment is final.

15 16 **G. Salary Recommendations**

17
18 Merit salary increases and other rewards made by the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic
19 Engineering will be made consistent with this APT document, and other relevant policies, procedures,
20 practices, and standards established by: (1) the College, (2) the Faculty Rules, (3) the Office of Academic
21 Affairs, and (4) the Office of Human Resources.

22
23 The department chair makes annual salary recommendations to the dean, who may modify them. The
24 recommendations are based on the current annual performance and merit review as well as on the
25 performance and merit reviews of the preceding 24 months.

26
27 *As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the department chair divides*
28 *faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and*
29 *unsatisfactory) and considers market and internal equity issues. Salary increases should be*
30 *based upon these considerations.*

31
32 *Faculty members who wish to discuss dissatisfaction with their salary increase with the*
33 *department chair should be prepared to explain how their salary (rather than the increase) is*
34 *inappropriately low, since increases are solely a means to the end of an optimal distribution of*
35 *salaries.*

36
37 Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation (see Section V-A above) for an annual
38 performance and merit review at the required time will receive no salary increase in the year for which
39 documentation was not provided, except in extenuating circumstances, and may not expect to recoup the
40 foregone raise at a later time.

41 42 **VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews**

43
44 [Faculty Rule 3335-6-02\(D\)](#) provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion
45 reviews:

46
47 *In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility*
48 *shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one*
49 *area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the university enters new*
50 *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 enough 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 Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering has three sets of criteria that are used in promotion and tenure and for promotion assessments: teaching, scholarship, and service, as pertinent to faculty appointment. Evidence of effective contributions in these areas, as pertinent to faculty appointment, must be demonstrated through the documentation of activities over a period.

The Office of Academic Affairs, Policies and Procedures Handbook: Volume 3, Section 4.1.2.2. sets out the timeframe of publications and creative works that are to be the focus of evaluating evidence for promotion criteria. Section 4.1.2.4. details the content associated with each of the sections of the core dossier.

The Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering comprises a wide array of sub-disciplinary specialties. Care must be taken to apply the three criteria cited above with enough flexibility. In all instances superior intellectual attainment and impact, in accordance with the criteria set forth, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured faculty positions. Insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for the maintenance and enhancement of the University as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge ([Faculty Rule 3335-6-02-\(D\)](#)).

A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Promotion to associate professor with tenure in the College of Engineering requires excellence in both scholarship and teaching, where scholarship is defined as research, scholarly, and/or creative work. The promise of excellence in service is desirable.

Excellence in scholarship means attainment of measurable national or international recognition based on an appropriate amount and rate of high-quality published research and/or other relevant creative endeavors. A successful candidate will have an emerging national reputation. When assessing a candidate's national and international reputation in the field, activities in outreach and engagement should be valued in addition to more traditional scholarly and teaching activities. Excellence in teaching means the provision to all students of the opportunity to realize their full capabilities for learning and, to the most capable and motivated students, an enhanced learning experience. Excellence in service means the provision of a high level of professional expertise and experience to the University, the community, the state and nation, and professional organizations. The service contribution during the probationary period of assistant professors is limited by design. The most important judgment is that the candidate will achieve excellence in service in the future.

The substantial probability that a high rate of quality scholarship and/or creative activity and excellence in teaching and service will continue needs to be established. The claim that retention of the candidate will improve the overall quality and standing of the unit needs to be supported.

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

Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering Clarification of Criteria:
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.

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

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

Teaching is broadly defined to include the imparting of knowledge to and the education of people.

Teaching activities include:

- undergraduate, graduate, and professional courses taught in curricular and co-curricular settings; involvement graduate exams, theses, and dissertations;
- promoting, coaching and mentoring undergraduate researchers;
- involvement in extension and continuing education; curriculum development;
- faculty and instructor professional development;
- evaluation and direction of student scholarship;
- academic advising;
- writing textbooks, monographs and other compilations of essential education resources, including online teaching resources;
- advising of student groups and organizations;
- participation in student affairs programs and student services; and
- engaging in the Scholarship of Teaching (SoTL).

Novel teaching methods including development of electronic and other forms of educational interactions with students inside and outside the traditional classroom environment are encouraged.

