

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures for The Ohio State University Department of Computer Science and Engineering

Approved by the Faculty: 20 June 2025

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs: 20 August 2025

Table of Contents

I	Preamble	5
II	Departmental Mission	5
III	Definitions.....	6
III.A	Committee of the Eligible Faculty	6
III.A.1	Tenure-track Faculty	6
III.A.2	Professional Practice Faculty	6
III.A.3	Research Faculty	7
III.A.4	Associated Faculty: Adjunct professor appointments (any rank)	7
III.A.5	Associated Faculty: Lecturers and Senior Lecturers	8
III.A.6	Conflict of Interest	8
III.A.7	Minimum Composition	9
III.B	Promotion and Tenure Committee.....	9
III.C	Quorum	9
III.D	Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty	9
III.D.1	Appointment	10
III.D.2	Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion	10
IV	Appointments	10
IV.A	Criteria	10
IV.A.1	Tenure-track Faculty	10
IV.A.2	Professional Practice Faculty	12
IV.A.3	Research Faculty	14
IV.A.4	Associated Faculty	14
IV.A.5	Regional Campus Faculty	16
IV.A.6	Emeritus Faculty	16
IV.A.7	Joint Appointments	17
IV.A.8	Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	17
IV.B	Procedures	17
IV.B.1	Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus	18
IV.B.2	Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus	20
IV.B.3	Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus	20
IV.B.4	Transfer from the Tenure Track.....	20
IV.B.5	TIU Transfer	20

IV.B.6	Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	21
IV.B.7	Regional Campus Faculty	21
IV.B.8	Joint Appointments	22
IV.B.9	Courtesy Appointments for Faculty	22
V	Annual Performance and Merit Review	22
V.A	Documentation	23
V.B	Probationary Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	24
V.B.1	Fourth Year Review	24
V.B.2	Extension of the Tenure Clock	25
V.C	Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	25
V.D	Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus	26
V.E	Research Faculty on Columbus Campus	27
V.F	Associated Faculty on Columbus Campus	28
V.G	Regional Campus Faculty	28
V.H	Salary Recommendations.....	29
VI	Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	29
VI.A	Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion	30
VI.A.1	Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	30
VI.A.2	Promotion to Professor	35
VI.A.3	Promotion of Professional Practice Faculty.....	36
VI.A.4	Promotion of Research Faculty.....	40
VI.A.5	Associated Faculty	41
VI.A.6	Regional Campus Faculty	41
VI.B	Procedures.....	42
VI.B.1	Tenure-Track Faculty, Professional Practice Faculty, and Research Faculty	42
VI.B.2	Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus	49
VI.B.3	Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty.....	49
VI.B.4	External Evaluations	49
VII	Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals	51
VIII	Seventh Year Review.....	52
IX	Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation.....	52
IX.A	Student Evaluation of Teaching.....	52
IX.B	Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	52

Appendix 1	Promotion and Tenure Nonmandatory Reviews, Committee Voting Procedures, and Review Schedules	54
	Nonmandatory Reviews for Promotion and Tenure or for Promotion	54
	Promotion and Tenure Committee Voting Procedures	54
	Summary of Normal Promotion and Tenure Schedules	54
Appendix 2	Publication Strategies for CSE Faculty	55

I Preamble

This document is a supplement to the general descriptions of appointment, promotion, and tenure (AP&T) criteria, procedures, and documentation that are outlined in the [Rules of the University Faculty](#) and the [Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). It specifically elaborates details of the AP&T criteria, procedures, and documentation outlined in Chapter 6 of the Rules of the University Faculty ([Rules of the University Faculty Concerning Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure](#)); Chapter 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty ([Rules of the University Faculty Concerning Clinical Faculty and Research Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Nonappointment, and Promotion](#)); the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews (see the current [Promotion and Tenure Review](#)); and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the department and its faculty are subject.

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

Changes to this document that solely implement changes in policies and procedures of the college or university may be made by the department chairperson in consultation with the faculty. Changes initiated by the department will be first recommended by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and then approved by the faculty and department chairperson before submission to the college. All changes must be approved by the Office of Academic Affairs.

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

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

Decisions considering appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the university's [policy on equal employment opportunity](#).

II Departmental Mission

The Department of Computer Science and Engineering will be a national leader in impactful computing research and education. We will create, teach, and actualize the principles that connect computing and society while advancing the forefront of foundational computer science into various interdisciplinary realms. Through the active engagement of faculty and staff in innovative and highly ranked programs, we will train the next generation of computing professionals to be thoughtful and connective problem solvers. Our students, faculty, and staff will be drawn from wide-ranging backgrounds to build a culture wherein teamwork is the operational principle, respect for differences is the norm, and trust in others is a redeeming value. We will enable the university to fulfill its land grant mission and meet the needs of the

state of Ohio and the nation. We will work with key academic partners within and outside of OSU, and with key industrial partners, in pursuit of our research and educational endeavors.

III Definitions

III.A Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

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

III.A.1 Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

Initial appointment recommendations to the chair are determined by the standing faculty search committee as representatives of the eligible faculty.

Appointment Review. For an appointment (hiring) review of an assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, recommendations are made to the chair from the appropriate committee as in the first paragraph.

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 and the tenure reviews of probationary associate 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.

III.A.2 Professional Practice Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

Initial appointment recommendations to the chair are determined by the standing faculty search committee as representatives of the eligible faculty.

Appointment Review. For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a professional practice assistant professor, associate professor, or professor, recommendations are made to the chair from the appropriate committee as in the first paragraph.

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 professional practice faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested.

Reappointment and Promotion Reviews

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

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

For the subsequent reappointment of professional practice faculty, an ad hoc subcommittee of the appropriate eligible faculty will advise the chair on reappointment.

III.A.3 Research Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

During on-duty terms, initial appointment recommendations to the chair are determined by the standing faculty search committee as representatives of the eligible faculty. As departmental committees do not operate during off-duty terms, for appointments considered in off-duty terms, a special meeting of the tenure-track faculty and research faculty will be called to make the initial appointment recommendation to the chair.

Appointment Review. For an appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) review of a research assistant professor, associate professor, or professor recommendations are made to the chair from the appropriate committee as in the first paragraph.

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 and Promotion Reviews

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

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

For the subsequent reappointment of research faculty, an ad hoc subcommittee of the appropriate eligible faculty will advise the chair on reappointment.

III.A.4 Associated Faculty: Adjunct professor appointments (any rank)

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

The initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of associated faculty members with adjunct titles is decided by the department chair in consultation with the faculty search committee.

Initial appointments at senior rank require a vote by the eligible faculty (all tenured faculty and professional practice faculty of equal or higher rank than the position requested) and prior approval of the college dean.

Reappointments are decided by the department chair in consultation with an ad hoc subcommittee of the appropriate eligible faculty.

Promotion Reviews

Adjunct faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure.

For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with adjunct titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment, as described in Sections III.A.1, 2 or 3 above.

III.A.5 Associated Faculty: Lecturers and Senior Lecturers

Initial Appointment and Reappointment

Initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of lecturers and senior lecturers is decided by the department chair in consultation with an appointed lecturer search committee, chaired by an associate chair.

Reappointments are decided by the department chair in consultation with the associate chair(s).

Promotion Reviews

For the promotion review of a lecturer to senior lecturer, the eligible faculty shall be all tenure-track and non-probationary professional practice faculty at the rank of associate professor and professor.

III.A.6 Conflict of Interest

• Search Committee Conflict of Interest

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

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

• Eligible Faculty Conflict of Interest

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

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

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

III.A.7 Minimum Composition

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

III.B Promotion and Tenure Committee

The eligible faculty for any case constitute the Promotion and Tenure committee for the case, and these terms are synonymous throughout this document. Ad hoc subcommittees will be assigned as Liaison subcommittees for each case (see Section VI.B.1 for procedural details).

III.C Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. Faculty on approved leave are not considered for quorum unless they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

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

III.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 abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter. Faculty who did not attend the entire discussion of a case are not permitted to vote on that case.

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

III.D.1 Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty or search committee for appointment is secured when at least two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment TIU prior to his or her appointment.

III.D.2 Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion, is secured when at least two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

In the case of a joint appointment, the department must seek input from a candidate's joint-appointment TIU prior to his or her reappointment, promotion and/or tenure.

IV Appointments

IV.A Criteria

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

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

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

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

IV.A.1 Tenure-track Faculty

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-6-02](#), [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03](#), and [OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

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

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

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

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

An appointee to the rank of assistant professor will have strong potential to help the Department achieve its mission and to enhance its quality and reputation. Specifically, an appointee will have:

- demonstrated excellence in verbal and written communication;
- a record of high-quality research in the computing field;
- a potential for excellence in teaching, both in the classroom and in student advising;
- a potential for excellence in scholarship, associated primarily with research that enhances the state-of-the-art in computing;
- a potential for leadership in service, both to the profession and to the university;
- a potential for making contributions to broadening participation in the field of computing;
- an attitude conducive of good citizenship, including a commitment to interact with others in a professional, ethical, and constructive fashion; and
- strong potential to achieve tenure and advance through the tenure-track faculty ranks.

Associate Professor and Professor.

Appointments at the rank of associate professor or professor will be made consistent with the criteria for promotion to those ranks, as discussed in Sections VI.A.1 and VI.A.2, respectively. Generally, an initial appointment at one of these levels will require that the candidate has achieved higher and/or more

sustained levels of accomplishment in most of the above areas, as opposed to being based primarily on potential or on number of years of experience. Appointment at the rank of associate professor normally entails tenure. Probationary appointments at the rank of associate professor without tenure may be made in accordance with [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03-B-1](#). A probationary appointment at the rank of associate professor is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, such as when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor, with or without tenure, Professor with tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

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

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

IV.A.2 Professional Practice Faculty

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-7-05](#), [Faculty Rule 3335-7-07](#).

Professional practice faculty in the Department will develop, enhance, and teach courses and programs in the CSE department. Professional practice faculty will engage in either a practice path or a teaching path that defines their workload and expectations for reappointment and promotion.

Professional practice faculty will be designated at time of appointment as being either practice path or teaching path. Professional practice faculty may request changes of path in writing to the Chair. The Chair makes the decision whether to allow the change, and if so, the effective date of the change. Changes of path should reflect evolving duties of the faculty member and not be used to change the criteria for reappointment or promotion without adequate time to adjust to the change in duties.

