

**Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Procedures
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering**

Revised September 17th, 2012

Revised and Approved April 9th, 2015

Revised and Approved May 25th, 2018; OAA approved 7/11/2018

Revised May 17th, 2020;

Revised and Approved November 22, 2023

REVISION APPROVED BY THE OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS: October 8, 2025

Table of Contents

I Preamble	5
II Department Mission	5
III Definitions.....	5
A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty	5
1. Tenure-track Faculty	6
2. Professional Practice Faculty	6
3. Research Faculty	6
4. Associated Faculty	7
5. Conflict of Interest	7
6. Minimum Composition	8
B. Promotion and Tenure Committee	8
C. Quorum.....	8
D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty	9
1. Appointment	9
2. Reappointment	9
3. Promotion and Tenure.....	9
4. Promotion.....	9
5. Tenure	10
6. Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion for Jointly Appointed Faculty	10
IV. Appointments.....	10
A. Criteria	10
1. Tenure-track Faculty	10
2. Professional Practice Faculty	11
3. Research Faculty	12
4. Associated Faculty.	13
5. Regional Campus Professional Practice Faculty	14
6. Emeritus Faculty	14
7. Courtesy Appointments for Tenure-track, Professional Practice, and Research Faculty	14
B. Procedures	14
1. Tenure-track Faculty	15

2. Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus	16
3. Research Faculty	16
4. Transfer of Appointment.....	16
5. Associated Faculty	17
6. Regional Campus Professional Practice Faculty	17
7. Courtesy Appointments for Tenure-track, Professional Practice, and Research Faculty	17
V. Annual Performance and Merit Review Procedures.....	18
A. Documentation	19
B. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty.....	19
1. Fourth-Year Review.....	19
2. Extension of the Tenure Clock	20
C. Tenured Faculty.....	20
D. Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus.....	21
E. Research Faculty	22
F. Associated Faculty	23
G. Regional Campus Professional Practice Faculty	23
H. Salary Recommendations.....	23
VI. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews	24
A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion	24
1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	24
2. Promotion to Professor	29
3. Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus	31
4. Research Faculty	32
5. Associated Faculty	33
6. Regional Campus Professional Practice Faculty	33
B. Procedures	33
1. Tenure-Track, Professional Practice, and Research Faculty on the Columbus Campus	34
a. Candidate Responsibilities	34
b. Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities	36
c. Eligible Faculty Responsibilities.....	38
d. Department Chair Responsibilities	38
2. Procedures for Associated Faculty.....	40

3. Procedures for Regional Campus Professional Practice Faculty	40
4. External Evaluations	40
VII. Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals.....	42
VIII. Seventh-Year Reviews	42
IX Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching	42
A Student Evaluation of Teaching.....	42
B Peer Evaluation of Teaching	43

I Preamble

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the [Rules of the University Faculty](#); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#); and other policies and procedures of the college and university to which the department and its faculty are subject.

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

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

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

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

II Department Mission

The Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering (ECE) will lead the nation through innovative curricula, teaching and impactful research that emphasize the central role that electrical and computer engineering plays in modern society and the role that it will play in its evolution. Through teaching and research, we will demonstrate its cross disciplinary impact, from health engineering to frontiers of space. Through active engagement of faculty and staff, we will develop the next generation of problem solvers who will actualize the cross-disciplinary impact. Our faculty and staff will build a culture wherein we will be an intellectual collective rather than an intellectual collection, and respect trust each other to move ECE forward. We will enable the University to fulfil its land grant mission and meet the needs of the state of Ohio and the nation. We will work with academic partners within and outside OSU, and partners with industry and other external stakeholders, in pursuit of our research and educational endeavors.

III Definitions

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

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

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

Appointment and promotion recommendations for tenure-track, professional practice, and research faculty, and reappointment recommendations for fourth-year reviews of tenure-track faculty are made through a polling process from eligible faculty (see Section III.D.) Such information is advisory to the Department Chair and Personnel Committee.

1. Tenure-track Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

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

Reappointment, Promotion, or Promotion and Tenure Reviews

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

2. Professional Practice Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

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

Promotion Reviews

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

3. Research Faculty

Initial Appointment Reviews

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

Promotion Reviews

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

4. Associated Faculty

Initial Appointment

- For the initial appointment (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of compensated associated faculty members, the eligible faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty, all professional practice faculty, and all research faculty in the department.

Promotion Reviews

- Associated faculty are eligible for promotion but not tenure if they have adjunct titles, tenure-track titles with service at 49% FTE or below, and lecturer titles.

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

For the promotion reviews of associated faculty with tenure-track titles, the eligible faculty shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty as described in Section III.A.1.

The promotion of a lecturer to senior lecturer is decided by the department chair in consultation with the Advisory Committee.

5. 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 if they have had had an intellectual collaboration with a candidate in the past three years and/or 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.

6. Minimum Composition

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

B. Promotion and Tenure Committee

The department has a Promotion and Tenure Committee that assists the eligible faculty in managing personnel and promotion and tenure issues. The promotion and tenure committee is composed of 7 tenured faculty members who hold the rank of Professor (committee Chair, oversight designee, 2 members each on subcommittees associated with research and teaching, and a single member of a service subcommittee). The Department Chair appoints the members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee annually, and specifies the roles for each member when appointed. In addition, the committee chair may choose to add more committee members if necessary to provide sufficient representation of the department's technical areas. If possible, the committee will be augmented when considering professional practice or research faculty promotions by adding a non-probationary Professional Practice Professor or a Research Professor, respectively, to the committee. No professor shall serve as the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee for more than three consecutive years.

C. Quorum

A quorum of the eligible faculty is required for:

- Promotion and tenure reviews of tenure-track faculty
- Promotion reviews of tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty
- Tenure reviews of probationary faculty of senior rank
- Fourth year reappointment reviews of probationary tenure-track faculty
- Consideration of the appropriateness of appointments at senior rank for tenure-track, professional practice, or research faculty

The minimum number of faculty required to achieve quorum is computed as 60% of the applicable eligible faculty after those on leave of absence, on faculty professional leave, on approved special assignment to an off-campus location, or having a conflict of interest are excluded. Faculty on approved leave are considered for quorum if and only if they declare, in advance and in writing, their intent to participate in all proceedings for which they are eligible during the leave.

A quorum is achieved at an eligible faculty meeting when the number of eligible faculty present or participating in the discussion by electronic means (including those who may be on leave of absence, on faculty professional leave, or on approved special assignment to an off-campus location) exceeds the minimum number described above.

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.

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted, but eligible faculty who participate in the eligible faculty meeting by telephone or other electronic means are allowed to vote.

1. Appointment

For appointments (hiring or appointment change from another faculty type) of tenure-track, professional practice and research assistant professors, a positive recommendation from the eligible faculty is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive. In cases involving appointments at senior rank, a positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for assignment of a specified rank is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

2. Reappointment

Eligible faculty votes for reappointment are conducted only for fourth year reviews of tenure-track faculty. A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

3. Promotion and Tenure

Promotion and tenure votes are conducted for the promotion of tenure-track Assistant Professor candidates to Associate Professor. A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

4. Promotion

Promotion votes are conducted for promotion of tenure-track Associate Professor candidates to Professor, for the promotion of research and professional practice faculty from Assistant to Associate Professor, and for the promotion of research and professional practice faculty from Associate to Professor. In all cases, a positive recommendation from the eligible faculty is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

5. Tenure

Eligible faculty votes to provide tenure to probationary tenure-track associate professors previously hired at senior rank without tenure may occur in unusual circumstances. A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

6. Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, and Promotion for Jointly Appointed Faculty

In the case of candidates being considered for appointments with partial FTEs in another department (jointly appointed faculty), the requirements for a positive recommendation are determined independently by the TIUs to which the candidate will be appointed. A positive recommendation is required from both TIUs in order to proceed with a joint appointment.