Evidence of effective teaching can include:

- student, peer, supervisor and external evaluations of teaching in the classroom;
- awards and formal recognition for teaching;
- evaluation of performance as an advisor and mentor;
- number, level, complexity and size of courses taught;
- exit interviews with graduating seniors; alumni surveys;
- quality of textbooks, monographs, electronic resources and other publications on education in the candidate's field;
- number of completed master's theses or Ph.D. dissertations;
- number and quality of undergraduate researchers advised;
- number and quality of jointly authored publications with graduate or undergraduate students;
- impact of course and/or curriculum development; and/or
- effective teaching innovations.

The evaluation of a candidate's teaching should be accomplished within a systematic and comparative evaluation process that includes all faculty within the TIU's in which the candidate has taught.

Candidates are expected to have:

- 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.
- Developed interdisciplinary courses across multiple departments, schools and colleges in the case of jointly appointed faculty.
- 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.

The Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering Department faculty engage in highly interdisciplinary work that is attractive to graduate students who are pursuing graduate degrees in disciplines other than Civil Engineering. Evaluation and performance as an advisor and mentor of graduate students shall consider all students for whom the candidate serves as major advisor or major co-advisor in programs at OSU.

b Scholarship

Scholarship is broadly defined to include discovery, scholarly and creative work, applied research, and the scholarship of pedagogy. ([Faculty Rule 3335-6-02\(A\)](#)). More specifically, scholarship may be defined to include the possession, application, and advancement of a body of knowledge gained through research, study, and learning. The College Mission states that the College and the Knowlton School of Architecture will “provide new knowledge that can be assimilated by our customers and partners” and “create and disseminate new ideas and concepts that expand our understanding of science, engineering and architecture.”

Scholarly activities will be specific to CEGE or TIUs to which a candidate has been appointed and may include:

- publishing scholarly works such as books and monographs, chapters in edited books, bulletins and technical reports, peer reviewed journal articles, editor reviewed journal articles, reviews and abstracts, papers in proceedings;
- presenting lectures at universities, symposia, and conferences;
- submitting proposals;
- conducting and directing original research or other creative activities;
- editing books and collections of research works;
- developing software;
- producing peer reviewed creative works in exhibits, symposia, publication, and juried competitions;
- designing and/or supervising the construction of creative products (e.g., new building, alloy, machine, device, or software);
- developing and securing intellectual property such as patents, patent disclosures and licensing of university-developed intellectual property.

Evidence of scholarship will be specific to CEGE or TIUs to which a candidate has been appointed and may include the quantity, quality, and impact of the activities, for example:

- numbers of publications and citation analysis thereto in the context of the publishing landscape of each TIU discipline,
- numbers of presentations and invited lectures; amount of research funding in the context of the funding landscape of the TIU discipline;
- placing in juried competitions;
- number of patents, licenses and licensing revenue, awards, prizes, and other forms of professional recognition;
- letters of evaluation by peers at the national and international level.

In the case of jointly appointed faculty, care must be taken to consider impacts across multiple fields. This is particularly important in cases where the research focus may deviate from what would be considered conventional work for the primary appointment TIU, and may require evaluations from referees outside of the primary appointment discipline.

Candidates are expected to have produced a 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 and appropriate flexibility must be exercised in the case of jointly appointed faculty. 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 of the candidate's contribution must be made.
- A demonstrated ability to obtain and potential to sustain research program funding, in disciplines where it is appropriate. 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 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, 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 Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering Department. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, this vision should include considerations of the research strategies of the TIUs to which the candidate has been appointed.
- Additional criteria can be important in documenting the Scholarship of Engagement. For example, the quantity, strength and impact on stakeholders can take a variety of forms such as the

enactment of related legislation, adoption of innovations and/or widespread changes in professional practice. Publications that translate research for practitioners, entrepreneurs, business/industry leaders and/or policy makers are valued in the Scholarship of Engagement.

- 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.

c Service

Service, or public service as stated in the mission of the University, is broadly defined to include administrative service to the University, professional service to the faculty member's discipline, and the provision of disciplinary expertise to public or private entities beyond the university ([Faculty Rule 3335-6-02\(A\)](#)). The College Mission states that the College and the Knowlton School of Architecture will "promote and support the purposes of the entire university."

Evidence of administrative service to the University can include:

- appointment or election to TIU, College, and/or University committees;
- administrative positions held and superior organizational leadership;
- mentoring activities.

Evidence of professional service to the faculty member's discipline can include:

- editorships of or service as a reviewer for journals or other learned publications;
- offices held and other service to professional societies;
- development of mechanisms to help bring people into the profession; and
- organization of and service to conferences, workshops and symposia.