Professional practice faculty on the practice path will focus on courses and programs that emphasize professional practice issues and incorporate practical design experience. They also may develop and teach courses designed for industry professionals seeking to advance their understanding of computing and especially its practice. In addition, professional practice faculty may engage in the development and delivery of technology transfer and consultative services for industry and for other academic units at OSU, primarily in the context of mentoring students in such activities.

Professional practice faculty on the teaching path will promulgate best practices in teaching by adopting these practices in their own classes, promoting these practices, and designing and redesigning course curricula and programs based on these practices. They may engage in disseminating such best practices to educators outside OSU, and participate in organizations and conferences that discuss such best practices. They may also experiment with and develop new pedagogical practices with the goal of improving computer science education. Finally, their service should focus on improving student experience, both inside and outside the classroom, including advising and supporting informal education and extracurricular student organizations and activities.

Professional practice faculty on either path may perform academic research in computer science, soliciting funded grants for such research and publishing in academic conferences and journals. They may also be engaged in developing and disseminating educational materials such as texts or recordings for broad audiences beyond OSU.

Professional practice faculty on either path will participate in faculty governance to the extent outlined in Section III.A.2 and in the Department's [Pattern of Administration](#) document. Professional practice faculty

will be referred to as “Professional Practice Assistant Professor”, “Professional Practice Associate Professor”, or “Professional Practice Professor.” The initial contract for all professional practice faculty members should be for a period of five years. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Subsequent contracts are non-probationary.

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

Professional Practice Assistant Professor

An appointee to the rank of professional practice assistant professor will have strong potential to help the Department achieve its mission and to enhance its quality and reputation, by contributing in the manner described in the previous paragraph.

Professional practice assistant professors on the practice path will have:

- a record of successful professional experience and productive activities in previous employment involving professional practice, indicating knowledge and capability in the appointee's area of specialization within computing;
- a potential for excellence in teaching courses involving professional practice in computing, both in the classroom and in student advising;
- a potential for leadership in service, both to the profession and to the university.

Professional practice assistant professors on the teaching path will have:

- a potential for excellence in teaching and in the adoption and promotion of best practices in teaching;
- a potential for leadership in the design of course curricula and programs,
- a potential for leadership in the support of extracurricular student activities and organizations;
- a potential for leadership in service in education, both within and outside the university.

In addition, professional practice assistant professors on either path will have:

- demonstrated excellence in verbal and written communication;
- a potential for making contributions to broadening participation in the field of computing;
- an attitude conducive of good citizenship, including a commitment to interact with others in a professional, ethical, and constructive fashion; and
- strong potential to advance through the professional practice faculty ranks.

Professional Practice Associate Professor, Professional Practice Professor

Appointments at the rank of professional practice associate professor or professional practice professor will be made generally consistent with the criteria for promotion to those ranks, as discussed in Section VI.A.3. Generally, an initial appointment at one of these levels will require that the candidate has achieved higher and/or more sustained levels of accomplishment in most of the above areas, as opposed to being based primarily on potential or on number of years of experience.

IV.A.3 Research Faculty

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-7-32](#), [Faculty Rule 3335-7-35](#).

Research faculty members in the Department are expected to focus their efforts on research. They will be expected to advise graduate students, and may participate in limited educational activities such as developing and teaching courses related to their research, but are not expected and will not be required to do the latter. They will participate in faculty governance to the extent outlined in Section III.A.3 and in the Department's [Pattern of Administration](#) document. Research faculty members will be referred to as "Research Assistant Professor", "Research Associate Professor", or "Research Professor".

Research Assistant Professor

An appointee to the rank of research assistant professor will have strong potential to help the Department achieve its mission and to enhance its quality and reputation, by contributing in the manner described in the previous paragraph. Specifically, an appointee will have:

- demonstrated excellence in verbal and written communication;
- a record of high-quality research in the computing field;
- a potential for excellence in advising of graduate students;
- a potential for excellence in scholarship, associated primarily with research that enhances the state-of-the-art in computing;
- a potential for leadership in service, both to the profession and to the university;
- a potential for making contributions to broadening participation in the field of computing;
- an attitude conducive of good citizenship, including a commitment to interact with others in a professional, ethical, and constructive fashion; and
- strong potential to advance through the research faculty ranks.

Research Associate Professor, Research Professor

Appointments at the rank of research associate professor or research professor will be made generally consistent with the criteria for promotion to those ranks, as discussed in Section VI.A.4. Generally, an initial appointment at one of these levels will require that the candidate has achieved higher and/or more sustained levels of accomplishment in most of the above areas, as opposed to being based primarily on potential or on number of years of experience.

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

IV.A.4 Associated Faculty

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-5-19](#).

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

OAA requires an open search for new appointments or for appointment for associated faculty who have not worked for OSU in the last 17 months. Options to accelerate the position posting and review are listed on the [SHIFT](#) website, under Associate Faculty Accelerated Framework.

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Professor. Adjunct titles are used to confer faculty status on individuals who have credentials comparable to tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty of equivalent rank. The adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment. Adjunct appointments may be compensated or uncompensated. Adjunct faculty appointments are given to individuals who give academic service to the department, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Typically, the adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty, as appropriate to the appointment.

Lecturer. An appointee to a lecturer position will have strong potential to help the Department achieve its mission and to enhance its quality and reputation, by contributing to teaching. In addition, an appointee to a lecturer position normally will have an advanced degree in computing or a related field, or equivalent experience. When equivalent experience is used in place of an advanced degree, the appointment shall be reviewed and approved by OAA. Specifically, an appointee will have:

- the ability to communicate clearly in written and verbal form as demonstrated through application materials and interviews;
- a potential to deliver high quality teaching demonstrated through previous teaching experiences and interviews;
- a potential for making contributions to broadening participation in the field of computing; and
- an attitude conducive of good citizenship, including a commitment to interact with others in a professional, ethical, and constructive fashion.

Exceptions to lecturer appointment requirements may be granted by review and approval of the college and OAA. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for lecturers cannot exceed three years.

Senior Lecturer. An appointee to a senior lecturer position will have strong potential to help the Department achieve its mission and to enhance its quality and reputation, by contributing to teaching. In addition, an appointee to a senior lecturer position will have (1) an earned doctorate in the computing field, or in a closely-allied discipline appropriate to the appointee's area of specialization, (2) a master's degree and at least 5 years of teaching experience with documentation of high quality teaching, or (3) extensive experience (20+ years) in the computing field. When equivalent experience is used in place of an advanced degree, the appointment shall be reviewed and approved by OAA. Specifically, an appointee will have:

- the ability to communicate clearly in written and verbal form as demonstrated through application materials and interviews;
- a potential to deliver high quality teaching demonstrated through previous teaching experiences and interviews;
- a potential for making contributions to broadening participation in the field of computing; and

- an attitude conducive of good citizenship, including a commitment to interact with others in a professional, ethical, and constructive fashion.

Exceptions to lecturer/senior lecturer appointment requirements may be granted by review and approval of the college and OAA. Lecturers/Senior Lecturers are not eligible for tenure. The initial appointment for a senior lecturer cannot exceed one year. Second and subsequent contracts for senior lecturers cannot exceed three years.

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor.

Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or uncompensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. Visiting faculty appointments may be renewed annually for only three consecutive years.

IV.A.5 Regional Campus Faculty

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-6-02](#).

In recognition of the differing mission of the regional campuses, for regional campus tenure-track faculty and professional practice faculty appointments, relatively less weight will be placed on the quantity of an applicant's scholarship compared to Columbus campus appointments and more emphasis will be placed on teaching potential or excellence. The quality of scholarship of regional campus appointments is expected to be comparable to that of Columbus appointments.

Research faculty appointed at Regional Campuses must meet the same expectations for appointment and promotion as research faculty on Columbus campus.

IV.A.6 Emeritus Faculty

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

Various offices within the university offer perquisites to emeritus faculty. Some of these include, but are subject to the discretion of the unit and modification at any time:

- Emeritus parking free of charge (application provided by the BOT).
- Emeritus permanent university ID card permitting library privileges.
- Continuing use of OSU email account (requested by calling the Office of Technology and Digital Innovation's Help Line at 614-688-4357).
- Reduced membership fee offered by the Faculty Club.
- Use of recreational facilities on same basis as university faculty.
- Athletic tickets, including football ticket applications, offered by the Department of Athletics at university faculty prices.

- Emeritus faculty are eligible to receive campus-wide news publications issued by the university.
- At the discretion of the TIU and/or college, emeritus faculty may attend certain faculty meetings without vote. Unit Patterns of Administration provide information about the participation of emeritus faculty in faculty meetings. Emeritus faculty may not participate in meetings involving personnel decisions.
- Use of hotel contracts and car rental contracts with OSU/Big Ten.
- The provision of office space, secretarial support, office supplies, and technology use, either at retirement or anytime thereafter, at the sole discretion of each TIU and/or college.

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

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

IV.A.7 Joint Appointments

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

IV.A.8 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

Courtesy appointments are no-salary joint appointments for Ohio State faculty from other tenure-initiating units. Candidates for such appointments will have significant experience in computing, and will be ready and able to engage effectively with the Department's faculty in activities that help the Department achieve its mission and enhance its quality and reputation. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

IV.B Procedures

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, professional practice, research, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the [SHIFT](#) Framework for faculty recruitment. All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university's system of record for faculty and staff. A formal review and selection process, including interviews using pre-designed

evaluation rubrics, is required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in [Workday](#) to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

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

- recruitment of tenure-track, professional practice, 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

For all tenure track faculty, professional practice faculty, and research faculty appointments on the Columbus campus, a Faculty Search Committee, appointed by the Department Chair, shall be responsible for conducting searches for new faculty members, in compliance with university policies.

Prior to any search, members of all search committees must undergo training as specified in the College of Engineering [APT document](#) (Section IV.C). In addition, all employees/faculty involved in the hiring must review and acknowledge recruitment and selection guidelines as specified in the College of Engineering APT document.

IV.B.1 Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

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

The department chair annually appoints a standing search committee consisting of three or more faculty who coordinate the activity across all active searches. For any search, the search committee will appoint subcommittees of three or more faculty that reflect the field of expertise that is the focus of the search. These faculty need not be members of the standing faculty search committee.