As per the College of Engineering Criteria and Procedures for APT, in the case of jointly appointed faculty, a positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion is determined by the TIU holding the primary (majority) appointment and defined by the APT documents of this TIU. For joint hires, a representative of the secondary TIU may be present in the discussion of the Committee of Eligible Faculty in the primary TIU as a resource in understanding aspects of a candidate dossier that might not conform to the primary TIU model or that might reflect a hiring MOU concerning the candidate's responsibilities.

IV. Appointments

A. Criteria

The department is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or have strong potential to enhance both the quality and impact of the department. Important considerations include the individual's record to date in teaching, impactful research 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, attract other outstanding faculty and students to the department and enhance the external visibility and reputation of the department. No offer will be extended in the event that the search process does not yield one or more candidates who would enhance the quality of the department. The search is either cancelled or continued, as appropriate to the circumstances.

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

All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university's system of record for faculty and staff. Formal interviews are required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in [Workday](#) to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

1. Tenure-track Faculty

Instructor. Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but requirements for the doctoral degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. Promotion to assistant professor occurs without review the semester following completion of the required credentialing. When an instructor has

not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment, the third year is a terminal year of employment.

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

Assistant Professor. An earned doctoral degree is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential for high scholarly achievement, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the department and the profession is essential. The candidate should also show promise of the ability to build a sustainable research program of high *impact*. 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 seventh year will be the final year of employment. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Promotion and Tenure Committee determines such a review to be appropriate. In case of jointly appointed faculty, such decision is made by the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the TIU holding the primary appointment. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted except through an approved request to exclude time from the probationary period.

Associate Professor and Professor. 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. Appointment at senior rank requires that the individual, at a minimum, meet the department's criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to these ranks (Section VI). In cases where the candidate does not have prior experience teaching or advising graduate students, teaching ability will be defined by the criteria set forth for the appointment of tenure-track Assistant Professors. The assessment of international candidates requires consideration of the nature of teaching and research support activities in the candidate's country. In all cases the candidate must have demonstrated superior and sustained impactful contributions to their research area in the form of well recognized and highly respected research contributions as evidenced by a strong publication record and national recognition of his or her research impact. In case of jointly appointed faculty, the criteria set by the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the TIU holding the primary appointment apply.

Appointment at the rank of associate professor normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at senior rank 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 Dean and Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure (but not necessarily promotion) occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional (terminal) year of employment is offered.

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

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

2. Professional Practice Faculty

Except for those appointed at the rank of instructor, for whom a contract is limited to three years, the initial contract for all other professional practice faculty members must be for a period of five years. The

initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Second and subsequent contracts for professional practice assistant and associate professors must be for a period of at least three years and for no more than five years. Second and subsequent contracts for professional practice professors must be for a period of at least three years and no more than eight years. Tenure is not granted to professional practice faculty. There is no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the department wishes to consider contract renewal, a review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. The policies on appointment must be consistent with Section IV.C.2 of the College of Engineering Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Document and Faculty Rule [3335-7](#).

Professional practice faculty in the Department will be referred to as “Professional Practice Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor. Distinctions among ranks are based on the level of distinction attained by the candidate. Professional practice faculty may participate with voting rights in matters of governance and committee service at the Department level, except that they cannot participate or vote on promotion and tenure matters of tenure-track faculty or research faculty.

Professional Practice Assistant Professor. The successful candidate must provide clear evidence of capability in his/her area of specialization and experience in the practice of the discipline. The successful candidate must possess the background and ability to share and transfer knowledge to students. Normally, the successful candidate will have an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in his/her relevant field. Professional publications and teaching experience are helpful but not required.

Professional Practice Associate Professor or Professor. The successful candidate must meet or exceed the Department criteria for promotion to these ranks (Section VI-A.3). In the case of a candidate who has no previous appointment as a professional practice assistant professor or tenure-track assistant professor, the candidate must have demonstrated superior proficiency in the practice of the discipline, as evidenced by reference letters, and must possess the background and ability to share and transfer knowledge to students.

3. Research Faculty

Appointment of research faculty will be for a period of at least one year and no more than five. The initial contract is probationary, with reappointment considered annually. Tenure is not granted to research faculty. There is no presumption that subsequent contracts will be offered, regardless of performance. If the department wishes to consider contract renewal, a review of the faculty member is required in the penultimate year of the current contract period. The policies on appointment must be consistent with Section IV.C.3 of the College of Engineering Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Document and Faculty Rule [3335-7](#). For more information see Section V.E of this APT.

Research faculty may participate with voting rights in matters of governance and committee service at the Department level, except that they cannot participate or vote on promotion and tenure matters of tenure-track or professional practice faculty.

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

Research Associate Professor and Research Professor. Appointment at the rank of research associate professor or research professor requires that the individual have a doctorate and meet, at a minimum, the department's criteria for promotion to these ranks (Section VI-A.6).

4. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as two weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. Associated faculty may be reappointed. Associated faculty may be invited to participate in discussions on non-personnel matters, but may not participate in personnel matters, including promotion and tenure reviews, and may not vote on any matter.

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

Lecturer. Appointment as lecturer requires that the individual, at a minimum, have a Master's degree or equivalent in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is desirable. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure but may be promoted to Senior Lecturer if the criteria for appointment to that rank are met. The Lecturer position is to be used only when a specific instructional need is identified in the Department. The initial appointment for a lecturer should not exceed one year. Subsequent appointments may be of longer duration. Exceptions to lecturer appointment requirements may be granted by review and approval of the college and OAA.

Senior Lecturer. Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual, at a minimum, have a doctorate in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction; or a Master's degree or equivalent and at least five years of teaching experience with documentation of high quality. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The Senior Lecturer position is to be used only when a specific instructional need is identified in the Department. The initial appointment for a senior lecturer should not exceed one year. Subsequent appointments may be of longer duration. Exceptions to senior lecturer appointment requirements may be granted by review and approval of the college and OAA.

Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below 50%. Appointment at these titles is for individuals at 49% FTE or below, either compensated or uncompensated. The rank of associated faculty with titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Associated faculty members with titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure within the department) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of tenure-track faculty.

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. The visiting faculty rank is typically conferred on candidates who hold a faculty appointment at another institution. Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from an academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of tenure-track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. They may not be reappointed for more than three years at 100% FTE. Appointment of a visiting faculty member can occur only if the candidate will be collaborating with a faculty member of the Department. Evidence of the collaboration should be provided in a letter from the nominating faculty member to the Department Chair.

5. Regional Campus Professional Practice Faculty

This department appoints only professional practice faculty on the regional campuses.

Regional campus criteria for the appointment of professional practice faculty are the same as those for Columbus campus faculty.

6. Emeritus Faculty

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

Faculty will send a request for emeritus faculty status to the Department Chair outlining academic performance and citizenship. The Department's Personnel Committee will review the application and make a recommendation to the Chair. The Chair will decide upon the request, and if appropriate submit it to the Dean. If the faculty member requesting emeritus status has in the 10 years prior to the application engaged in serious dishonorable conduct in violation of law, rule, or policy and/or caused harm to the university's reputation or is retiring pending a procedure according to Faculty Rule [3335-05-04](#), emeritus status will not be considered.

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

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

7. Courtesy Appointments for Tenure-track, Professional Practice, and Research Faculty

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

B. Procedures

The appointment of all compensated tenure-track, professional practice, research, and associated faculty, irrespective of rank, must be based on a formal search process following the SHIFT Framework for faculty recruitment. All faculty positions must be posted in [Workday](#), the university's system of record for faculty and staff. Formal interviews are required for all positions. Appropriate disposition codes for applicants not selected for a position must be entered in workday to enable the university to explain why a candidate was not selected and what stage they progressed to before being removed.