Evidence of the provision of expertise to public and private entities beyond the University includes:

- reviewer of proposals;
- external examiner;
- service on panels and commissions;
- professional consultation to industry, government, and education.

Professional expertise provided as a compensated outside professional service alone is insufficient to satisfy the service criterion.

Candidates are expected to have:

- Made contributions to the governance and advancement of the department/school in a collegial manner that facilitates positive contributions by others, and
- Made useful contributions to the College, the University, industry, and/or civic community.
- Made useful contributions to the profession.

The impacts and associated responsibilities of service activities are anticipated to increase in responsibility with promotion in rank from assistant professor to associate professor to professor. For example, institutional service of assistant professors will likely consist primarily of department service.

The quality and quantity of service and its importance relative to teaching and scholarship are evaluated in the context of the individual faculty member's distribution of effort. For candidates whose duties are mainly administrative in nature, superior administrative service that clearly enhances the effectiveness of the institution may be a primary and leading professional contribution that should be highly valued.

2 Promotion to Professor

All tenure track faculty must be engaged in teaching, the development of the Department and College academic program, the mentoring of students, the development of a record of scholarship, service both on campus and off thereby demonstrating a commitment to citizenship and collegiality.

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 like those for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and increasing quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national and international reputation in the field, using evidence outlined in Section VI.A.1. When assessing a candidate's national and international reputation in the field, creative activities in outreach and engagement should be valued in addition to scholarly and teaching activities.

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 the scholarship of leadership to make visible and demonstrable impact upon the mission of the department, college and university.

3 Practice Faculty

Practice Faculty vary considerably in their roles in the college, entirely in keeping with enhancing the teaching mission of the University and the College of Engineering. University Faculty Rules ([3335-7-01](#)) specify that:

These faculty are teacher/practitioners and shall be engaged primarily in teaching activities related to: a) courses or instructional situations involving live patients or live clients, b) courses or instructional situations involving the simulation of live patients or live clients, c) courses or instructional situations involving professional skills, or d) teaching.

Teaching, as defined in the University Faculty Rules ([3335-6-02\(A\)\(2\)](#)), includes, "didactic classroom, non-classroom and distance instruction, extension and continuing education, advising, and supervising or mentoring students or postdoctoral scholars." Within these parameters, practice faculty develop a path to promotion in keeping with their unique skills and contributions to the mission of the college and University. Examples of these possible paths include: primary engagement in classroom teaching, in undergraduate research mentoring, relationships with industry to enhance problem-based and entrepreneurially minded learning, leadership in academic program development, engaged scholarship

with external communities, and engagement with professional practice.

Promotion to Professional Practice Associate Professor in the College of Engineering requires that a faculty member show convincing evidence of excellence as a teacher and a provider of effective service; have a documented high level of competence in professional practice; and display the potential for continuing a program of high-quality teaching and service relevant to the mission of the department. Specific criteria in teaching and service for promotion to professional practice associate professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

For consistency with the CEGE Department expectations of professional practice faculty contributions to the department, as detailed in Section IV (C) (2) of the CEGE APT Document, the following guidelines are applied to interpret practice faculty accomplishments:

- *Teaching activities should reflect or integrate civil, environmental and/or geodetic engineering practice. Example activities include introducing tools of practice, grounding student assessments (homework and design projects) in real-world scenarios, introducing case histories and contemporary issues into the curriculum, introducing professional conventions, developing student professionalism and other appropriate integration of practice into the classroom. Evidence of these activities may include student assignments, design projects and student work.*
- *Other teaching activities may include revising or developing new courses and programs and relationships with industry.*
- *Practice faculty may be engaged in collaboration with other CEGE faculty to integrate aspects of the current state of practice into courses taught by other CEGE faculty. Examples include consultation on development of class modules and/or assignments.*
- *Mentoring students can include activities to develop student professional skills, cultivation of internship, practitioner mentoring, and other opportunities for students in conjunction with the CEGE Student Advising team and COE Engineering Career Services.*
- *Advising and mentoring graduate students is not required, although practice faculty may choose to serve as associate advisors to Master student committees.*
- *Outreach and engagement activities may include serving as a liaison of the CEGE Department to the professional community.*
- *Other service activities may include involvement in industry career preparation, presentation of short courses, active involvement in professional organizations (ASCE, ACI, etc.) or as a committee member, active participation or organization of technical conferences or panels (ASCE, ASEE, ACI, etc.), reviewer or panelist (TRB, NSF, etc.), involvement in ABET such as qualification as an evaluator.*
- *With consideration of the practice faculty member's teaching assignments, there is an expectation for participation in scholarly endeavors or other creative works related to CEGE. Such products would be expected to reflect topics including but not limited to student training and pedagogy or the state of professional practice with dissemination through conference proceedings, published case histories or studies, published design guidelines, or other appropriate venues.*