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

The [SHIFT Framework](#) serves as a centrally coordinated guideline and toolkit to support the entire process of faculty recruitment with clear engagement from all participating stakeholders involved in the faculty hiring process. This framework is intended to provide faculty engaged in search committees and staff providing support services with the tools and support needed to attract excellent applicant pools, conduct consistent and equitable evaluations, and successfully hire and properly onboard new faculty

members who will continue our tradition of academic excellence. This framework consists of six phases, each targeting a specific stage of the recruitment process:

- “Phase 1 | Search Preparation & Proactive Recruitment” is the earliest stage in the search process. Key steps during this phase include determining faculty needs for the unit, creating a search strategy (including timeline), establishing a budget, and identifying additional partners to include in the process. The steps in this phase provide guidance on forming committees, detail training requirements for search committee members, and innovative approaches to advertising and outreach. This section also includes ideas and resources for developing qualified talent pools to ensure alignment with the university’s commitment to EEO principles and advance the eminence of the institution.
- “Phase 2 | Preliminary Review of Applicants” focuses on best practices for the application review and candidate screening processes. The guidelines and resources in this section support consistency and fairness in the review, assessment, and selection of candidates moving forward in the recruitment process. This section also outlines how to select a list of candidates for on-campus interviews.
- “Phase 3 | Finalists Interviews & Evaluations” provides guidance and tools for conducting interviews and campus visits, requesting reference letters (if not requested earlier in the application stage), and collecting feedback from everyone who interacted with the candidates. Adherence to the guidelines outlined in this section has a direct impact on enhancing the candidate experience and ensuring a consistent evaluation process. This phase concludes with the submission of a letter from the search committee to the TIU chair/director.
- “Phase 4 | Extend Offer” provides guidance and resources related to effectively selecting the most qualified candidate(s) for the position(s) and successfully negotiating to result in an accepted offer.
- “Phase 5 | Preboard and Onboard” offers resources to help prepare and support new faculty as they transition to Ohio State. The suggestions in this phase focus on creating a seamless transition for incoming faculty and their partners/families, if applicable.
- “Phase 6 | Reflect and Assess the Search” is a process supported by OAA to reflect on the hiring cycle each year and evaluate areas that may need improvement and additional support.

If the offer involves senior rank, the faculty search committee forwards a request for rank evaluation to the Promotion and Tenure committee chair. The eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. If the offer may involve prior service credit, the eligible faculty members vote on the appropriateness of such credit. Based on the vote of the eligible faculty, the Promotion and Tenure committee chair reports a recommendation on the appropriateness of the proposed rank or the appropriateness of prior service credit to the department chair. Appointment offers at the rank of Associate Professor, with or without tenure, Professor with tenure, and/or offers of prior service credit require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs.

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

The department should 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.

In case of searches that target jointly appointed faculty with CSE as the primary appointment TIU, the CSE faculty search committee must include at least one representative from all proposed TIUs. With such searches, the seminar presentation must be arranged by CSE, with attendance by relevant faculty from all proposed TIUs. Each proposed TIU must make a recommendation to the CSE Department chair on each interviewed candidate.

A tenure-track faculty appointment will be made by the Department chair, following approval by the dean of the College of Engineering. An offer to a foreign national will require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

IV.B.2 Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

Appointments of professional practice faculty must respect the limits on number of professional practice faculty provided by Faculty Rule [3335-7-03](#).

IV.B.3 Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

IV.B.4 Transfer from the Tenure Track

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

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

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

IV.B.5 TIU Transfer

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

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

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

IV.B.6 Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

Reappointment for compensated associated faculty (including faculty separated 17 months or less from the university) is decided by the department chair following consultation with an ad hoc subcommittee of the appropriate eligible faculty who are familiar with the candidate, the duties of the position and have interacted with the candidate in performance of the candidate's assigned duties.

For a compensated associated appointment that involves an adjunct or visiting faculty title, input also will be sought from the Faculty Search Committee (see the Department's [Pattern of Administration](#) document). Compensated appointment or reappointment of adjunct faculty will be for a period not to exceed three years FTE. Visiting appointments may be made for one term of up to three years or on an annual basis for up to three years.

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

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

IV.B.7 Regional Campus Faculty

The appointment of all compensated regional campus faculty follows a formal search following the [SHIFT](#) Framework, which includes a job posting in [Workday](#) and candidate interviews.

The hiring of regional campus faculty is initiated by the dean of the regional campus, since funding for such positions comes from these campuses. The regional campus faculty have the primary responsibility for determining the position description for a regional campus faculty search, but the regional campus should consult with and reach agreement on the description with the Department chair. The search committee for a regional campus position will include at least one member of the CSE Faculty Search Committee. Part of the interview process will be conducted on the Columbus campus. Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, department chair, and either the regional campus search committee or broader representation of the regional and Columbus faculties.. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. The CSE Faculty Search Committee will consider recommendations of the regional campus faculty search committee and make a recommendation to the Department chair. A decision to make an offer requires agreement by the department chair and regional campus dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the department chair and the regional campus dean.

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

A regional campus tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty appointment will be made jointly by the Department chair and the dean of the regional campus, following approval by the dean of the College of Engineering. An offer at the associate professor rank, with or without tenure, professor with tenure, or an offer of prior service credit, will require prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. An offer to a foreign national will require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs.

IV.B.8 Joint Appointments

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

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

IV.B.9 Courtesy Appointments for Faculty

A candidate for a courtesy appointment will be nominated initially by a tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty member in the Department. The Department chair, after consultation with the Faculty Search Committee and tenure-track faculty, will invite the candidate to make a public presentation of his/her research that highlights past and potential interactions with the Department's faculty.

A courtesy appointment or a courtesy reappointment will be made by the Department chair, following consultation with the Faculty Search Committee and tenure-track, professional practice and research faculty. Appointment or reappointment will be for a period not to exceed three years.

V Annual Performance and Merit Review

The department follows the requirements for the annual performance and merit review 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 for all probationary faculty, an opportunity for a face-to-face meeting for all other compensated faculty members, as well as a written assessment. According to the policy, the purposes of the review are to:

- 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 a faculty member's appointment type, the annual performance and merit review is based on expected performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or service as set forth in the

department's guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; on progress toward promotion where relevant.

The department chair may designate the responsibility for annual performance and merit reviews to appropriate unit administrators. The designee or a subcommittee of the eligible faculty may provide a written assessment to the department chair. However, unless the Office of Academic Affairs has granted an exception to a large unit, the chair must schedule a face-to-face meeting with all probationary faculty as part of the review. An opportunity for a face-to-face meeting with the department chair or the chair's designee must be provided to all tenured and non-probationary faculty.

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

The review of faculty with budgeted joint appointments must include input from the joint appointment TIU head for every annual evaluation cycle. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on goals specific to the individual in the joint unit.

Meritorious performance in teaching, scholarship, and service is assessed in accordance with the same criteria that form the basis for promotion decisions.

The chair is required (per Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#)) to include a reminder in the annual performance and merit 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.

V.A Documentation

Each faculty member, even one on leave, will be expected to prepare an **Annual Activity Report** detailing his/her professional activity over the past year. This report normally will be due in March. The Department chair will annually provide at least two weeks advance notice to all faculty of the exact due date of this material.

Faculty members must submit the following documents as part of the review:

- Office of Academic Affairs [dossier outline](#) (currently submitted through the [Faculty Activity Reporting](#) system).
- updated CV, which will be made available to all faculty in an accessible place

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.

Information from the Annual Activity Report will be used in annual evaluations as noted below, and in determining salary increases (see Section V.H). Supplementary information may be offered by the faculty member, or may be requested by the Department chair. The Annual Activity Report and any other materials submitted by the faculty member as part of the annual review will be included in that faculty member's personnel file.

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.

V.B Probationary Tenure-track Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-6-03](#).

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.

The Department chair will prepare a written annual review for each probationary tenure-track faculty member. This review will be conducted as follows:

- in the second year of the candidate's appointment, with the advice of the entire Promotion and Tenure Committee;
- in other years in which a more elaborate formal review is not required, with the advice of a subcommittee of the Promotion and Tenure Committee consisting of at least two members selected annually at a meeting of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

If the department chair recommends renewal of the appointment, this recommendation is final. The department chair's annual review letter to the faculty member renews the probationary appointment for another year and includes content on future plans and goals. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review. The department chair's 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 provided).

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.

A peer teaching evaluation will be conducted annually following the guidelines in Section IX.B.

For jointly appointed faculty with primary appointment in CSE, in preparing the annual review, the Department chair must also solicit feedback from the chairs/directors of all pertinent TIUs. For probationary tenure-track faculty members, professional practice faculty, and research faculty members, the written annual review must also be signed by the chairs/directors of all pertinent TIUs; any face-to-face meeting with the faculty member to discuss the annual review must include the chairs/directors or designees from all pertinent TIUs. In the case of probationary faculty, the meeting must also include some discussion of the relative requirements and progress for each TIU relative to the percent appointment to the TIU.

V.B.1 Fourth Year Review

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

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

5
6 The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty
7 votes on whether to renew the probationary appointment using the procedure given in Section VI.B.1.
8

9 The eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department
10 chair, who conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that
11 includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the
12 departmental review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#)) is followed and the case
13 is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or
14 nonrenewal.
15

16 If either the department chair or the dean recommends nonrenewal of a faculty member's probationary
17 contract, the case will be referred to the college's Promotion and Tenure Committee, which will review
18 the case, vote and make a recommendation to the dean. The dean makes the final decision regarding
19 renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.
20

21 **V.B.2 Extension of the Tenure Clock**

22

23 Faculty Rule [3335-6-03](#) (D) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure-track faculty
24 member may extend the probationary period. Faculty Rule [3335-6-03 \(E\)](#) does likewise for reducing the
25 probationary period. A faculty member remains on duty regardless of time extensions or reductions to the
26 probationary period, and annual reviews are conducted in every probationary year regardless of time
27 extended or reduced. Approved extensions or reductions do not limit the department's right to
28 recommend nonrenewal of appointment during an annual review.
29

30 **V.C Tenured Faculty on the Columbus Campus**

31

32 The Department chair will prepare a written annual review for each tenured faculty member. The review
33 will be based on relevant materials including the Annual Activity Report submitted by the faculty
34 member, and normally will be given to the faculty member before the end of Spring semester. The
35 review will summarize strengths and weaknesses, contain a clear statement of the area(s) of performance
36 needing improvement, and whenever possible suggest ways and means to bring about improved
37 performance.
38

39 For Associate Professors, the chair shall seek input from the Professor subcommittee of the Promotion
40 and Tenure committee every two years in order to provide advice for subsequent promotion. The chair
41 conducts an independent assessment; may meet with the faculty member to discuss their performance and
42 future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. The faculty member may
43 provide written comments on the review.
44

45 The annual review of Professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery
46 and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the tenure initiating unit, as demonstrated
47 by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including
48 their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to
49 the department, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional
50 development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be role models in their

academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest-ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty.