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

- Recruitment of tenure-track, professional practice, and research faculty
- Appointments at senior rank or with prior service credit

- Hiring faculty from other institutions after April 30
- Appointment of foreign nationals
- Letters of offer

1. Tenure-track Faculty

A national search is required to ensure a deep 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 Volume 1, Chapter 4, section 5.1 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#). Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the college and the Office of Academic Affairs in advance. Search procedures must entail substantial faculty involvement and be consistent with the OAA [Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection](#).

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

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

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

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 university and unit EEO goals 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.

All appointment offers at the rank of associate professor, with or without tenure, and at the rank of professor with tenure, and all offers of prior service credit require the prior approval of the Dean and the Office of Academic Affairs. For offers at the rank of Associate Professor, with or without tenure, or Professor with tenure, an evaluation by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and a discussion and vote by the eligible faculty are required. Procedures are identical to those for promotion review of tenure-track faculty, with the exception that some recommendation letters may be included. Before the evaluation, candidates are given the opportunity to provide additional material on their research, teaching, and service record beyond that provided with their application.

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

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

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 interview is on professional practice rather than research. The Department Chair determines the details of the offer, including the length of the initial contract subject to approval by the Dean.

Appointments at the rank of Professional Practice Associate Professor or Professor require evaluation by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and a discussion and vote by the eligible faculty are required. This includes a requirement for external evaluation letters commenting on the candidate's credentials in teaching and/or professional practice, although recommendation letters may also be included.

3. Research Faculty

Searches for research faculty generally proceed identically as for tenure-track faculty, with the exception that the candidate is not asked to teach. Sources of funding for research faculty positions must also be identified and secured prior to appointment. The department chair determines the details of the offer, including the length of the initial contract subject to approval by the Dean.

Appointments at the rank of Associate Research Professor or Research Professor require evaluation by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and a discussion and vote by the eligible faculty. This includes a requirement for external evaluation letters, although recommendation letters may also be included.

4. Transfer of Appointment

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

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

5. Associated Faculty

The appointment 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. The reappointment of all compensated associated faculty members is decided by the department chair in consultation with the department Advisory Committee. All offer letters to associated faculty members require approval by the College.

Appointment of adjunct or visiting faculty may be proposed by any faculty member in the department. The proposal for adjunct faculty is considered by the Personnel Committee and if approved, the department chair extends an offer. The departmental approval of an offer for visiting faculty is provided solely by the department chair.

Associated appointments are generally made for a period of one year, unless a shorter or longer period is appropriate to the circumstances. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Adjunct appointments may be renewed only when the uncompensated academic service for which the appointment was made continues. Visiting appointments are limited to three years at 100% FTE. Lecturer appointments are usually made on an annual basis. After the initial appointment, and if the department's curricular needs warrant it, a multiple year appointment may be offered.

6. Regional Campus Professional Practice 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 regional campus has primary responsibility for determining the position description for a professional practice faculty search, but the dean/director or designee must reach agreement with the ECE department chair on the position before the search begins. The regional campus search committee must include at least one representative from the department.

Candidates are interviewed by, at a minimum, the regional campus dean, department chair, and either the regional campus search committee or a broader representation of the regional and Columbus faculties. The regional campus may have additional requirements for the search not specified in this document. A decision to make an offer requires agreement by the department chair and regional campus dean. Until agreement is reached, negotiations with the candidate may not begin, and the letter of offer must be signed by the department chair and the regional campus dean.

7. Courtesy Appointments for Tenure-track, Professional Practice, and Research Faculty

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a faculty member from another Ohio State department. The faculty advocate must provide a letter justifying the need for the courtesy appointment. In addition, the candidate must provide a resume and any other pertinent information detailing the candidate's research record.

The Personnel Committee will evaluate the candidate's documentation and, on that basis, make a recommendation to the Department Chair as to the candidate's suitability for the position. The Department Chair shall then either accept or reject the candidate's request. The faculty member who receives the courtesy appointment is expected to provide an activity report every year, describing the contributions made to the Department. The appointment will be evaluated every fifth year, and if the contributions to the Department are insubstantial, the Department Chair will terminate the courtesy appointment. However, the Department Chair can also terminate the appointment at any time should it be determined the appointment is not in the best interests of the Department.

V. Annual Performance and Merit Review Procedures

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in the [Policy on Faculty Annual Review and Reappointment](#), which stipulates that such reviews must include a scheduled opportunity for a face-to-face meeting as well as a written assessment. 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.

The annual performance and merit review of a faculty member is the responsibility of the department chair.

Depending on a faculty member's appointment type, the annual reviews are based on expected performance in teaching, research, and service as set forth in the department's guidelines on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload as well as how they have upheld University values; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.

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 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. Documentation

For their annual performance and merit review, compensated faculty members must submit the following documents to the department chair no later than January 31:

- Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#), Volume 3 (*required for probationary faculty*) or updated documentation of performance and accomplishments (*non-probationary faculty*) (see [sample template](#) for a template)
- updated CV

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

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

B. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty

The annual reviews for the first three years and for the fifth year will be conducted by the Department Chair in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Both the Department Chair and Promotion and Tenure Committee will evaluate the candidate's documentation (see Section V.A above). The Department Chair, with input from Promotion and Tenure Committee, will generate a letter concerning the progress of the individual in research, teaching, and service, respectively. Following a face-to-face meeting between the Department Chair and the probationary faculty member, this letter will be given to the probationary faculty member and will include a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

If the recommendation is to reappoint the candidate, then the 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). In the case of jointly appointed faculty, this letter should include input from all of the appointed TIUs. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, this evaluation is to be signed by all Directors and Chairs of TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed if within the College.

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

1. Fourth-Year Review

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

The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes on whether to renew the probationary appointment. The voting may be done electronically.

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

2. Extension of the Tenure Clock

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

C. Tenured Faculty

Associate professors are reviewed annually by the Department Chair. The Department Chair conducts an independent assessment; meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals; and prepares a written evaluation on these topics. Within 10 days after receiving the review letter, a faculty member may respond in writing to the annual review, and this response also becomes a part of that faculty member's file.

Professors are reviewed annually by the Department Chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance and future plans and goals. The annual review of professors is based on their having achieved sustained excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge relevant to the mission of the tenure initiating unit, as demonstrated by national and international recognition of their scholarship; ongoing excellence in teaching, including their leadership in graduate education in both teaching and mentoring students; and outstanding service to the department, the university, and their profession, including their support for the professional development of assistant and associate professors. Professors are expected to be 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 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. Within 10 days after receiving the review letter, a faculty member may respond in writing to the annual review, and this response also becomes a part of that faculty member's file.

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

It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to ensure that candid, constructive, and appropriate feedback is given to the faculty through this process. To this end, the Department Chair may actively consult with other members of the faculty, for example laboratory directors or other collaborators and associates of the faculty member, as deemed appropriate.

D. Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus

Annual review procedures for professional practice faculty differ for probationary and non-probationary faculty, and also for both probationary and non-probationary faculty in the penultimate contract year. Note that the initial contract of all professional practice faculty members is probationary regardless of the academic rank at hire. The duration of the initial contract defines the length of the probationary period.

Non-probationary, not penultimate year: Annual reviews follow procedures identical to those for tenured tenure-track faculty, including guidance for jointly appointed faculty.