Promotion to Professional Practice Professor in the College of Engineering requires that a faculty member have a record of continuing professional growth and increasing quality of contributions, including a sustained record of excellence in teaching and professional practice; a sustained record of mentoring students, continued contribution to the outreach and engagement mission of the Department, College, and University that is recognized at the national and/or international level, proven leadership in service, professional practice, and/or teaching at the national and/or international level and production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice.

Evaluations for promotion to the rank of Professional Practice Professor will consider CEGE Department Clarification of Criteria as specified above for Professional Practice Associate Professor appointments; however, a sustained record of superior accomplishments in teaching and service is required for appointment to the rank of Professional Practice Professor.

With consideration of the practice faculty member's teaching assignments, there is an expectation for sustained record of scholarly endeavors or other creative works related to CEGE. Expected products are as described above for Professional Practice Associate Professor appointments.

Evidence of professional growth and stature at the national and/or international level may include specialty licensure or designation (e.g. SE and GE from certain states), appointment as a Diplomate (e.g. ASCE Institutes) or ABET evaluator, and recognition from professional organizations (e.g., becoming a Fellow of ASCE).

With consideration of the practice faculty member's teaching assignments, evidence of leadership in external and internal service is expected. Examples of service may include chairing a committee, leading curriculum development, serving as chair of a major national committee (e.g., ASCE) or governor for national professional society activities, serving as a delegate to international societies, editorships or associate editorships, serving as an ABET Commissioner.

4 Research Faculty

Promotion to Research Associate Professor in the College of Engineering requires excellence in scholarship. There is an expectation of a record of significant external support for research and a substantial probability that external support for research will continue along with student research mentoring. The claim that retention of the candidate will improve the overall scholarly quality and standing of the unit needs to be supported.

Promotion to Research Professor in the College of Engineering requires excellence in scholarship. There is an established record of significant external support for research and a substantial probability that external support for research will continue. Faculty must have mentored graduate students to develop their research capabilities and demonstrated leadership in service relevant to the mission of their department. The claim that promotion of the candidate will improve the overall scholarly quality and standing of the unit needs to be supported.

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 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 have an established and sustained record of effective teaching as described for tenure-track faculty and curriculum innovation, such as including revision of courses or development of new courses.

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

B Procedures

The college'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 and all TIUs in the college.

1 Tenure-Track, Practice, and Research Faculty

a. Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion are responsible for (1) submitting a complete, accurate dossier and (2) indicating the APT under which they wish to be reviewed. If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for (3) reviewing the list of potential external evaluators compiled for their case according to departmental guidelines. Each of these elements is described in detail below.

Dossier

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

While the Promotion and Tenure Committee makes reasonable efforts to check the dossier for accuracy and completeness, the candidate bears full responsibility for all parts of the dossier that are to be completed by him or her.

The time period for **teaching** documentation 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 documentation include:

- Cumulative eSEI (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) reports 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 X 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. All scholarship outcomes will be reviewed for increasing independence over time. There should also be an increasing trajectory of significant scholarly outcomes over time. . Examples of documentation include:

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

The time period for **service** documentation included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or nonprobationary faculty it is normally 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 documentation include:

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

- *By March 15, non-mandatory candidates must inform the P&T committee of their intention to be considered for promotion in the upcoming promotion cycle, and submit their university compliant dossier to the P&T committee.*
- *For all candidates, the deadline for submission of CV for external evaluators is June 1 and updated university compliant dossier is August 1.*
- *By August 1, provide a first page of all peer-reviewed articles and books facilitating the P&T Committee's requirement to ensure correctness of dossier information.*
- *Candidates are responsible for creating a Google Scholar page that is reflective of a candidate's scholarly work and available to the voting body during the review period. Google Scholar information is but one form of information helpful in identifying scholarly quality and impact. In no instance will Google Scholar information such as an h-index be taken without other indicators of scholarly quality and impact and without putting such numbers into appropriate context to the candidate's field of research.*

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document

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

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

External Evaluations (see also External Evaluations below)

As noted above, if external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the Department Chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The Department Chair decides whether removal is justified.

Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering Clarification of Criteria:
The CEGE Promotion and Tenure Committee does not disclose the list of external evaluators to candidates while external reviewers are in the process of preparing their letters. Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit external evaluations or initiate contact in any way with potential 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 (such as 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.

Prior to developing the list, the CEGE Promotion and Tenure Committee requests from candidates a list of up to three names of "arm's length" experts who can potentially serve as external reviewers. Additionally, candidates are requested to supply a list of collaborators, such as required in an NSF

grant submission, to minimize conflicts of interest in the external review process. Candidates may also request up to two potential reviewers to NOT be included, if substantive reasons are provided for consideration by the Department Chair. The CEGE Promotion and Tenure Committee uses the candidate's input, in consultation with the Department Chair, to develop a list of potential external evaluators. Per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (B) (3) "no more than one-half of the letters contained in the final dossier should be from persons suggested by the candidate". A minimum of five external letters is required for a case to proceed through review.

b TIU Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

The sections that follow provide a complete description of responsibilities of all participants in the departmental review process in the CEGE Department: the CEGE Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Committee of Eligible Faculty and the Department Chair.

As detailed in the CEGE Pattern of Administration, the CEGE Department has a Promotion and Tenure Committee, normally consisting of three professors. Additional members may be added to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The committee's chair and membership are appointed by the Department Chair. The term of service is three years, with reappointment possible. The responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are as follows:

- To review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place.
 - The Promotion and Tenure Committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's dossier 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 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 only once. Faculty Rules [3335-7-08](#) and [3335-7-36](#) make the same provision for nonprobationary 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 Promotion and Tenure Committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the Department Chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- To conduct the review process annually, according to the following timeline, to allow for administrative support throughout the review process:
 - May 1: Select from among the Promotion and Tenure Committee 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.
 - June 1: Suggest names of external evaluators to the Department Chair. The Department Chair solicits external review letters over the summer so that they are available for the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

- *Late summer: 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 but completeness ultimately rests with the candidate.*
- *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, research and service to provide to the Committee of Eligible Faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The Promotion and Tenure Committee does not take a position in presenting its analysis of the record.*
- *Revise the draft analysis of each case following the meeting of the eligible faculty, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair.*
- *The written evaluation should be a narrative document that provides clear rationale as to why the candidate's accomplishments merit the expectations assessed. The candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship and service (as appropriate to appointment type) are each individually assessed to "meet expectations," "exceed expectations" or be "below expectations." Additionally, an overall assessment of the candidate's accomplishments is indicated to "meet expectations," "exceed expectations" or be "below expectations" with narrative rationale provided for this overall assessment.*
- *Provide a written response, on behalf of the Committee of Eligible Faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.*
- *Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure initiating unit is another department. The Committee of 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.*

c Committee of Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

- *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 Committee of 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

- *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.*
- *March 15: To appoint the P&T committee for the next academic year.*
- *Late Spring Semester: To solicit external evaluations from a list including names suggested by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Chair and the candidate. (Also see EXTERNAL*

EVALUATIONS below.)

- *To solicit an evaluation from a TIU head of any TIU in which the candidate has a joint appointment.*
- *To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the Committee of 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 Committee of Eligible Faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review. Conflicts of Interest are defined in Section III (A) (5) of the CEGE APT Document.*
- *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 Promotion and Tenure Committee's completed evaluation and recommendation.*
- *To meet with the Committee of 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 Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Committee of Eligible Faculty, and the Department Chair*
 - *Of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, Committee of 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 he or she expects to submit comments.*
- *To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrant response for inclusion in the dossier.*
- *To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline.*
- *To receive the Promotion and Tenure Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the Department Chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the Department Chair of the other tenure initiating unit by the date requested.*

2 Procedures for Associated Faculty

Adjunct faculty and associated faculty with tenure-track titles for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed in Section 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. Positive recommendations from the dean likewise do not proceed to the executive vice president and provost.