If an Associate Professor or 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.

The department chair is required (per Faculty Rule [3335-3-35](#)) 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.

A peer teaching evaluation will be conducted every three years for associate professors with tenure, and every five years for professors with tenure, following the guidelines in Section IX.B.

V.D Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus

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

The department chair will prepare a written annual review for each professional practice faculty of each rank. The review will be based on relevant materials including the Annual Activity Report submitted by the faculty member and normally will be given to the faculty member before the end of Spring semester. The review will summarize strengths and weaknesses, contain a clear statement of the area(s) of performance needing improvement, and whenever possible suggest ways and means to bring about improved performance.

For professional practice associate professors, the chair shall seek input from the professor subcommittee of the Promotion and Tenure committee every two years in order to provide advice for subsequent promotion.

The annual review of professional practice professors is based on their having achieved ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in development of academic programs; 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 role models in their academic work, interaction with colleagues and students, and in the recruitment and retention of junior colleagues. As the highest-ranking members of the faculty, the expectations for academic leadership and mentoring for professors exceed those for all other members of the faculty.

If a professional practice faculty 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.

The department chair will offer to meet with the faculty member to discuss the review (such a meeting is required for probationary faculty members), and the faculty member will be offered an opportunity to comment on the review. If necessary, the Department chair will prepare a response to the faculty

member's comments, and a copy of this new statement will be sent to the faculty member. A copy of all summary statements and responses, if any, will be included in the faculty member's personnel file.

In the penultimate year of appointment, the review process includes additional consultation from the eligible tenure track faculty and eligible professional practice faculty (Section III.A.2). For reappointment of probationary faculty (first appointment), a review will be conducted by the Promotion and Tenure committee utilizing 4th year review procedures for tenure track faculty (Section V.B.1). The Promotion and Tenure committee shall send a formal recommendation on reappointment to the chair. For subsequent reappointments of non-probationary faculty, the department chair shall appoint an *ad hoc* committee, a subset of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, consisting of both professional practice faculty and tenure-track faculty, selected by the department chair in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair. This *ad hoc* committee will review the cumulative performance of the faculty member whose appointment contract term is ending and will make recommendations to the department chair regarding whether the contract should be renewed, and if so whether the faculty member should be considered for promotion to the next professional practice faculty rank (in which case see Section VI).

If a professional practice faculty is promoted to Professional Practice Associate Professor or Professional Practice Professor, the department chair may choose to reappoint the faculty member with a new contract, even if the previous contract has not reached its penultimate year.

A peer teaching evaluation will be conducted annually for probationary professional practice faculty, every two years for non-probationary professional practice faculty below the rank of professor, and every four years for professional practice faculty at the professor rank, following the guidelines in Section IX.B.

V.E Research Faculty on Columbus Campus

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.

The department chair will prepare a written annual review for each research faculty member of each rank. The review will be based on relevant materials including the Annual Activity Report submitted by the faculty member, and normally will be given to the faculty member before the end of Spring semester. The review will summarize strengths and weaknesses, contain a clear statement of the area(s) of performance needing improvement, and whenever possible suggest ways and means to bring about improved performance.

The department chair will offer to meet with the faculty member to discuss the review (such a meeting is required for probationary faculty members), and the faculty member will be offered an opportunity to comment on the review. If necessary, the department chair will prepare a response to the faculty member's comments, and a copy of this new statement will be sent to the faculty member. A copy of all summary statements and responses, if any, will be included in the faculty member's personnel file.

In the penultimate year of appointment, the review process includes additional consultation from the eligible tenure track faculty and eligible research faculty (Section IV.A.3). For reappointment of probationary faculty (first appointment), a review will be conducted by the Promotion and Tenure committee utilizing 4th year review procedures for tenure track faculty (Section V.B). The Promotion and Tenure committee shall send a formal recommendation on reappointment to the chair. For subsequent reappointments of non-probationary faculty, the department chair shall appoint an *ad hoc* committee

consisting of both research faculty and tenure-track faculty. The former will be selected by the department chair. The latter will be a subset of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, selected by the department chair in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair. This *ad hoc* committee will review the cumulative performance of the faculty member whose appointment contract term is ending and will make recommendations to the department chair regarding whether the contract should be renewed, and if so whether the faculty member should be considered for promotion to the next research faculty rank (in which case see Section VI).

If a research faculty is promoted to Research Associate Professor or Research Professor, the department chair may choose to reappoint the faculty member with a new contract, even if the previous contract has not reached its penultimate year.

V.F Associated Faculty on Columbus Campus

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals.

The chair's decision on renewal of the appointment is final. If the decision is to renew, the chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

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

V.G Regional Campus Faculty

The annual performance and merit review of a regional campus probationary tenure-track or tenured faculty member is conducted on the regional campus. Following the review by the regional campus, the regional campus dean meets with the department chair for evaluation of a regional campus faculty member's research and creative activity during the review period. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice. The dean/director will provide the department chair a copy of a tenure-track or tenured faculty member's annual performance and merit review letter. For probationary tenure-track faculty, in the event that the regional campus dean recommends renewal and the department chair recommends nonrenewal, the case shall be reviewed by the college dean or their designee, with the college dean's or their designee's judgment prevailing.

The annual performance and merit review of regional campus professional practice faculty member is conducted on the regional campus, with input from the department chair if there is any scholarship activity. The dean/director will provide the department chair a copy of a professional practice faculty member's annual performance and merit review letter.

The annual performance and merit review of regional campus research faculty is conducted by the department and proceeds as described above for Columbus campus research faculty. The department chair

will provide the regional campus dean/director a copy of the faculty member's annual performance and merit review letter.

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

V.H Salary Recommendations

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

In formulating recommendations, the chair consults with the department Executive Committee. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the chair divides faculty into at least four groups based on continuing productivity (high, average, low, and unsatisfactory). The chair should proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in it. Salary increases should be based upon these considerations.

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

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

Faculty on leave for part or all of an academic year will be evaluated without prejudice for being on leave. If an individual is away for part of an academic year, then the evaluation of teaching will be based on any course(s) taught while present. A similar procedure will be followed for evaluation of Department and University service.

VI Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

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

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

VI.A Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

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

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

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

VI.A.1 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-6-02](#).

The criteria for an appointment to an assistant professor position (Section IV.A.1) involve *potential*. The criteria for promotion to associate professor with tenure involve *achievement* of a strong combined record in all areas with the potential for higher and more sustained achievement. They are:

- the achievement of a strong record in teaching, both in the classroom and in student advising;
- the achievement of a strong record in scholarship, associated primarily with research that enhances the state-of-the-art in computing and that has led to the establishment of an independent research identity and reputation;
- the achievement of a strong record of service, both to the profession and to the university; and
- strong potential to achieve higher and more sustained levels of accomplishment and thereby to advance to professor.

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

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

The Ohio State University is a world-class research university that requires each college, department, and program to maintain a distinguished research program. This requirement is the foundation for continual improvements in the quality of graduate and undergraduate education programs by timely introduction of new knowledge, new discoveries, and new innovations into the classroom. Most importantly, excellence in scholarship brings competitiveness and recognition to the department, the college, and the university so that we continue to attract strong students, excellent faculty, and research grants. A high research expectation of junior faculty is therefore consistent with the overall mission of the institution.

Research will be a critical evaluation component in the tenure and promotion process. In this research-intensive department, a faculty member with an average research record will not be granted tenure even if he/she has an excellent teaching and service record. On the other hand, teaching and service are also

important criteria in the evaluation. The candidate must show strong and sustained evidence of substantial promise for continued growth and productivity. In summary, tenure will be reserved for faculty members who have clearly demonstrated the ability and potential to become distinguished scholars and recognized leaders in their research fields, who are effective teachers in the classroom and in advising, and who provide high quality service to the university and to the community.

In each of the Teaching, Scholarship, and Service categories and in a few specific subcategories of each (outlined below), ratings of the candidate's record will be provided: **does not meet criteria, meets criteria, meets-to-exceeds criteria, exceeds criteria**. A record rated as **meets criteria** is tantamount to meeting expectations for promotion in that category. If a (sub)category is not required and there are no applicable activities, the committee may choose to issue **no rating** as the category is not required of this faculty. Whether a criterion is met is determined by the overall category rating, not any subcategory rating.

TEACHING

The overall scholarship criterion for the promotion of tenure-track faculty to associate professor is “the achievement of a strong record in teaching, both in the classroom and in student advising.”

For tenure track faculty and professional practice faculty, the teaching component of the review will include summary evaluations of classroom teaching, curricular development, and advising of students. Research faculty only have an expectation for advising of students; classroom teaching and curriculum development may receive no rating if appropriate.

Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidates must exhibit a strong overall record in these three areas:	Candidates may be asked to submit (or collected on their behalf):
Classroom teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Student evaluations of instruction, including ratings and summary of open-ended comments• Peer observations of instruction• Awards for teaching• Letters (not solicited by the candidate) from former students regarding teaching effectiveness• Letters (not solicited by the candidate) from other faculty regarding teaching effectiveness• Documentation of newly developed curricula• Contributions to broadening participation in the classroom setting• Independent external evaluators' opinions of the quality of the work (for professional practice faculty)
Curriculum development	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Curricular and content development and innovations

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Textbook and course material development• Pedagogical innovations• Publications about teaching computing• Awards for curricular development• Letters (not solicited by the candidate) from other faculty regarding curricular contributions• Independent external evaluators' opinions of the quality of the work (for professional practice faculty)• Contributions to broadening participation in curricular development
Student advising Each faculty member is expected to perform his/her fair share of academic advising to undergraduate and graduate students, and to provide appropriate advice regarding course and program matters as well as career and graduate school choices. For Tenure Track and Research Faculty, the primary distinguishing factor in this sub-category of teaching will be the role of the candidate in advising graduate student research leading to Ph.D. and M.S. (thesis) degrees, and (to a lesser extent) senior honors theses by undergraduates.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Achievements (e.g., publications and awards) of Ph.D. and M.S. thesis students advised• Mentoring undergraduate student research and/or completion of honors theses• Sustained progress toward the degree by Ph.D. and M.S. thesis students advised• Service on Ph.D. dissertation and M.S. thesis committees of students who have other primary advisors• Letters (not solicited by the candidate) from other faculty regarding advising contributions• Independent external evaluators' opinions of the quality of the work (for professional practice faculty)• Contributions to broadening participation in advising

The CSE approach to teaching assessment and feedback has two components. Direct formal assessment of teaching will be conducted using the OSU student evaluation of instruction (SEI) questionnaires and peer evaluation. Procedures for collection of evaluations are found in Section IX.A.