Non-probationary, penultimate year: There is no presumption of reappointment at the end of a contract period. At the beginning of each penultimate contract year of a professional practice faculty member's appointment, the Department Chair will consult with the department Advisory Committee and with the Dean to determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, the consultation is extended to Chairs or Directors of any secondary appointment TIUs. If the position will not continue, the Department Chair should inform the faculty member 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. No annual review is required in this situation.

If the position will continue, the annual review in the penultimate year is conducted following procedures identical to those for annual reviews of tenured tenure-track faculty (i.e. conducted by the Department Chair only), and the Department Chair recommends whether it is appropriate to renew the candidate's contract. If the Department Chair recommends renewal, the decision is forwarded to the Dean. If the Department Chair does not recommend contract renewal, an additional review of the candidate's record occurs in the Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee (this process is similar to that conducted in annual reviews of probationary tenure-track faculty). The Promotion and Tenure Committee produces an additional letter that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the faculty member's contract; this letter is forwarded with the Department Chair's letter for consideration by the Dean, and the Dean makes the final decision.

Probationary, not penultimate year: Probationary professional practice faculty members must annually provide the documentation described in Section V.A above. A face-to-face meeting between the candidate and the Department Chair is required for any annual review of a probationary professional practice faculty member. The annual review letter is written by the Department Chair, who may seek input from other faculty members as deemed necessary. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, this evaluation is to be prepared in consultation with Chairs or Directors of any secondary appointment TIUs, and is to be signed by all Directors and Chairs of TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed if within the College.

Copies of all annual review letters for probationary professional practice faculty members, along with any written comments from the candidates, must be provided to the Dean. The Department Chair's letter recommends whether it is appropriate to renew the candidate's contract. If the Department Chair recommends renewal, the decision is final. If the Department Chair does not recommend contract renewal, the "penultimate year" procedures described below are invoked.

Probationary, penultimate year: There is no presumption of reappointment at the end of a contract period. At the beginning of the penultimate contract year, the Department Chair consults with the department Advisory Committee and with the Dean to determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, the consultation is extended to Chairs or Directors of any secondary appointment TIUs. If the position will not continue, the Department Chair should inform the faculty member 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. No annual review is required in this situation.

If the position will continue, the candidate must provide the documentation described in Section V.A above. This documentation is reviewed by the Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee, which prepares a letter providing feedback to the candidate and a recommendation to the department chair on renewal of the candidate's appointment. A face-to-face meeting between the candidate and the Department Chair is then required, and an additional review letter is written by the department chair. The Department Chair's letter provides an additional recommendation of whether it is appropriate to renew the candidate's contract. Both letters are then forwarded to the Dean, who makes the final decision on reappointment.

E. Research Faculty

Annual review procedures for research faculty differ for probationary and non-probationary faculty, and also for both probationary and non-probationary faculty in the penultimate contract year. Note that the initial contract of all research faculty members is probationary regardless of the academic rank at hire. The duration of the initial contract defines the length of the probationary period.

Non-probationary, not penultimate year: Annual reviews follow procedures identical to those for tenured tenure-track faculty.

Non-probationary, penultimate year: There is no presumption of reappointment at the end of a contract period. At the beginning of each penultimate contract year of a research faculty member's appointment, the Department Chair will consult with the Department's Advisory Committee and with the Dean to determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, the consultation is extended to Chairs or Directors of any secondary appointment TIUs. If the position will not continue, the Department Chair should inform the faculty member 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. No annual review is required in this situation.

If the position will continue, the annual review in the penultimate year is conducted following procedures identical to those for annual reviews of tenured tenure-track faculty (i.e. conducted by the Department Chair only), and the Department Chair recommends whether it is appropriate to renew the candidate's contract. If the Department Chair recommends renewal, the decision is forwarded to the Dean. If the Department Chair does not recommend contract renewal, an additional review of the candidate's record occurs in the Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee (this process is similar to that conducted in annual reviews of probationary tenure-track faculty). The Promotion and Tenure Committee produces an additional letter that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the faculty member's contract; this letter is forwarded with the Department Chair's letter for consideration by the Dean, and the Dean makes the final decision.

Probationary, not penultimate year: Probationary research faculty members must annually provide the documentation described in Section V.A above. A face-to-face meeting between the candidate and the Department Chair is required for any annual review of a probationary research faculty member. The annual review letter is written by the Department Chair, who may seek input from other faculty members as deemed necessary. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, this evaluation is to be prepared in consultation with Chairs or Directors of any secondary appointment TIUs, and is to be signed by all Directors and Chairs of TIUs to which the faculty member has been appointed if within the College. Copies of all annual review letters for probationary research faculty members, along with any written comment from the candidates, must be provided to the Dean. The Department Chair's letter recommends whether it is appropriate to renew the candidate's contract. If the Department Chair recommends renewal,

the decision is final. If the Department Chair does not recommend contract renewal, the “penultimate year” procedures described below are invoked.

Probationary, penultimate year: There is no presumption of reappointment at the end of a contract period. At the beginning of the penultimate contract year, the Department Chair consults with the Department's Advisory Committee and with the Dean to determine whether the position held by the faculty member will continue. In the case of jointly appointed faculty, the consultation is extended to Chairs or Directors of any secondary appointment TIUs. If the position will not continue, the Department Chair should inform the faculty member 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. No annual review is required in this situation.

If the position will continue, the candidate must provide the documentation described in Section V.A above. This documentation is reviewed by the Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee, which prepares a letter providing feedback to the candidate and a recommendation to the department chair on renewal of the candidate's appointment. A face-to-face meeting between the candidate and the Department Chair is then required, and an additional review letter is written by the department chair. The Department Chair's letter provides an additional recommendation of whether it is appropriate to renew the candidate's contract. Both letters are then forwarded to the Dean, who makes the final decision on reappointment.

F. Associated Faculty

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. There is no presumption of reappointment at the end of a contract period. If the position will not continue, the Department Chair should inform the faculty member that there will be a non-renewal of employment. If the position will continue, a formal performance review for reappointment is necessary to determine whether the faculty member will be offered a new contract. Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment are reviewed annually by the Department Chair. The Department Chair or designee prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. The Department Chair's recommendation on reappointment is final. If the recommendation is to renew, the Department Chair may extend a multiple year appointment subject to the limitations discussed in Section IV.C.5 of the College of Engineering Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Document and Faculty Rule [3335-7](#).

Annual reviews of associated faculty members follow the same procedures of annual reviews for tenured tenure-track faculty.

G. Regional Campus Professional Practice Faculty

Regional campus professional practice faculty are reviewed according to the process established on that campus, with the review focusing on teaching and service. The regional campus dean will provide the department chair a copy of a professional practice faculty member's annual performance and merit review letter.

H. Salary Recommendations

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

On occasion, one-time cash payments or other rewards, such as extra travel funds, are made to recognize non-continuing contributions that justify reward but do not justify permanent salary increases. Such payments/rewards are considered at the time of annual salary recommendations.

Meritorious performance in teaching, research, and service are assessed over the past 36 months, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity. Faculty with high-quality performance in all applicable areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

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

The Department Chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the dean, who may modify these recommendations. Salary increases are formulated in dollar amounts rather than percentage increases, with the goal of distributing available funds in a manner that achieves the optimal distribution of salaries. As a general approach to formulating salary recommendations, the department chair relies upon the results of the annual review and considers market and internal equity issues as appropriate. The department chair should proactively engage in an annual equity audit of faculty salaries to ensure that they are commensurate both within the department and across the field or fields represented in the department.

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

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.

VI. Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews

A. Criteria and Evidence that Support Promotion

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) provides the following additional 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.

1. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

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

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

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

The award of tenure is an acknowledgement of excellence and future potential for preeminence. It is therefore essential to evaluate and judge the probability that faculty, once tenured, will continue to develop professionally and contribute to the department's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university.

Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Above all, candidates are held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. For example, assume that the candidate's annual load is 45% research, 45% teaching and 10% service. A mediocre performance in research and service cannot be counter balanced with an excellent performance in teaching, nor can mediocre performance in teaching be counter balanced with excellent performance in research and service. Excellence in teaching, research, and service are moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the [American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics](#).

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

Teaching

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have an excellent teaching portfolio. Note, the types of evidence listed are not intended to be comprehensive, but are intended to be exemplars that support each criterion:

TEACHING	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Candidates must have demonstrated excellence in instruction:	• Provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge • Demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm • Demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment

	• Provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process (as reflected in student's comments) • Treated students with respect and courtesy (as reflected in student's comments) • Summary of student comment upon taking the class • Summary of peer evaluation reports
Continuous improvement and new content generation	• Changes to or development of syllabi, examinations, laboratory exercises, problem sets, computer software demonstrate up-to-date thought on subject content • Improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs • Completed Teaching at Ohio State through the Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning • In the case of jointly appointed faculty, improved interdisciplinary curriculum across two or more departments, schools or colleges through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs.
Demonstrate mentorship	• Have a robust research group of graduate and undergraduate students • Have mentored graduate students to growing their portfolio as a researcher. This includes engagement with their peer society via intellectual contributions, defending their research work, teaching them how to mentor junior students, and so on

Consistency is a key aspect of the candidate's evaluation with respect to teaching. Generally poor teaching evaluations punctuated by the occasional good, or even excellent, performance are not considered sufficient for promotion and tenure. This is especially true if the better evaluations are clustered at the end of the probationary period and do not appear to be the result of a steady effort toward improvement, but rather suggest application of just enough effort to fulfill a requirement. Consistency applies in similar fashion to the candidate's performance in graduate student advising and on the various forms of graduate examination committees.

The Department expects the candidate to have taught a variety of material at all academic levels from the undergraduate to the graduate. It is also expected that the candidate will have taught a range of class sizes. Significant differences among the areas, departmental needs, scheduling matters, and other opportunities will impact the degree of diversity represented in the candidate's teaching history. Many of these factors will lie beyond the candidate's control, but it remains desirable that the candidate's teaching record demonstrate excellence in a variety of instructional situations.

Research

Successful candidates will demonstrate a well-developed research program with a healthy prognosis for future growth. Note, the types of evidence are not intended to be comprehensive, but are intended to be exemplars that support each criterion. Characteristics of such programs include:

Research	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Demonstrated excellence in research output	• Archival publications that demonstrate a research identity that is independent of the candidate's own doctoral advisor and of other faculty members at The Ohio State University or elsewhere • Publications in high quality forums • Publications with their students and post-doctoral researchers • Impact of work • National and international recognition as someone who has the potential to be one of the top researchers in his or her field. • Invited talks at peer institutions/conferences
Mentorship and Advisees	• The demonstrated ability to develop graduate students as apprentice researchers and to advise them effectively through their graduate programs
Grantsmanship	• Singe/Lead PI activity • Collaborative activity • Healthy ratio of submitted/funded proposals • Funding from multiple agencies

Evidence of consistency must be very clear. A burst of activity in the year or two just prior to consideration for promotion and tenure may not be considered favorably, because it fails to support the belief that consistent, high-quality work may be expected of the candidate in the future.

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

We establish the following research criteria specific to promotion to Associate Professor with tenure:

Publication: The successful candidate will have published a body of papers in peer reviewed journals and/or conferences of high quality that clearly demonstrates creation of an independent research program over time, and contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus. Publications should be thematically focused. There should be evidence of growing influence on the work of others. The

successful candidate will possess a record of publication that is both consistent and increasing in magnitude and impact over time. It is typical that a successful candidate might have a slower rate of publication at the outset of his/her career due to establishment of his/her research program, but successful candidates are expected to be well beyond this by the time of promotion review, and there should be clear evidence predicting continued scholarship beyond promotion.

While it is typical that the candidate's dossier will include publications co-authored with the doctoral advisor, a significant portion of the publications, especially the archival publications, should be authored by the candidate with his or her own graduate students. Collaborative work is strongly encouraged, and indeed is essential to most types of inquiry. In this case, the candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described to permit accurate assessment. In the assessment of collaborative work that has led to research productivity, there shall be no evaluative bias against the number of collaborators or co-authors of publications, proposals, projects or other tangible products of the work. Because of the synergism that often results from collaborative work and because of the unique capabilities that individual contributors bring to a team, an assessment of contribution based solely on a linear fractionation of contribution among collaborators can be misleading and inappropriate, and a more holistic assessment of the candidate's contribution must be made.

A complete publication record will include more than archival journal papers. Conference papers (both refereed and otherwise), books, book chapters, magazine articles, patents, invention disclosures, licensing of university-developed intellectual property, and so on are all worthy products of the faculty member's research enterprise. Generally, these are considered to be secondary to the archival output, but in some research areas more consideration is warranted, especially for those research areas where highly selective refereed conference publications are deemed more prestigious than their journal counterparts. To have a significant impact on the candidate's case, it is imperative that the conferences involved be widely recognized as refereed, highly selective, and of high quality. The visibility of the conference as a focal point for research in the area must be clearly established.

Graduate Student Development: Consistent with educational objectives, the successful candidate will be advising a group of graduate students at varying stages of progress in their own development as apprentice researchers, with clear evidence of support to the graduate students through extramural funding and evidence of publishing with these students. It is expected that the successful candidate will have already graduated at least one PhD student or be close to achieving this goal. It is also expected that there be clear evidence for a graduate student advisee cohort that will sustain growth of the research program beyond promotion.

Extramural Research Funding: The successful candidate will have demonstrated an ability to obtain and potential to sustain research program funding. Research funding is a means to an end; funding that has not led to research productivity is disregarded in the review. The successful candidate will have a research record that includes consistent evidence of proposal development and submission for which the candidate is the Principal Investigator. There should be clear evidence that the candidate can independently generate funding for his/her research program that is sufficient to support graduate students and the specific expenses to carry out the particular research program. Funding for which the candidate serves as Co-Principal Investigator, while also supportive of a research program, does not substitute for demonstration of the ability to obtain research support as Principal or Sole Investigator. There should also be clear and compelling evidence for sustainable funding beyond promotion, through evidence of ongoing programs, pending proposals and so on. There shall be no evaluative bias against any particular source of research funding if it has led to research productivity.

Reputation: A developing national/international reputation in the candidate's field as evidenced by external evaluations, invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals, and a beginning trend of positive citations in other researchers'

publications. A reputation based on the quality of the research contribution is distinguished from one based mainly on familiarity through the faculty member's frequent attendance at national and international conferences.

Ethics: The candidate should have demonstrated a high degree of ethics in the conduct of research including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators.

Service

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

- Made substantive contributions to the governance of the department in a manner that facilitates positive contributions by others
- Demonstrated the potential for useful contributions to the profession

Service	
Criteria	Types of Evidence Demonstrating Impact and Showing Criteria Have Been Met
Demonstrated excellence in service to intellectual peer community	• Panels for judging proposal • Reviewing papers • Serving in an organizing capacity for flagship conferences (chapter activities, workshops, program chair for conferences, sessions, and so on) • Serving in an administrative capacity to peer society • Serving as an associate editor of prestigious journal in their field
Demonstrated excellence to governance of the department	• Playing an active role in department, college and University level committees • Playing an active role in the ECE/College community for ad-hoc occasions

2. Promotion to Professor

Faculty Rule [3335-6-02](#) (C) and (D) establishes the following general criteria for promotion to the rank of professor:

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

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.