3 External Evaluations – Tenure Track, Practice Faculty, Research Faculty and Associated Faculty

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 appointment contract renewals and promotion reviews. External evaluations of scholarly activity and research are not obtained for practice or associated faculty unless the faculty member has

1 been involved in a significant amount of scholarship. The decision to seek external evaluations of the
 2 scholarship of a practice or associated faculty member will be made by the department chair after
 3 consulting with the candidate and the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

4
 5 External evaluations that assess the quality and impact of practice faculty candidates under consideration
 6 for promotion are to be obtained. The source and content of external evaluations for practice faculty
 7 promotion candidates should reflect the contributions expected of practice faculty members. External
 8 evaluations should address the extent and quality of teaching as characterized by internal and external
 9 evaluations of instruction and the quality of contributions through outreach and engagement with industry,
 10 the educational community and the broad community of practitioners as appropriate for the individual
 11 under review. Evaluations should also address the extent and quality of professional service to the
 12 Department, College and University. External evaluations need not be restricted to national or
 13 international peers, but should derive from authoritative and reputable sources qualified to comment
 14 substantively on the contributions and accomplishments of the faculty member.

15
 16 A minimum of five credible and useful evaluations must be obtained. A credible and useful evaluation
 17 has the following two characteristics:

- 18 • Is written by a person who is a non-Ohio-State employee and who is highly qualified to judge
 19 the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, as relevant), who is not a close personal
 20 friend, research collaborator, former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the
 21 candidate. The department will solicit evaluations only from distinguished evaluators--
 22 professors at full rank at institutions comparable to Ohio State or non-academics who have
 23 similar credentials and experience. For example, an evaluator could be a top person from
 24 industry or another type of institution, so long as the "distinguished" criterion is met. The
 25 biographical information provided on the cover sheet for external evaluations should provide
 26 a compelling and explicit justification of the appropriateness of each evaluator. In the case of
 27 an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the
 28 evaluations may come from distinguished associate professors. For consideration of an
 29 associate professor seeking promotion to the rank of professor, all of the evaluations must be
 30 from a professor or equivalent (in the case of an evaluator from another type of institution or
 31 industry).
- 32
 33 • Provides enough analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A
 34 letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to
 35 perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an
 36 evaluator on the merits of the case.

37
 38 As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee,
 39 the Department Chair of the primary appointment, and the candidate. In cases of jointly appointed faculty,
 40 additional evaluators may be suggested by the Department Chair of the secondary appointment TIU as
 41 appropriate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is
 42 requested from at least one of those persons. [Faculty Rule 3335-6-04](#) requires that no more than half the
 43 external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event
 44 that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs
 45 nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

46
 47 The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format for letters requesting external
 48 evaluations. A sample letter for tenure-track faculty can be found [here](#). A sample letter for practice faculty
 49 can be found [here](#).

Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit evaluations or initiate contact in any way with evaluators for any purpose related to the promotion review. If an 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.

Since the Department cannot control who agrees to write and/or the usefulness of the letters received, additional letters are sought as 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.

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) including collection of open-ended narrative comments is required in every course offered in this college. 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.

B Peer Evaluation of Teaching

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

Annually the Department Chair appoints a Peer Review of Teaching Committee. The responsibilities of the Peer Review of Teaching Committee are as follows:

- To review the teaching of probationary tenure track and practice faculty at least once per year during the first two years of service, and at least twice more before the commencement of the mandatory tenure review, 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 nonprobationary professional practice associate professors at least once every other year, with the goal of having at least two peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion review
- To review the teaching of tenured professors and nonprobationary professional professors at least once every four years with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned during the year of the review
- To review the teaching of Lecturers at least once per year during the first two years of service and at least once every other year until the Lecturer has been appointed for eight years, after which reviews will occur once every four years
- To review Adjunct Faculty members at least once during the first two years of service, and at least once per three course offerings for the remaining years of service.
- To review, upon the Department Chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.
- To review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The Department Chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the [Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#).

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

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations (the first three situations listed above) are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instruction materials. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, the class visitation is conducted by one or more senior peers whom the promotion and tenure Chair has identified in consultation with the candidate. The peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to establish a time for the visit and to understand the goals of the course and the candidate's teaching philosophy. If possible, the peer reviewer should attend two different class sessions over the course of the semester.