Open-ended comments from each class taught by the faculty must be collected and retained by the faculty member for inclusion in their file. These comments are summarized on a course-by-course basis for purposes of formal review (fourth year, promotion and tenure, or promotion to professor). The liaison committee will summarize the comments for inclusion in the dossier. The summary must include the name and role of the summarizer, and should be shared with the candidate. Note that an individual other than the candidate must summarize the comments for inclusion in the dossier (ref [OAA Policies and Procedures Handbook 3.4.1.3.3](#))

The total direct assessment of classroom teaching will be comprehensive, so that material from the range of courses taught by the candidate will be examined and evaluated. Candidates for promotion to professor should provide evaluations for the most recent five years.

1

SCHOLARSHIP

The overall scholarship criterion for the promotion of tenure-track faculty to associate professor is “the achievement of a strong record in scholarship, associated primarily with research that enhances the state-of-the-art in computing and that has led to the establishment of an independent research identity and reputation.”

Scholarship for tenure-track faculty and research faculty involves primarily research that advances the state-of-the-art in computing. The scholarship component of the review will include summary evaluations of publication record, significance/impact, and funding.

For professional practice faculty, scholarship, if required, involves advancing the professional practice of computing, or advancing computer science education. The scholarship component of the review will include summary evaluations of publication record, significance/impact, and funding (if any). The summary will account for the different role of, and expectations for, professional practice faculty. Any subcategory, and the whole category, may receive no rating, if appropriate.

Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidates must exhibit a strong overall record in these three areas:	Candidates may be asked to submit (or collected on their behalf):
Publication record Candidates are expected to have a research portfolio that represents superior intellectual achievement. Qualitative evaluations and quantitative metrics will assess the originality, novelty, and intrinsic value of research contributions as well as the quantity of these contributions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent external evaluators' opinions of the quality of the work (when available) • Promotion and Tenure Committee members' own opinions of the quality of the work when within the scope of their research expertise • Prestige (reputation and visibility), selectivity, and impact factors of publication outlets • Number of equivalent papers (i.e., accounting for multiple authorship and paper length) appearing in or fully accepted by top publication outlets, and that can be attributed to the candidate's research publication efforts • Number of publications appearing in other outlets • Number of substantial work products other than traditional publications (such as software), if applicable • Patents, patent applications, and similar evidence of technological innovation • Competitive peer-reviewed grants, contracts, and gifts for which the candidate is the PI or a critically important co-PI • Invited presentations at other institutions • Invitations to serve on editorial boards or program committees of prestigious journals or conferences • Invitations to serve on government or professional organization policy-making panels and boards • Special commendations and honors for research quality, e.g., professional society Fellow designation

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contributions to broadening participation in scholarship
Significance/Impact “Significance/impact” refers to the degree to which the candidate’s work is fundamentally important for the field, as well as the extent to which it has been recognized, cited, adopted, and/or built upon by others.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independent external evaluators’ opinions of the significance/impact of the work (when available) Promotion and Tenure Committee members’ own opinions of the significance/impact of the work when within the scope of their research expertise Citations of the candidate's work by others Actual adoption and use of the candidate's research results and techniques, or other work products (such as software), by others <p>When external evaluators’ opinions are sought, candidates will be asked to provide a portfolio of significant work products for inclusion in the request for evaluation. These will typically be a set of publications representing the scholarly work of the candidate, but may include other artifacts of activities in the record.</p>
Funding As noted above, competitive peer-reviewed grants, contracts, and gifts to support research (and where they are from) will be considered in evaluating the quality of the candidate's research program. Such funding is also an independently important aspect of scholarship because of the expectation that the candidate will obtain funding to support graduate students to do research and will contribute to the financial stability of the department. Funding is optional for professional practice faculty, but should be reported if any exists. All external funding, regardless of source, that supports students and for which the CSE Department and/or a CSE-related center gets appropriate expenditure credit will be considered equally important in rating the funding sub-category of research.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grants, contracts, and gifts for which the candidate is the PI or a critically important co-PI Number of graduate students supported with external funding Total amount of external funding for the candidate's research program Letters (not solicited by the candidate) from collaborators, especially the PI, documenting the importance of the candidate's role in obtaining the funding and accomplishing the work for funded projects where the candidate is a co-PI

1

SERVICE	
The overall service criterion for promotion of tenure-track faculty to associate professor is “the achievement of a strong record of service, both to the profession and to the university.” The service component of the review will include summary evaluations of internal service and external service.	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met

Candidates must exhibit a strong overall record in two areas:	Candidates may be asked to submit (or collected on their behalf):
Internal service Every faculty member is expected to contribute to the effective governance of the department, and senior faculty are expected to contribute to the effective governance of the college and university as well.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Effective involvement and active participation in assigned department, college, and university committees• Demonstration of initiative and follow-through in identifying and helping to address specific departmental problems• Observations made by Promotion and Tenure Committee members who have served with the candidate on committees and/or have been served by the candidate's activities• Independent external evaluators' opinions of the quality of the work (for professional practice faculty)
External service	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Professional activities such as service on conference organizing and program committees, editorships, reviewing, etc.• Reviewing of proposals for funding agencies• Public service related to the candidate's professional expertise• Consulting activities• Independent external evaluators' opinions of the quality of the work (for all faculty)

VI.A.2 Promotion to Professor

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-6-02](#).

The criteria for promotion to professor involve *sustained* achievement combined with the attainment of *distinction* in the field. They are:

- the sustained achievement of a strong record in teaching, both in the classroom and in student advising;
- the sustained achievement of a strong record in scholarship, associated primarily with research that enhances the state-of-the-art in computing;
- the sustained achievement of a strong record of service, both to the profession and to the university; and
- a total body of high-quality work and recognition as a leader in the field that leads to national or international distinction.

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

Examples of evidence of sustained achievement that support the case for promotion are similar to that in Section VI.A.1.

Background: OAA [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), Faculty Rule [3335-6-02C](#) and (D).

The department acknowledges that 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. Evidence of academic leadership in one or more evaluation dimensions that leads to national or international distinction may be considered in support of a case for promotion. In the case where academic leadership forms a significant component of the candidate's dossier, a separate statement evaluating the leadership contributions of the candidate will be added to the Promotion and Tenure committee's letter.

Candidates who wish to have examples of leadership should document their leadership in the dossier; examples of academic leadership aligned with service roles should demonstrate impact above and beyond the standard responsibilities for the role. Evidence that will be evaluated may include:

- Leadership in systemic changes in educational delivery
- Leadership in development of strategic partnerships and programs within the university and across organizations
- Leadership in program evaluation including national accreditation agencies
- Leadership in broadening participation in computing
- Leadership in innovative corporate engagement
- Leadership in technology transfer of computing innovations to practice
- Leadership of science and engineering policy and goal setting, for instance, through National Academies and Congressional Testimony

This list is not exhaustive. Candidates may also prepare documentation of this leadership that could be evaluated by external evaluators; these examples will be forwarded with the additional research samples.

CSE faculty with joint appointments will be evaluated on the basis of some (not necessarily all) of the following criteria:

- Teaching CSE courses and expanding CSE course offerings with interdisciplinary topics or courses whose content crosses department boundaries.
- Engaging in research collaboration with faculty whose TIU is CSE. Evidence of such collaboration may be co-authored papers, joint advising of graduate students, joint research proposals to funding agencies and/or joint organization of seminars and colloquia.
- Engaging in impactful interdisciplinary activities with a substantial CSE component. Such activities may include publishing research papers in CSE related conferences or journals, serving on program committees or editorial boards of CSE related conferences or journals, or collaborative projects that have significant CSE components and involve faculty (not necessarily OSU faculty) tenured in CSE departments.

CSE faculty with joint appointments are not necessarily expected or required to fulfill all three criteria listed above. At the time of the joint appointment, the CSE department chair should generate an MOU that specifically outlines the expectations and evaluation of the faculty member and which of the above criteria may apply.

VI.A.3 Promotion of Professional Practice Faculty

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-7-05](#).

Promotion to Professional Practice Associate Professor

The criteria for an appointment to a professional practice assistant professor position (Section IV.A.2) involve *potential*. The criteria for promotion to professional practice associate professor involve *achievement* combined with the potential for higher and more sustained achievement.

For professional practice assistant professors on the practice path, the criteria for promotion are:

- the achievement of a strong record in teaching courses involving professional practice in computing, both in the classroom and in student advising;
- the achievement of a strong record in academic program development that demonstrates the effective bridging of professional industry contexts and the classroom;
- the achievement of a strong record of service, both to the profession and to the university; and
- strong potential to achieve higher and more sustained levels of accomplishment and thereby to advance to professional practice professor.

For professional practice assistant professors on the teaching path, the criteria for promotion are:

- the achievement of a strong record in teaching courses and in adopting and promoting best teaching practices
- the achievement of a strong record in developing and revising course curricula and programs based on best practices;
- the achievement of a strong record of service that improves student experiences both inside and outside the classroom; and
- strong potential to achieve higher and more sustained levels of accomplishment and thereby to advance to professional practice professor.

Scholarship is not a requirement for promotion on either path, although scholarship activity can be a strong support for promotion. In the practice path, scholarship activity typically supports a strong record of outreach and engagement. In the teaching path, scholarship of teaching and learning and discipline-based education research typically supports the achievement of a strong record in the promulgation of best education practices. However, any kind of scholarship related to computer science and engineering is indicative of continual growth and development of one's knowledge and skills, can be included as support for promotion.

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

Academic program development and effective teaching will be the most critical evaluation components in the promotion process. On the other hand, service is also an important criterion in the evaluation. The candidate must show strong and sustained evidence of substantial promise for continued growth and productivity.