The specific criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and increasing quality and quantity of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national and international reputation in the field. The tables with exemplars of criteria and evidence are still applicable here. The Department review considers the full dossier for context, but places primary emphasis on the period since last appointment, or the past five years, whichever is shorter. A successful review should provide clear indication that excellent performance will continue well beyond the promotion.

Promotion standards are to reflect the reality that (a) not all faculty members have the same distribution of assignments, (b) not all faculty members will be able to contribute excellence equally in all evaluation dimensions, and (c) there is a multi-faceted institutional responsibility that must be achieved by the skills of the faculty collectively. Promotion to professor should be awarded not only to those faculty who have demonstrated impact in their scholarship of research and creative inquiry, teaching and learning, and service, but also to those who have exhibited academic leadership that has led to demonstrable impact upon the mission of the Department and The Ohio State University.

Teaching

For promotion to professor, the candidate should have a consistent record of good classroom performance, as documented by student and peer evaluations. He or she is expected to be actively involved in curriculum development consistent with the needs of the Department and the area. The candidate is expected to have advised to completion a number of Ph.D. students and participated in examination committees. In addition, Ph.D. advisees in various stages of their programs are also expected.

Research

For promotion to professor, the candidate should have a research record of impact that is nationally and internationally recognized by scholars in his or her area. This should be supported by the external evaluation letters and documented by citations by other authors. Other indicators of this impact include a significant body of publications in refereed journals, conference proceedings, book chapters and in other forms, particularly in high quality archival journals. In addition, evidence of a well-developed, successful research program is required; examples of such evidence include multiple Ph.D. students advised to completion, the placement of PhD's in prestigious institutions, and a long-term (e.g. > 5 years immediately leading to the promotion consideration) sustained record of funding at a level beyond the requirements for promotion to associate professor with tenure and at a level consistent with the candidate's research area. There should also be evidence of significant on-going research activities that includes papers in review, continuing grants/contracts and/or submitted proposals, a steady flow of graduate students receiving graduate degrees, and a presence of advisees at different stages in their programs.

Service

The well-rounded member of the faculty of a premier institution such as The Ohio State University is expected to assume a leadership role in his or her research community and its professional activities. For

promotion to professor, service in leadership roles at the national (international) level is expected. This could be in the form of editorships of prestigious journals, conference organization committees, service to professional societies and review panels. In addition, we also expect our faculty to carry their fair share of the service burden to the Department and the rest of the OSU community. For promotion to professor, some level of service and leadership in college and university committees is also desirable.

3. Professional Practice Faculty on the Columbus Campus

From Faculty Rule [3335-7](#), professional practice faculty are teacher/practitioners engaged primarily in teaching activities, especially those related to courses or instructional situations involving professional skills. The criteria for promotion reflect the importance of the responsibilities of professional practice faculty. External evaluations are optional in the promotion review of professional practice faculty.

All professional practice faculty are expected to:

- be engaged in teaching, the development of one or more of the departmental programs, and the mentoring of students;
- contribute to the outreach and engagement mission of the department;
- contribute to service and thereby demonstrate a commitment to citizenship and collegiality.

The teaching activities of professional practice faculty must be consistent with the rationale for having professional practice faculty in the college; these consist of courses that involve the professional practice of engineering. The scholarly emphasis of professional practice faculty is expected to be different from that of tenure-track and research faculty; professional practice faculty are to be more engaged in activities dealing with the professional practice of engineering and its impact on engineering education whereas tenure-track and research faculty are more engaged in activities that advance the state-of-the-art and science of engineering. The venues appropriate for dissemination of such scholarly contributions may be different from those expected of tenure-track and research faculty. Scholarly and professional service activities of professional practice faculty are expected to emphasize outreach and interaction with constituencies beyond the research community, such as with industry, the broader educational community, and the broad community of practitioners.

The teaching and service criteria for promotion in rank for professional practice faculty are different than the corresponding criteria for promotion in rank for tenure-track faculty, with an emphasis on contributions in teaching. Further, the department recognizes that professors of professional practice may contribute to the department and their discipline in a variety of ways which may differ from one candidate to another. In this regard, the dossier should clearly identify any contributions beyond classroom teaching, laboratory instruction, and internal service. Professional Practice faculty should work with the Department Chair at the annual reviews to identify their contributions to the department and ways to stay current in their chosen discipline. Such contributions and measures will not apply to all professional practice faculty. The list below provides examples but is not comprehensive.

- Advising of student organizations and student project teams
- ABET related activities
- Instructional activities outside the classroom:
 - Authorship of textbooks, where wide use of such texts implies a significant measure of positive peer recognition.
 - Grants for teaching and course development, especially if they involve significant peer evaluation.
 - Mentoring of other teachers
 - Curriculum development, including course development, laboratory development and curriculum-wide changes; the dossier should provide detailed description and rationale

- Participation in the Course Design Institute from the University Center for the Advancement of Teaching to update and/or introduce a new course.
 - The earning of an “endorsement” from the University Institute of Teaching
- Scholarship and publication related to teaching
 - Publications in ASEE Prism, ASEE Journal of Engineering Education, or other appropriate journals
- Teaching awards for classroom instruction.
- Notable research activity such as:
 - Advising undergraduate research and undergraduate honors theses
 - Advising on MS theses
 - Advising on PhD dissertation committees and candidacy examinations
 - Meaningful involvement in graduate exams, theses, and dissertations, in capacity other than that of advisor.
 - Fundraising in support of student projects
- Demonstration of engineering practice through summer faculty fellowship programs or other experiences with industry or national labs.

Promotion to professional practice associate professor. For promotion to Professional Practice Associate Professor, there must be clear and convincing evidence that the candidate has and will continue to provide:

- high quality teaching or instruction as it relates to professional practice;
- mentorship of students;
- support of the outreach and engagement mission of the department, college, and university;
- service that demonstrates a commitment to citizenship and collegiality;
- promise of continued professional growth.

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

Promotion to professional practice professor. For promotion to Professional Practice Professor, there must be clear and convincing evidence that the candidate has and will continue to provide:

- distinguished and sustained accomplishment in the area of teaching or instruction as it relates to professional practice
- sustained growth as an educator; example activities are listed above
- sustained mentorship of students
- sustained support of the outreach and engagement mission of the department, college, and university
- proven leadership in service, professional practice, and/or teaching at the national and/or international level
- service that demonstrates a commitment to citizenship and collegiality.
- production and dissemination of scholarly materials pertinent to pedagogy and/or professional practice.

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

4. Research Faculty

Promotion to Research Associate Professor: For promotion to research associate professor, a faculty member must have a substantial record of high-quality focused research consistent with an appointment

devoted solely to research. Publications in high-quality peer-reviewed venues are required, as well as external evaluator comments that indicate the candidate's substantial positive impact on the field. A record of continuous funding support is required along with evidence of a growing national reputation. The criteria for promotion are similar to those under the research and service categories for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. It is recognized however that research faculty are often engaged in research that applies and transitions new technologies into practice, as opposed to purely fundamental research. The importance of maintaining continuous salary support for research faculty is also recognized. The department takes these distinctions into consideration when evaluating candidates; clear evidence of high quality research contributions and of graduate student supervision are required in all cases.

Promotion to Research Professor: For promotion to research professor, a faculty member must have a national and international reputation built on an extensive body of high-quality publications and with demonstrated impact on the field. A record of continuous funding support is required, along with demonstrated research productivity as a result of such funding. The criteria for promotion are similar to those under the research and service categories for promotion to Professor. It is recognized however that research faculty are often engaged in research that applies and transitions new technologies into practice, as opposed to purely fundamental research. The importance of maintaining continuous salary support for research faculty is also recognized. The department takes these distinctions into consideration when evaluating candidates; clear evidence of high quality research contributions and of graduate student supervision are required in all cases.