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

The Peer Review of Teaching Committee will be chaired by the CEGE Associate Chair and consist of all assigned peer teaching reviewers for the current academic year. The Chair of the Peer Review of Teaching Committee will recommend an annual review plan to the Department Chair for the peer review activity expected that year. Reasonable effort will be made to distribute these peer reviews among the tenured faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage attention to the quality

1 *of teaching in the department. A peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty*
2 *member being reviewed.*

3

4 *The peer teaching process will be developed and sustained by the Peer Review of Teaching Committee*
5 *using resources from the [Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning](#). Sample review forms are*
6 *provided in Appendix B.*

7

Appendix A

Example letter of offer for faculty courtesy appointment



THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

College of Engineering

Department of Civil, Environmental and
Geodetic Engineering

470 Hitchcock Hall
2070 Neil Avenue
Columbus, OH 43210-1275

Phone: (614) 292-2771
Fax: (614) 292-3780

ceg.osu.edu

DATE

On behalf of the faculty of the Department of Civil, Environmental and Geodetic Engineering (CEG), I am pleased to extend to you a non-salaried non-voting courtesy appointment in the rank of xxxx (the current rank of the faculty in his/her TIU). This department has requirements and expectations for faculty participation in program activities, fulfillment of which is reviewed every three years. A statement of these expectations is as follows:

- You may serve as the MS and Ph.D. advisor for CEG graduate students, and if you choose to accept CEG graduate students into your research group, you will be required to provide evidence that you are able to provide appropriate laboratory space, research supplies and stipend support.
- The other purpose of your appointment is to continue to stimulate scientific interactions between yourself and another faculty in our Department. For example, we strongly encourage you and members of your group to attend the Departmental student and faculty seminars.
- We would value your participation in serving on MS and Ph.D. advisory committees for students in the CEG Graduate Program, and in more formal teaching efforts that would take advantage of your expertise as appropriate.

Sincerely,

Signature

APPENDIX B – Peer Review of Teaching Forms**I. Background Information**

Name of Instructor:

Name of Evaluator:

Date and Time of Observation:

Location of Class:

Course Observed:

Please have the instructor who is being observed complete Part II before you observe the class.

II. Class Planning

1. What are the learning goals for the observed class session?

2. What is the plan for the class period to achieve the goals?

3. What, if any, specific concerns do you have about the class (e.g. common misconceptions, particularly difficult concepts, etc.) or special considerations you apply when presenting the material to this group of students?

4. How well-prepared for class are students on a typical day?

5. What is the students' general attitude toward the coursework/class?

III. Observations

Please fill out the table below providing comments where needed for clarity.

Criteria	Poor to Excellent	Comments
Organization:		
1. Explains how current lesson relates to previous/future work	1 2 3 4 5	
2. Clearly outlines goals of class period	1 2 3 4 5	
3. Planned activities take into account students' prior knowledge	1 2 3 4 5	
4. Anticipates and addresses potential student pitfalls and questions	1 2 3 4 5	
Variety and Pacing:		
1. Listens to student effectively throughout the entire class period	1 2 3 4 5	
2. Manages time for participation/active learning	1 2 3 4 5	
3. Incorporates various teaching approaches to address different learning styles	1 2 3 4 5	
4. Keeps students engaged and on task	1 2 3 4 5	
Presentation Skills:		
1. Confidence and projection	1 2 3 4 5	
2. Clarity of speaking and explanation	1 2 3 4 5	
3. Positive attitude toward material and activities	1 2 3 4 5	
Content Knowledge:		
1. Communicates the reasoning behind operations or concepts	1 2 3 4 5	
2. Relates theories and concepts to practical issues	1 2 3 4 5	

IV. Overall Summary/Suggestions

Please answer each of the questions below for this instructor. This information can be used to create a free form letter addressing the peer evaluation of teaching.

1. Overall Strengths (What are the instructor's strengths as a teacher?)

2. Areas for Improvement and Professional Growth (What suggestions do you have for the instructor, both generally as a teacher and specifically for working with this particular group of students in this course?)

3. Additional Feedback (Provide any other feedback you believe will be helpful to the instructor.)

Course Material Checklist

Course: _____ **Instructor:** _____ **Date:** _____

Rank responses to each of the topics and provide additional comments below the table.

1. Course content includes the appropriate topics					
2. Course content reflects the current state of the field					
3. Course learning objectives are clear and appropriate					
4. Course policies and rules are clear and appropriate					
5. Lecture notes are well-organized and clearly written					
6. Supplemental handouts and web pages are well-organized and clearly written					
7. Assignments are consistent with objectives and appropriately challenging					
8. Tests are consistent with learning objectives and appropriately challenging					
9. Tests are clearly written and reasonable in length					
10. Student products demonstrate satisfaction of learning objectives					

What are the strengths of the course materials?

What could have been improved