Professional practice faculty on the practice path should promote professional practice in teaching and service. In addition to any of the activities listed in Section VI.A.1, examples of contributions to teaching, scholarship (if any), and service that promote professional practice may include:

- Engagement with industry or cross-disciplinary partners in the development of novel education programs, including bootcamps, stackable certificates, and translational degrees.
- Participation in research/development projects, including cross-disciplinary efforts
- Participation in national or international committees or organizations that connect the department to broader initiatives
- Engagement with industry, community, and government including supervising joint projects and developing capstone experiences
- Engagement in initiatives that broaden the participation of computing
- Technology transfer and patents
- Publication in commercial outlets documenting best practices
- Publication of papers in scholarly publications, including research or pedagogical conferences and journals
- Publication and dissemination of education materials such as texts or recordings
- Funded research or engagement projects, including service as consultant or subject matter expert
- Contributions to broadening participation in outreach and engagement

Professional practice faculty on the teaching path should adopt and promote best teaching practices; service should be focused on education and on improving student experience both in and outside the classroom. In addition to any of the activities listed in Section VI.A.1, examples of contributions to teaching, scholarship (if any), and service for teaching path faculty may include:

- Engagement with industry or cross-disciplinary partners in the development of novel education programs, including bootcamps, stackable certificates, and translational degrees.
- Participation in national or international committees or organizations that connect the department to broader initiatives
- Engagement in initiatives that broaden the participation of computing
- Leadership of activities that promote best practices in teaching to other faculty in or outside the department
- Development of effective innovative methodologies for teaching computing
- Publication in commercial outlets documenting best teaching practices
- Publication of papers in scholarly publications, including research or pedagogical conferences and journals
- Publication and dissemination of education materials such as texts or recordings
- Contributions to broadening participation in computer science education

These lists are not exhaustive nor exclusive of each other, and candidates may include additional examples of contributions to the departmental mission that are of comparable scope in their dossier.

Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Professional Practice Professor

The criteria for promotion to professional practice professor involve *sustained* achievement combined with the attainment of *distinction* in the field.

For professional practice associate professors on the practice path, the criteria for promotion are:

- 1 • the sustained achievement of a strong record in teaching courses involving professional practice in
2 computing, both in the classroom and in student advising;
- 3 • the sustained achievement of a strong record in academic program development involving
4 professional practice in computing and related state-of-the-practice activities that directly engage
5 students;
- 6 • the sustained achievement of a strong record of service, both to the profession and to the university;
7 and
- 8 • a total body of high-quality work and recognition as a leader in the field that leads to national or
9 international distinction in at least one of teaching, outreach and engagement (including scholarship),
10 or service.

11
12 For professional practice associate professors on the teaching path, the criteria for promotion are:

- 13 • the sustained achievement of a strong record in teaching courses and in adopting and promoting best
14 practices;
- 15 • the sustained achievement of a strong record in developing and revising course curricula and
16 programs based on best practices;
- 17 • the sustained achievement of a strong record of service that improves student experiences both inside
18 and outside the classroom; and
- 19 • a total body of high-quality work and recognition as a leader in computer science education and
20 national distinction in education practice, scholarship of education, or service.

21
22 A strong record in teaching, scholarship, outreach and engagement, and service are moreover defined to
23 include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the [American](#)
24 [Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

25
26 Promotion to professional practice associate professor does not require production and dissemination of
27 scholarly materials as part of the candidate's body of work. Per the College of Engineering Appointment,
28 Promotion, and Tenure criteria, promotion to professional practice professor requires production and
29 dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy (teaching path) and/or professional practice
30 (practice path) as part of the candidate's body of work.

31
32 Examples of evidence of sustained achievement that support the case for promotion are similar to those
33 for promotion to professional practice associate professor, but with the expectation of higher and
34 sustained levels of achievement.

35
36 Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract
37 terms.

38
39 Background: OAA [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), Faculty Rule [3335-7-05](#).

40 The department acknowledges that the reality that (a) not all faculty members have the same distribution
41 of assignments, (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence equally in all evaluation
42 dimensions, and (c) there is a multi-faceted institutional responsibility that must be achieved by the skills
43 of the faculty collectively. Evidence of academic leadership in one or more evaluation dimensions that

leads to national or international distinction may be considered in support of a case for promotion. In the case where academic leadership forms a significant component of the candidate's dossier, a separate statement evaluating the leadership contributions of the candidate will be added to the Promotion and Tenure committee's letter. See Section VI.A.2 for examples that can be used to support the assessment of leadership.

VI.A.4 Promotion of Research Faculty

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-7-32](#).

Promotion to Research Associate Professor

The criteria for an appointment to a research assistant professor position (Section IV.A.3) involve *potential*. The criteria for promotion to research associate professor involve *achievement* combined with the potential for higher and more sustained achievement. They are:

- the achievement of a strong record in graduate student advising, and a potential for excellence in advising;
- the achievement of a strong record in scholarship, associated primarily with research that enhances the state-of-the-art in computing;
- the achievement of a strong record of service, both to the profession and to the university, and a potential for excellence in service;
- strong potential to achieve higher and more sustained levels of accomplishment and thereby to advance to research professor.

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

Evidence in support of meeting criteria for promotion to research associate professor is as listed in Section VI.A.1.

Research will be a critical evaluation component in the promotion process. The candidate must show strong and sustained evidence of substantial promise for continued growth and productivity.

Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Promotion to Research Professor

The criteria for promotion to research professor involve *sustained* achievement combined with the attainment of *distinction* in the field. They are:

- the sustained achievement of a strong record in graduate student advising;
- the sustained achievement of a strong record in scholarship, associated primarily with research that enhances the state-of-the-art in computing;
- the sustained achievement of a strong record of service, both to the profession and to the university;
- professional and ethical conduct consistent with the [AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics](#); and

- a total body of high-quality work and recognition as a leader in the field that leads to national or international distinction.

Evidence in support of meeting criteria for promotion to research professor is as listed in Section VI.A.1.

Promotion will entail generation of a renewed contract. There is no presumption of a change in contract terms.

Background: OAA [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), Faculty Rule [3335-7-32](#).

The department acknowledges that 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. Evidence of academic leadership in one or more evaluation dimensions that leads to national or international distinction may be considered in support of a case for promotion. In the case where academic leadership forms a significant component of the candidate's dossier, a separate statement evaluating the leadership contributions of the candidate will be added to the Promotion and Tenure committee's letter. See Section VI.A.2 for examples that can be used to support the assessment of leadership.

VI.A.5 Associated Faculty

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

Promotion to Senior Lecturer. Lecturers may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank as described in Section IV.A.4. Lecturers may be promoted to senior lecturer after a period of service as CSE lecturer, provided they meet the following considerations for promotion to senior lecturer, including teaching a variety of CSE courses, including CSE 3000 level or higher courses, work on curriculum development, service as course coordinator, and/or other service to the CSE department and the university. Promotion to senior lecturer is not automatic based on years of service and is dependent upon the listed criteria.

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

VI.A.6 Regional Campus Faculty

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-6-07](#).

Expectations for regional campus faculty differ somewhat from those for faculty on the Columbus campus. The primary mission of the regional campuses is to provide high quality undergraduate education and serve the academic needs of their communities. Therefore, the relative emphasis on teaching and service expected of regional campus faculty will typically be greater. While the Department expects regional campus tenure-track faculty to achieve a record of high-quality scholarship and publications, it recognizes that greater teaching and service commitments and less access to research resources for regional campus faculty require different research expectations. In general, regional campus tenure-track faculty are not expected to have a scholarship output that is as high as that for Columbus campus faculty, but the overall quality of this scholarship is expected to be comparable. Similarly, non-classroom teaching expectations may be altered to the locale. While graduate student advising may or

may not be part of the faculty member's profile, undergraduate advising/mentoring should be a documented part of a tenure-track regional campus faculty member's profile.

In the evaluation for promotion of regional campus professional practice faculty, research faculty, and associated faculty, the department will use the same criteria as described above for the promotion of faculty in each of these categories. Regional campus associated faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean. The decision of the regional campus dean is final.

VI.B Procedures

Background: [Faculty Rule 3335-6-04](#) and [Faculty Rule 3335-7-08](#).

VI.B.1 Tenure-Track Faculty, Professional Practice Faculty, and Research Faculty

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

Promotion and tenure reviews normally will take place in the Autumn semester; the schedule below assumes this. These reviews include all mandatory reviews for faculty in the final year of a probationary period, and all approved nonmandatory reviews. If a review will occur during any other semester, the normal schedule below may be adjusted accordingly to allow similarly adequate time for all steps.

VI.B.1.a Candidate Responsibilities

Reference: College of Engineering [Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Document](#) Section VI.A

Each faculty member being reviewed will complete the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier. The Department of Computer Science and Engineering seeks to broaden participation in computing, and encourages candidates to highlight contributions to broadening participation within the department and the field as part of their dossier. Candidates will make available to the Promotion and Tenure Committee copies of all publications authored or co-authored by the candidate and copies of all student evaluations of instruction for courses taught by the candidate. Other significant documents normally considered during the reviews will include external letters of evaluation, peer evaluations of teaching, and prior annual performance evaluations. Supplementary documentation may be offered by the candidate, or may be requested by the Liaison Subcommittee (see Section VI.B.1.b), the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair, or the Department chair.

In addition to submitting a complete, accurate dossier, candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion are responsible for providing a copy of the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed, if other than the department's current document. If external evaluations are required, candidates are responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators compiled for their case according to departmental guidelines, and preparing an appropriate packet for evaluators.

Under no circumstances will the candidate solicit letters of evaluation or have contact of any type with prospective or actual evaluators regarding the review process.

Each of these elements is described in detail below:

- **Dossier**

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

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

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

Examples of teaching documentation include:

- cumulative SEI reports for every class or departmentally approved reports, including summarized comments
- peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in Section IX.B of this document)
- Mentoring undergraduate students in research with the potential completion and defense of undergraduate theses
- Participation in evaluation of candidacy, PhD, and MS exams
- Publication of student research in high quality, high impact peer reviewed journals
- Timely progress of graduate students to graduation and to appropriate employment and/or additional training of the student upon graduation.
- Recognition of teaching and mentoring through awards
- candidate's self-evaluation, to include a statement of the instructor's approach to and goals for teaching, self assessment, and description of specific strategies for improvement—past, current, and planned
- 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 or reappointment may be provided. Any such material should be clearly indicated. However, it is the scholarship performance since the start date or date of last promotion that is to be the focus of the evaluating parties.