5. Associated Faculty

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

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

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

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

6. Regional Campus Professional Practice Faculty

The criteria for promotion of professional practice faculty on a regional campus are identical to those on the Columbus Campus.

B. Procedures

The department's procedures for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews are fully consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule [3335-6-04](#) and the Office Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the [Policies and Procedures Handbook](#).

Consideration of candidates for promotion and/or tenure requires at least one meeting of the eligible faculty to discuss the candidates. The cases for promotion to professor are discussed and voted on before those for promotion to associate professor, to allow candidates for promotion to professor to participate, without any reservations, in the discussion of cases for promotion to associate professor. In this meeting,

the eligible faculty consider and discuss the Promotion and Tenure Committee's reports and cast secret ballots. Those who are teleconferenced into the meeting may vote by electronic ballot to the Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair. Ballots shall be retained by the Department Chair in a confidential file for a period of four years. Because of the obvious importance of the meeting of the eligible faculty to the candidates as well as to the future of the Department, each eligible faculty member is expected to attend the meeting in its entirety. Accordingly, the Chair of the P & T committee will notify each member in writing of the time, date, location, and expected duration of the meeting.

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

a. Candidate Responsibilities

Candidates for promotion and tenure or promotion are responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier and providing a copy of the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed, if other than the department's current document. If external evaluations are required), candidates are responsible for suggesting potential external evaluators as requested by the department chair and/or the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair. Each of these elements is described in detail below.

- **Dossier**

Every candidate must submit a complete and accurate dossier that follows the Office of Academic Affairs [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.

Teaching Documentation

- Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer-generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class; it is the department policy that student evaluations using the SEI are to be performed for every offering of every course, every term. Therefore, the SEI (or its successors) will serve as the instrument for the collection of student evaluations for promotion and tenure purposes.
- Student written comments obtained through the SEI for every class
- Copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published (either print or online), or accepted for publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.
- Teaching activities as listed in the core dossier including
 - Involvement in graduate/professional exams, theses, and dissertations, and undergraduate research

- Mentoring postdoctoral scholars and researchers
- Extension and continuing education instruction
- Involvement in curriculum development
- Awards and formal recognition of teaching
- Presentations on pedagogy and teaching at national and international conferences
- Adoption of teaching materials at other colleges or universities.
- Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.
- Peer evaluation of teaching reports are not provided by the candidate, but are provided to the Promotion and Tenure Committee and eligible faculty by the Department Chair.

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.

Scholarship Documentation

- Copies of all books, articles, and scholarly papers published (print or online) or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form, with no further revisions needed.
- Documentation of grants and contracts received.
- Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted.)
- Research activities as listed in the core dossier, including:
 - Documentation of creative works pertinent to the candidate's professional focus including artwork, choreography, collections, compositions, curated exhibits, moving images, multimedia, performances, radio, recitals, recordings, television, and websites
 - Documentation of inventions, patents, disclosures, options and commercial licenses
 - List of prizes and awards for research, scholarly, or creative work.
- The Department does not require the candidate to provide a numerical percentage of contribution to papers; however, the candidate must provide the percentage contribution and percentage expenditure for grants/contracts.
- The candidate is not required to describe contributions to joint-authored publications in detail, but the candidate may do so if he or she feels that it will benefit the case.
- The candidate can decide how to fulfill the request for a "Description of quality indicators of research, scholarly, or creative work."

The time-period for service documentation to be included in the dossier for probationary faculty is the start date to present. For tenured or 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.

Service Documentation

- Service activities as listed in the core dossier, including:
 - Involvement with professional journals and professional societies

- Consultation activity with industry, education, or government
- Practice services
- Administrative service to department
- Administrative service to college
- Administrative service to university and Student Life
- Advising to student groups and organizations
- Awards and prizes for service to profession, university, or department.
- Any available documentation (e.g. letters from committee chairs) of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier

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

- **Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Document**

Candidates must indicate the APT document under which they wish to be reviewed. A candidate may be reviewed using the department's current APT document, or they may elect to be reviewed under either (a) the APT document that was in effect on their start date, or (b) the APT document that was in effect on the date of their last promotion (or last reappointment in the case of 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**

If external evaluations are required the candidate is permitted suggest a maximum of 3 reviewers. In a similar manner, the candidate can provide up to two names of potential evaluators to be excluded. These potential evaluators are in addition to those selected by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. There will be a minimum of five external evaluation letters and no more than half can be from the candidate's list. The Promotion and Tenure Committee is not obligated to follow the candidate's recommendations. Under no circumstances should a candidate solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the review.

b. Promotion and Tenure Committee Responsibilities

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

- To review this APT document annually in the early fall semester and to recommend proposed revisions to the faculty.
- To include a Procedures Oversight Designee who fulfills the responsibilities described in the Office of Academic Affairs [annual procedural guidelines](#). The Procedures Oversight Designee cannot be the same individual who chairs the committee.

- To provide, at the beginning of Spring semester, an evaluation memo for annual reviews of probationary tenure-track faculty, professional practice faculty, and research faculty as described in Sections V.B, V.D, and V.E, respectively.
- To provide a letter to the Dean for re-appointment consideration of non-probationary professional practice faculty and research faculty as described in Sections V.D and V.E, respectively.
- To consider requests from faculty members seeking a non-mandatory review in the following academic year and to decide by majority vote 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 decision is based on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's current dossier submission (see above) and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (including 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 [3335-6-04A\(3\)](#) for one year. Faculty Rules [3335-7-08](#) and [3335-7-36](#) make the same provision for nonprobationary professional practice and research faculty, respectively. If the denial was based on lack of required documentation and the faculty member insists that the subsequent review go forward despite incomplete documentation, the individual should be advised that such a review is unlikely to be successful.
 - A decision 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.
- To provide administrative support for the promotion and tenure review process as described below. For tenure-track faculty, this process occurs annually in the Autumn; for professional practice or research faculty renewal review of probationary contracts in the penultimate contract year, or for appointments at senior ranks this process may occur at other times.
 - Review candidates' dossiers for completeness, accuracy (including citations), and consistency with Office of Academic Affairs or other applicable requirements.
 - Work with candidates to assure that needed revisions are made in the dossier before the formal review process begins.
 - Seek to clarify any inconsistent evidence in the case, where possible.
 - Prepare a presentation describing the candidate's performance in teaching, research and service to present in an eligible faculty meeting.
 - Prepare a summary letter to the Department Chair following the faculty meeting that includes an analysis of the candidate's record, the faculty vote, and a summary of the faculty perspectives expressed during the meeting.
 - Provide a written response, on behalf of the eligible faculty, to any candidate comments that warrant response, for inclusion in the dossier.

- Provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the Department Chair in the case of joint appointees from another tenure-initiating unit. The full eligible faculty does not vote on these cases since the department's recommendation must be provided to the other tenure-initiating unit substantially earlier than the committee begins meeting on this department's cases.

The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure committee has the following additional responsibilities:

- To determine suitable external evaluators for promotion or appointment consideration (by May 31 for faculty promotions) through consultation with the candidate, the faculty members in the candidate's research area, and the Department Chair. The external evaluators will be drawn predominantly from prominent faculty at peer and aspirational peer programs.
- To solicit external evaluation letters as required to meet the applicable review schedule (also see External Evaluations below.)

c. Eligible Faculty Responsibilities

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

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

It must be understood that the Promotion and Tenure Committee's report in no way relieves each eligible faculty member of the personal obligation to judge the merits of each candidate for promotion and tenure, balancing higher accomplishments and/or heavier responsibilities in one area against less significant accomplishments in another.

d. Department Chair Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the department chair are as follows:

- After the successful appointment of a new faculty member, to determine and appoint an appropriate mentor or mentors to aid the new faculty member with regard to procedures and processes of research, teaching and service within the University.
- To charge each member of the Eligible Faculty Committee to conduct reviews free of bias and based on criteria.
- To determine whether a candidate is authorized to work in the United States and whether a candidate now, or in the future, will require sponsorship for an employment visa or immigration status. For tenure-track assistant professors, the department will confirm that candidates are eligible to work in the U.S. Candidates who are not U.S. citizens or nationals, permanent residents, asylees, or refugees will be required to sign an [MOU](#) at the time of promotion with tenure.