Examples of scholarship documentation include:

- List of all scholarly papers published or accepted for publication in high-quality peer-reviewed journals and conferences. See Appendix 2 for further information.
- List of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published.
- Invitations to present one's work at national/international conferences and at major universities.

- List of funding that supports research for which the candidate is a principal investigator, co-principal investigator, or senior personnel.
- Documentation of grants submitted and contracts received, including outcome of review for unfunded applications.
- Documentation of invention disclosures, submitted and awarded patents, options and commercial licenses.
- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate

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

Examples of documentation of service include:

- List of departmental, college, and university service, such as service as an active member of one or more departmental committees, including graduate admissions, graduate recruiting, safety, or coordinating divisional seminars
- Serving as the PI of a training grant for graduate or undergraduate students; serving as director of a summer research program
- Recognition (awards and prizes) for service to the department or the university
- List of professional service, such as reviewing manuscripts for high-impact scientific journals, conferences, and proposals, participation as a member of the editorial board of a major journal, organizing symposia at a national/international meeting, or service in a formal role in a professional society. any available documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier
- Other relevant documentation of service as appropriate

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

- **Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Document**

Candidates must indicate the APT under which they wish to be reviewed. Candidates 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 last reappointment in the case of professional practice and research faculty), whichever of these two latter documents is the more recent. However, for tenure-track faculty the current APT document must be used if the letter of offer or last promotion, whichever is more recent, was more than 10 years before April 1 of the review year.

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

- **External Evaluations**

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. The department chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

For external evaluations requiring assessment of scholarship, candidates should prepare an electronic packet including a current CV, up to five representative publications, and optionally a one-page research summary contextualizing the five representative publications.

For external evaluations requiring assessment of teaching and service, candidates should prepare an electronic packet including a current CV, description of service, and a teaching portfolio including at least a description of teaching, and description and documentation of curriculum development including syllabi. The CSE department will provide peer evaluations, SEI quantitative summaries, and summaries of SEI comments to the teaching portfolio. For candidates on the practice path, the description of teaching should include incorporating professional practices and skills in academic classes. For candidates on the teaching path, the description of teaching should include adoption and promotion of best practices in teaching.

VI.B.1.b Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

The Promotion and Tenure Committee is the same as the eligible faculty for a case (Section III.A). The responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are as follows:

- To review this APT document annually and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To consider annually, in spring semester, requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide whether it is appropriate for such a review to take place. Only professors on the committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed.
 - The committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.
 - A tenured faculty member may only be denied a formal promotion review under Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) only once. Faculty Rules [3335-7-08](#) and [3335-7-36](#) make the same provision for non-probationary professional practice and research faculty, respectively. If the denial is based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the review go forward in the following year despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.

- A decision by the committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the eligible faculty, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.
- Annually, in late spring through early autumn semester, to provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below.
 - **Late Spring:** Select from among its members Procedures Oversight Designee(s) (PODs) who will serve in this role for the following year. One POD will be selected from the eligible faculty for the tenure-track cases, one for professional practice faculty cases, and one for research cases; this may be the same individual. The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee. The Procedures Oversight Designee's responsibilities are described [here](#).
 - **Late Spring:** The Promotion and Tenure Committee chair will appoint a two-person **Liaison Subcommittee** of the eligible faculty for each faculty member who will be undergoing review for promotion and tenure or for promotion in the next academic year. One of the two will be designated as the chair of that subcommittee. The candidate may suggest one additional faculty member to join the subcommittee. The Liaison Subcommittee members will explain and be available to answer questions the candidate may have concerning the preparation of the dossier. The Liaison Subcommittee also will be responsible for gathering any materials deemed relevant to the review.
 - Members of the P&T Committee who are eligible to vote on the candidate's case (the eligible faculty) meet and identify a list of appropriate external evaluators to whom requests for evaluation could be sent. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from the lists of peer and aspirational peer programs (see Section VI.B.4 below). Justification will be provided in cases when a suggested evaluator is from a program not included on these lists. The P&T Committee Chair will provide the list to the candidate, who then has the option of suggesting the removal of up to two names, and providing up to three alternate names for addition to the list. The Promotion and Tenure Committee then identifies a subset from this list as primary evaluators, along with a number of alternates (to be requested to write letters if primary evaluators decline to write). Careful attention must be paid to balance among the evaluators in all relevant respects and as indicated in the Faculty Rules.
 - **Early Autumn:** Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; and work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
 - Meet with each candidate for clarification as necessary and to provide the candidate an opportunity to comment on his or her dossier. This meeting is not an occasion to debate the candidate's record.
 - The chairs of the Liaison Subcommittees will lead the discussions of the respective candidates' cases. The cases of all candidates for a given rank will be discussed before voting takes place on any of them.
 - Draft an analysis of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service to provide to the full eligible faculty with the dossier; and seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible. The committee neither votes on cases nor takes a position in presenting its analysis of the record.

- Consider the interdisciplinary work of a candidate across multiple units as part of the whole work, especially if the candidate has a joint appointment in another unit.
- Revise the draft analysis of each case following the eligible faculty meeting, to include the faculty vote and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting; and forward the completed written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair.
- Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.
- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department chair in the case of joint appointees whose tenure-initiating unit is another department. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.
- **Late Autumn:** The Promotion and Tenure Committee chair will appoint a two-person **Liaison Subcommittee** of the eligible faculty for each faculty member who will be undergoing fourth year review or probationary reappointment review in the next semester. The candidate may suggest one additional faculty member to join the subcommittee. One of the two will be designated as the chair of that subcommittee. The Liaison Subcommittee members will explain and be available to answer questions the candidate may have concerning the preparation of the dossier. The Liaison Subcommittee also will be responsible for gathering any materials deemed relevant to the review.
- To review thoroughly and objectively every candidate's dossier in advance of the meeting at which the candidate's case will be discussed.
- To attend all eligible faculty meetings except when circumstances beyond one's control prevent attendance; to participate in discussion of every case; and to vote.

VI.B.1.c Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- **Late Spring Semester:** To solicit external evaluations from the list provided by the Promotion and Tenure Committee after vetting by the candidate. The Department chair will send official letters soliciting the evaluations, normally by early Summer semester. Each letter will be accompanied by a current curriculum vitae and up to five representative publications chosen by the candidate. The Department chair will monitor receipt of the evaluation letters to ensure that they are received by the beginning of the review semester. (Also see External Evaluations below.)
- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments whose primary appointment is in this department. The chair will seek a letter of evaluation from the TIU head of the joint appointment unit. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.
- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.

- 1 • To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate
2 now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. (The
3 department must ensure that such questions are asked of all applicants in a non-discriminatory
4 manner.) For tenure-track assistant professors, the chair will confirm that candidates are eligible to
5 work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or
6 refugees will be required to sign an [MOU](#) at the time of promotion with tenure.
7
- 8 • To make each candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty at
9 least one week before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted.
10
- 11 • To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a
12 conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
13
- 14 • To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed
15 and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the
16 department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
17
- 18 • **Mid-Autumn Semester:** To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each
19 candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
20
- 21 • To meet with the eligible faculty to explain any recommendations contrary to the recommendation of
22 the committee.
23
- 24 • To inform each candidate in writing after completion of the department review process:
25
 - 26 ○ of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair
 - 27
 - 28 ○ of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department
29 chair
 - 30
 - 31 ○ of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from
32 receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is
33 accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or
34 not he or she expects to submit comments.
35
- 36 • To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the
37 dossier.
38
- 39 • To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline
40
- 41 • To receive the Promotion and Tenure Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of
42 candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material,
43 along with the department chair's independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the
44 department chair of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.
45

46 Further information on nonmandatory promotion and tenure reviews, Promotion and Tenure Committee
47 voting procedures, and promotion and tenure review schedules appears in Appendix 1.

VI.B.2 Procedures for Associated Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Adjunct faculty for whom promotion is a possibility, follow the promotion guidelines and procedures detailed in Section VI.B.1 above, with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is negative, and does not proceed to the executive vice president and provost if the dean's recommendation is negative (a negative recommendation by the department chair is final in such cases).

VI.B.3 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty

The responsibilities of regional campus candidates are the same as those of a Columbus campus candidate as described above.

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

Regional campus professional practice faculty are reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. Following the review, the dean/director consults with the faculty member's department chair. A request to promote follows the same procedures as tenure-track faculty.

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

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

VI.B.4 External Evaluations

In keeping with the national standing of The Ohio State University, the Department of Computer Science and Engineering will ask for evaluations from faculty in programs that are nationally recognized in their field or subfields. Computer science is a vast field with specialized areas both within traditional computer science (e.g., systems, theory, artificial intelligence, graphics, software engineering, programming languages) as well as interdisciplinary areas (e.g., data science, computational medicine, computational ecology). Because expertise in subareas of computer science are often found outside of traditional departments of computer science, a specific list of institutions from which evaluators are drawn cannot be easily devised.

Accordingly, this department will seek external evaluations predominately from evaluators from the Big Ten Academic Alliance and the Association of American Universities. If a candidate's field of research requires additional expertise outside of AAU, a request for review and approval will be made to the College of Engineering. For evaluation of the quality and impact of the teaching and service of

professional practice faculty, it is likely that a larger number external evaluators may need to be selected from teaching-focused institutions beyond the AAU; the request for review and approval should note this general need.

The following principles will be applied in identifying external reviewers: the external reviewer 1) will be a distinguished expert in their field, as demonstrated by their scholarship credentials to include publications; creative work; national and international awards; prominence in professional organizations; and presence on editorial boards of major journals; 2) will be nationally or internationally known in the field related to a candidate's interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary projects; and/or 3) where relevant, will be a distinguished, award-winning scholar who is not affiliated with an academic institution.

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

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

A conflict of interest for external reviewers exists if the reviewer is or has been to the candidate: a) a thesis, dissertation, or postdoctoral advisee/advisor; b) a research collaborator, which includes someone who has been a coauthor on a publication within the past 3 years, including pending publications and submissions; c) a collaborator on a project within the past 3 years, including current and planned collaborations; d) in a consulting/financial arrangement with the candidate within the past 3 years, including receiving compensation of any type (e.g., money, goods, or services); e) a relative or close personal friend; or f) in any relationship, personal or professional, that could reduce the reviewer's objectivity. Also excluded are reviewers from the same institution, or those who had previous employment in the same institution within the past 12 months, or those who are being considered for employment at that institution.

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

- Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's scholarship (or other performance, if relevant) who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or post-doctoral mentor of the candidate (see description of conflict of interest for external reviewers just above). Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. This department will solicit evaluations only from professors with institutional affiliations predominately in the programs listed above. Evaluators should be distinguished faculty (or occasionally non-academics who have similar research credentials

and experience) as evidenced by scholarly records and awards. Evaluators shall be in a position to comment in an informed way both on the quality of the candidate's scholarly work and on its significance to the broader field in which it resides. External evaluators must be able to provide an objective evaluation of the scholarly work. Faculty external evaluators should generally hold the rank of professor; they must be at the rank above the candidate being considered unless an exception has been granted by the college.

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

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

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format for letters requesting external evaluations. A sample letter for tenure-track faculty can be found [here](#). A sample letter for professional practice faculty can be found in the College of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Teams directory.

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

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

VII Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals

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

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

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule [3335-5-05](#).

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

VIII Seventh Year Review

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

IX.A Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) is required in every regular course offered in this department. 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.

IX.B Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The chair oversees the department's peer evaluation of teaching process. The chair may delegate this authority to a faculty member, typically an associate chair.

Peer reviews of teaching (by faculty selected by the chair or designee) will be conducted annually for probationary tenure-track faculty and professional practice faculty. A peer teaching evaluation will be conducted every three years for associate professors with tenure, and every five years for professors with tenure. A peer teaching evaluation will be conducted every two years for non-probationary professional practice faculty below the rank of professor and every four years for professional practice faculty at the professor rank. At least two different faculty reviewers will be selected for each faculty member during his/her probationary period. These will be part of the candidate's record to be considered in such reviews.

Peer reviews of teaching (by faculty selected by the chair or designee) will be conducted annually for associated faculty (including adjunct and lecturer-title faculty) for the first four years of teaching in the department, and at least once every two years (but preferably annually) for associated faculty with at least four years of teaching in the department.

Peer reviews of teaching consist of three components: classroom observation, review of classroom materials, and one or more face-to-face post-visit meetings to discuss the classroom observation and class material assessments. Classroom observations and review of materials are recorded using standard departmental review forms. At the beginning of the academic year, the timing of the assessments should be discussed between reviewer and the person being observed to ensure that the candidate can benefit maximally from the timing of the visit; the person being observed will have been informed in advance when an assessment is to be conducted. The review forms are retained in the observed faculty's departmental folder, with a copy given to the observed faculty. Faculty may optionally choose to respond

1 to the review with written comments, to be placed in the departmental folder. The reports are included in
2 the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier. A subsequent peer review may be added if the candidate so
3 requests.

4
5 Peer review of probationary faculty in their first year of service is to be formative only; in this case the
6 above procedure is used (observation, material review, post-visit meeting) but the materials are for the
7 faculty's formative use; review forms are not submitted to the department folder. Instead, a note
8 indicating the date of observation is placed in the faculty's file.
9
10

Appendix 1 Promotion and Tenure Nonmandatory Reviews, Committee Voting Procedures, and Review Schedules

Nonmandatory Reviews for Promotion and Tenure or for Promotion

Any faculty member in the Department may request in writing to the Department chair to have a formal promotion and tenure or promotion review that would not be mandatory: early consideration of promotion to associate professor with tenure, promotion to professor, or promotion within the professional practice faculty or research faculty ranks. Such requests must be filed by April 1 and be accompanied by a current curriculum vitae. Furthermore, any tenured associate professor will be considered for promotion to professor on the recommendation by April 1 of the Department chair or any tenured professor, assuming the candidate gives his or her consent to being nominated.

The eligible voters for a prospective case will consider the request and, by April 30, decide whether a formal review will be conducted. The affected faculty member will be notified of the decision and, if it is negative, the rationale. The eligible faculty may not deny a tenured faculty member a formal review for promotion more than one year in succession. (Faculty Rule [3335-6-04-\(A\)-3](#))

Promotion and Tenure Committee Voting Procedures

See Section III.C for definition of quorum and Section III.D for definition of positive recommendation.

As the CSE department believes in open discussion about cases, those who attend the voting meeting will vote by show of hands—yes (in favor of promotion and tenure or promotion) or no (against). Any eligible faculty who fails to make their vote known to the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair at the meeting will be recorded as not voting. The Promotion and Tenure Committee chair will then record and announce the vote totals to the entire Committee.

The Liaison Subcommittee for a candidate, with the assistance of the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair, will be responsible for drafting the Committee's recommendation letter for that candidate. All members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will have the opportunity to examine and make suggestions regarding the letter before it is presented to the Department chair; but the final letter will come from, and will be the responsibility of, the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair.

Summary of Normal Promotion and Tenure Schedules

Mid-Spring: Requests due on reviews for nonmandatory promotion and tenure, and decisions made on requests for nonmandatory reviews; Liaison Subcommittees appointed for mandatory and nonmandatory reviews, and for fourth year reviews.

Late Spring/Early Summer: Evaluation letters solicited for tenure and promotion reviews.

Fall: Tenure and promotion reviews conducted.

Early Spring: Fourth year and reappointment reviews conducted.

Appendix 2 Publication Strategies for CSE Faculty

The Department of Computer Science and Engineering (CSE) Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) document includes this statement regarding judgments about research quality: "Because of the wide range of applications of computing, research papers may appear in many types of journals and proceedings. In addition, in many areas of the discipline, conference publications are rigorously reviewed and prestigious, and can be as significant as publications in premier journals."

It is, nonetheless, tempting to try to rate a candidate's publication outlets. This analysis must be based on the outlets' overall quality or significance (as opposed to the quality or significance of the candidate's papers that are published there).

Research faculty in most disciplines are expected to publish the results of scholarly activities in "archival" publications, i.e., "place[s] or collection[s] containing records, documents, or other materials of historical interest" [*The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Third Edition*, Houghton Mifflin, 1992]. In many fields, the archival publications are academic journals and books. The obviously correct publication strategy is to publish in these outlets.

This is not the case in computer science (CS). Since about 1970—essentially from the time of establishment of the first university CS departments, and well before the age of digital libraries that now make nearly every publication "archival"—there have been many widely held and widely read series of conference¹ proceedings in CS. The consequence is that there is a second reasonable publication strategy for CS faculty: to publish papers in such conference proceedings in addition to, or even instead of, publishing similar papers in journals. Indeed, sometimes publications that are nominally journals devote special issues to the publication of major conference proceedings with which they ally themselves. Thus, it is not always clear whether a given paper is a journal paper or a conference proceedings paper.

But the distinction does not matter as much in CS as in most other academic fields. The important point is that papers in the best CS journals and those in the best CS conference proceedings are nearly indistinguishable in many important respects. The papers submitted to most CS conferences are typically 10 camera-ready pages, not short abstracts that are commonly reviewed and/or published by conferences in many other fields. These full papers are subject to peer review by three or more referees with rigor comparable to reviews for the best journals. The reputations of the best conference proceedings in CS are similar to those of the best journals. Acceptance rates for the best conferences are comparable to, or lower than, those of the best journals. Objective "impact ratings" based on citation rates to papers of the best conference proceedings are comparable to, or higher than, those of the best journals. The most respected researchers in the field publish in certain conference proceedings. And, of course, all the top conference proceedings are searchable and retrievable on-line from digital libraries run by the professional organizations serving computer science (e.g., ACM and IEEE). In fact, these societies are usually the main conference sponsors.

Why do many CS faculty prefer to publish papers in conference proceedings rather than in journals? There are three main reasons. First, the CS field is fast-moving, and the generally much shorter turn-around time of conference proceedings (submission to publication) makes for more timely publication of results. Second, an accepted paper is the faculty member's ticket to speak (for 20-30 minutes) in front of an audience of peers, to get rapid additional turn-around on ideas, and to establish new working relationships. The opportunity to meet new people and to have this sort of personal interaction is an important factor in much CS research, which tends to be interdisciplinary by nature. Finally, as top

¹ The word "conference" is used here to include any meeting that is self-described as a "conference", "symposium", "workshop", etc.

journals offer on-line access through society-sponsored digital libraries, the circulation of paper subscriptions—which other scholars might routinely browse for interesting papers—is declining. In fact, some professional society journals in CS are now exclusively on-line, with no print versions whatsoever. Conferences, with their opportunities for personal interaction, are thus becoming more rather than less important in terms of research visibility. We would not be surprised to see other fields move in this direction in the future, and for the same reasons.

Of course, not all CS faculty everywhere (even within our department) agree that papers published in top conference proceedings carry essentially the same prestige as those in top journals. There is divided opinion about what is the best strategy for publishing. However, we emphasize that the question of appropriate CS publication patterns was not invented here; nor was the prevailing belief that it is perfectly legitimate to focus one's publication efforts on major conference proceedings. This view is so widely held in our field that the Computing Research Association Board of Directors in 1999 approved [*Best Practices Memo: Evaluating Computer Scientists and Engineers for Promotion and Tenure*](#). This report, written by David Patterson (University of California, Berkeley), Larry Snyder (University of Washington), and Jeff Ullman (Stanford University), explains the situation very clearly, although it stops far short of rating specific journals and conference proceedings. It was written after the much longer and more detailed 1994 report [*Academic Careers for Experimental Computer Scientists and Engineers*](#) by the National Research Council. Appendix B of that report is entitled "Comparing Journal and Conference Publications". It provides more foundation for the analysis above and does name a few specific publications in its examples, but also does not provide a list of ratings.

Not all conferences, and not all journals, are of comparable quality. A given journal or conference proceedings will be evaluated as a top publication outlet using the following criteria:

1. there is a consensus among knowledgeable members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee that its overall reputation for publishing quality work is excellent;
2. acknowledged leaders in the field consistently publish in it;
3. it consistently has a documented acceptance rate that suggests only the best submitted papers pass its peer review process;
4. it is among the top publication outlets in its subarea of CS in terms of the journal "impact factor" as defined by the ISI [*Web of Science*](#), or other "impact rating" services with credible approaches to assessing publication impact.

Section VI.A.1 notes that research venues, particularly in cross-disciplinary research or research in emerging areas, may result in publications in new and/or non-traditional venues. In these cases, the candidate should work with faculty mentors to document the quality of newer venues, particularly in terms of points 2 and 3 above.