- To review faculty with budgeted joint appointments. The TIU head from the joint appointment unit must provide a letter of evaluation to the primary TIU head. The input should be in the form of a narrative commenting on faculty duties, responsibilities, and workload; on any additional assignments; and on impact of the work of the individual in the field of the joint unit.
- To make each considered candidate's dossier available in an accessible place for review by the eligible faculty (but secure from others) at least two weeks before the meeting at which specific cases are to be discussed and voted. At no time should the materials provided include anonymous comments or anonymous letters.
- To remove any member of the eligible faculty from the review of a candidate when the member has a conflict of interest but does not voluntarily withdraw from the review.
- To attend the meetings of the eligible faculty at which promotion and tenure matters are discussed and respond to questions raised during the meeting. At the request of the eligible faculty, the department chair will leave the meeting to allow open discussion among the eligible faculty members.
- To provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation for each candidate, following receipt of the eligible faculty's completed evaluation and recommendation.
- In the event the Department Chair finds it necessary to depart from the recommendation of the eligible faculty, the Department Chair must so inform the eligible faculty in a meeting. The Department Chair should give reasons and invite comments at that meeting or in writing within 2 business days.
- To inform each candidate in writing upon completion of the department review process:
 - Of the recommendations by the eligible faculty and department chair;
 - Of the availability for review of the written evaluations by the eligible faculty and department chair;
 - Of the opportunity to submit written comments on the above material, within ten days from receipt of the letter from the department chair, for inclusion in the dossier. The letter is accompanied by a form that the candidate returns to the department chair, indicating whether or not he or she expects to submit comments.
- To provide a written response to any candidate comments that warrants response for inclusion in the dossier.
- To forward the completed dossier to the college office by that office's deadline.
- To receive the Promotion and Tenure Committee's written evaluation and recommendation of candidates who are joint appointees from other tenure-initiating units, and to forward this material, along with the department chair's own independent written evaluation and recommendation, to the head of the other tenure-initiating unit by the date requested.
- To determine the continuation status of research and professional practice faculty positions in the contract penultimate year and conduct the applicable re-appointment review process for continuing positions.

- To conduct a program of peer evaluation of teaching for all Assistant and Associate Professors, so that at least two peer evaluations are obtained annually for each Assistant and Associate Professor. The Department Chair will assign review duties annually to Associate Professors (for review of Assistant Professors) or Professors (for review of Assistant or Associate Professors). Faculty conducting the peer evaluation of teaching form the Peer Review of Teaching Committee (see Section IX.B.)

2. Procedures for Associated Faculty

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

3. Procedures for Regional Campus Professional Practice Faculty

Regional campus professional practice 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. Following the review, the dean consults with the department chair. A request to promote follows the same procedures as tenure-track faculty except that external letters are not needed unless scholarship is a component of the assigned role.

4. External Evaluations

In keeping with the national standing of The Ohio State University, the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering will ask for evaluations from faculty who are nationally/internationally recognized in their field or subfields. Because of the nature of the department's research mission, and because electrical and computer engineering experts can be found outside of traditional departments, a specific list of institutions or even programs cannot be easily devised. However, the following principles will be followed in identifying external reviewers: the external reviewer will be nationally or internationally known in the field related to a candidate's research, as demonstrated by a number of metrics, including (but not limited to) membership in the National Academy of Engineering, publications, national and international awards for their research, recognition as a fellow of peer societies (AAAS, IEEE, APS, etc.), and presence on editorial boards of major journals and so on. Where relevant, an external reviewer will be a distinguished, award-winning scholar who is not affiliated with an academic institution.

External evaluations of research and scholarly activity are obtained for all promotion reviews in which research must be assessed. These include all tenure-track promotion and tenure or promotion reviews and all research promotion reviews. External evaluations of research and scholarly activity are not obtained for professional practice or associated faculty members unless the faculty member has been involved in a significant amount of research, but evaluations of teaching activity may be required by the College of Engineering. The decision to seek external evaluations for a professional practice faculty member will be made by the department chair after consulting with the candidate, the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs of the College of Engineering.

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; typically, six letters are included. A credible and useful evaluation:

- Is written by a person, not in conflict (see above), who is 1) a distinguished expert in the field or sub-field, as indicated by the impact of their publications; national and international awards for their research; prominence in professional organizations; and presence on editorial boards of major journals, and so on; 2) is nationally or internationally known in a field d/sub-field of candidate's research area; 3) meets the standards for a peer reviewer in a TIU in which the candidate is joint-appointed; and/or 4) where relevant, is a distinguished, award winning scientist or scholar who is not affiliated with an academic institution. Whenever possible, external reviewers will hold the rank of Professor. In the case of an Assistant Professor seeking promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from Associate Professors.
- Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and or the usefulness of the letters received, tenure-track faculty evaluation letters are solicited no later than the end of June prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

As described above, the list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee using input from department faculty, the department chair, and the candidate. In cases of jointly appointed faculty, additional evaluators may be suggested by the Department Chair of the secondary appointment TIU as appropriate. 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 Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair will take reasonable steps to verify that all reviewers have an "arm's-length" relationship to the candidate, i.e., not advisors, supervisors, relatives, co-authors, research collaborators, or contract administrators. The outside evaluators will be asked to comment on the technical and professional quality of the candidate, and specifically on:

- Quality of the research, including its significance and impact
- The originality and creativity displayed by the candidate
- The opinion of the outside evaluator as to the quality of the journals in which the candidate has published
- The opinion of the outside evaluator as to the quality and level of selectivity of the conferences in which the candidate has presented work.
- The contribution of the candidate to the profession in terms of service.

In addition, the outside evaluators will be asked to compare the candidate to other people in the same sub-discipline at the same stage in their careers.

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

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.

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.

VII. Promotion and Tenure and Reappointment Appeals

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

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

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

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

VIII. Seventh-Year Reviews

Faculty Rule [3335-6-05](#) sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a Seventh Year Review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year (mandatory tenure) review.

IX. Procedures for Student and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

A Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) is required in every course offered in this department. Faculty members should choose a day late in the semester when attendance is likely to be high if s/he is going to provide in-class time for students to complete the evaluation using a mobile application. The faculty member must leave the classroom during the time allotted for completing the evaluation. The faculty member should reiterate to students that the feedback provided in the evaluations is used both for performance reviews and to provide feedback that can be taken into account in future teaching.

B Peer Evaluation of Teaching

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

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

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

- To review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and professional practice faculty at least twice per year during each year of service before the commencement of the mandatory review, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned.
- To review the teaching of tenured associate professors and non-probationary professional practice associate professors at least twice a year, with the goal of assessing teaching at all the levels of instruction to which the faculty member is assigned over a six-year period and of having at least four peer reviews of teaching before the commencement of a promotion review.
- To review, upon the Department Chair's request, the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.

Reviews conducted upon the request of the Department Chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the Department Chair or faculty member and include class visitations. Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations are comprehensive and may include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instruction materials. In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should focus on such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the class visits, submits a written report to the Department Chair. The reviewer may meet with the candidate to give feedback. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.